

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes, and then the Senator from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes, and we will vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Montana and commend the reasoning he has presented to this body. What he has pointed out is we could move ahead on this issue and reach a fair resolution of the injustice of the marriage tax penalty if we just had the opportunity to have a reasonable debate and discussion on these measures. We are effectively being denied, closed out from that opportunity. I just thank him for reiterating that. As a leader on the Finance Committee on this issue, I think he has made this case in a very powerful way.

EDUCATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on the issue of education, the elementary and secondary education legislation will be coming to the floor in the next several days, according to what the leader has announced. I wish to indicate, once again, the position of those of us on this side of the aisle and what we tried to do in the markup of the education proposal several weeks ago.

We attempted to follow some of the rather radical, but significant, changes we have seen as a result of enhanced and improved academic achievement at the local level. We want some guarantees because of the scarce resources available to us.

As my colleagues know, 7 cents out of every dollar for education comes from the Federal Government. We are strongly committed on this side of the aisle to building on tried and tested programs that are indicating enhanced achievement for the children of this country, rather than the alternative, which is a block grant program our Republican friends have supported.

We will have a chance to go through their legislation. It is S. 2. Instead of providing targeted resources to local communities for improving teacher quality, smaller class size, afterschool programs, the majority, in this lengthy legislation, says it should be ". . . determination of State participation, the Governor of a State"—not the local parents, not the local school board, not the local community, but the Governor of a State—"in consultation with the individual body responsible for the education of the State shall determine. . . ." We will go through the legislation next week,

Their legislation says 5 years later there is going to be an accounting. We, on this side, do not want to wait 5 years to find out if their particular block grant program has been effective. All one has to do is go back to 1965 to 1969. We provided block grants to the States under the title I program. We will go through some of this during the debate. The State of Tennessee—all

States have indicated how they utilized the money—purchased 18 portable swimming pools in the summer of 1966 at \$3,500 each. The justification was that funds originally approved for a summer remedial program would not be spent and the money would otherwise go unspent. There is the buying of football uniforms in some States, and the buying of musical instruments for groups not even affected by title I. We will go through what has happened historically with the block grant program.

Our programs are targeted to make sure we have a well-trained teacher in every classroom. We believe the overwhelming majority of American parents understand that and want that. We want to make sure we have smaller class sizes. We do not need more studies. We have had all the studies, and we have the results. We understand, as Senator MURRAY has pointed out so effectively, that smaller class sizes result in enhanced academic achievement. We believe, with the scarce resources available, we ought to invest in a guaranteed program with guaranteed results of having the smaller class sizes. We believe in afterschool programs which are so important.

Modern, safer schools: Our schools are too crowded, out-of-date, and dilapidated. We owe it to our children to modernize our schools—to have more classrooms, to provide modern teaching facilities, and to provide our children with a safe and orderly learning environment.

Accountability for results: We should hold schools accountable for results. We don't want to write a blank check to the states. We want federal education dollars to go to proven programs that will bring about real change. And we should require schools to use scarce federal dollars to bring about that change.

A greater role for parents: Children and schools need the support of parents. Senator REED will propose an amendment to give parents a stronger role in the education of their children and in the decision-making in their local schools.

Gun safety: We should give gun safety top priority when it comes to our children and our schools. Child safety locks on guns should be a requirement. And we should close the gun show loophole that has proven so deadly to our children and our schools. The Senate passed such legislation last year, but it languishes in conference. We should act again—this time in earnest—to protect our children and our schools from gun violence.

Republican colleagues will talk about change—they talk about having better teachers and safer schools. But if you read their bill, they just perpetuate the status quo. All they want to do is give more money to the governors and the states to use for their favorite programs. There is no guarantee under the Republican bill that your local school will spend the money on smaller

classes, safer schools, or better teachers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY RELIEF

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank Senator ROTH and Senator GRASSLEY for helping us write a very good bill that will give relief to 21 million married couples in this country; 42 million people will receive a benefit.

When I go through my State and a policeman comes up to me and says, "I cannot believe how much more I am paying since I got married," or a schoolteacher or a county clerk or a sheriff's deputy, I wonder what could we be thinking. This is not a tax cut; this is a tax correction. Twenty-one million American couples are paying a penalty only because they are married. That is not right.

The President of the United States, in his March 11 radio address, addressed six tax cuts he thinks would be a good idea. Two of those are in the bill we are voting on today. He said:

. . . a tax relief to reduce the marriage penalty, tax relief to reward work and family with an expanded earned income tax credit.

Of the six tax cuts he says he favors, two are in the bill on which we will be voting. One has to ask the fair question: Why would so many of the Democrats refuse to let us bring up the bill that addresses exactly what the President has asked us to send to him?

We sent him marriage tax penalty relief last year. He vetoed the bill. He said there was too much in it; there were too many other tax cuts. I happen to believe there is not a tax cut that I do not like because I think hard-working Americans deserve more relief. We are only using part of the income tax withholding surplus here, not Social Security surplus, not even all of the income tax withholding surplus. We are only using part to give the money back to the people who earned it.

Nevertheless, the President said it was too much. So we said: All right, we are going to send him smaller tax cut bills just as he requested.

We sent him one which removed that terrible added tax on Social Security recipients between the age of 65 and 70 who want to work and make more than \$17,000. That is gone. We passed the bill, we sent it to the President, and he signed it.

There must be a real problem on the Democratic side, and I quote the distinguished leader of the Democratic Party in the Senate in Reuters on April 13 of this year when he said:

I think the Republican bill is a marriage penalty relief bill in name only. It's a Trojan horse for the other risky tax schemes they have that have been proposed so far this year.

To what risky tax schemes could he be referring? Was it the Social Security earnings tests we eliminated for