In Title II of the bill, the title providing funds to strengthen teacher training, Senator LIEBERMAN has added a master teacher section so that school districts can use these funds to establish master teacher programs. Under the language, a master teacher would be an experienced teacher, one who has been teaching at least five years, and who assists other (particularly new) teachers in improving their skills.

I have proposed creating master teacher programs because I believe these ''senior teachers'' could enhance the profession of teaching and encourage people to stay in the classroom, as well as help the newer teachers ''learn the ropes.'' School districts could use these funds to, for example, increase teachers' salaries and that too could keep them in the classroom instead of moving to an administrative job or to private industry.

In California, teachers' salaries average $44,585 which is $4,000 higher than the U.S. average. But the schools cannot compete with private industry without some help. I believe starting master teachers should earn at least $65,000 a year so that we can begin to reward excellence and dedication and keep our teachers in the classroom. These programs have proven to work in Rochester and Cincinnati and I believe other areas should be given the resources to try them too.

I am also grateful that Senator LIEBERMAN has included language I suggested to clarify and refine how Title I funds can be used. The goal of this amendment is to better focus Title I on improving students' academic achievement. Under current law, there is little direction and no restrictions on how Title I funds can be used. Under this amendment, Title I funds would have to be used for services directly related to instruction, including extending instruction beyond the normal school day and year; purchasing books and other materials; and instructional interventions to improve student achievement. Funds could not be used, for example, for paying utility bills, janitorial services, constructing facilities, and buying food and refreshments.

This amendment is needed because when my staff checked with a number of California schools, we learned that Title I funds have been used for virtually everything, from clerical assistants to payroll administration, from college counseling to coaching, from school yard duty personnel to school psychologists. Alan Bersin, Superintendent of the San Diego Public Schools, found that Title I funds have been used to pay for everything from playground supervisors and field trips to nurses and counselors.

Many of these are no doubt worthy expenditures. But we have to realize that Title I cannot do everything. With limited federal dollars, I believe we should focus those dollars on what counts—helping students learn and helping teachers teach. Activities unrelated to instruction will have to be funded from other sources.

This debate is about the future of our nation. We must ask some fundamental questions about our schools.

Seventeen years ago, the nation's attention was jolted by a report titled A Nation at Risk. In April 1983, the Reagan Administration's Education Secretary, Terrell Bell, told the nation that we faced a fundamental crisis in the quality of American elementary and secondary education. The report said:

> Our nation is at risk. If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war.

The report cited declines in student achievement and called for strengthening graduation requirements, teacher preparation and establishing standards and accountability.

Today, we still face mediocrity in our schools. While there are always exceptions and clearly there are many excellent teachers and many outstanding schools, we can do better. To those who say we cannot afford to spend more on education, I say we cannot afford to fail our children. Our children do not choose to be illiterate or uneducated. It is our responsibility and we must face up to it.

If we have failed, it is because as a society we have become complacent and have had low expectations. So we do whatever it takes, no matter how painful, to fix a system that is not only failing our children, but hurting our children.

If we are not willing to make the commitment to provide our children a first-class education, we are failing as a society. What can be more important that giving our children a strong start, a knowledge base and a set of skills that make them happy, productive and fulfilled citizens?

I truly believe, if we expect our children to achieve, we must make it clear that we expect and support achievement in every way. That is why I support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business for the next 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL KIDNAPPING

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I have come to the floor this evening because I want to draw my colleagues' attention to a very important editorial that appeared in this morning's Washington Post. This editorial concerns international parental kidnapping. I also call my colleagues' attention to a feature article that appeared on the same subject in Sunday's Washington Post.

Both Sunday's article and today's editorial are very critical of the way the Federal Government has been handling international parental abduction cases. In fact, the editorial today characterizes the Government's response to these cases as ''incomprehensibly lackadaisical.'' I could not have said it better myself.

This is an issue that I have spoken on this floor about on several different occasions. It is a matter on which our committee has held several hearings. But despite those hearings and despite those speeches, I do not think there has been anything that has explained it in as great a detail and in as heartbreaking a way as the article that appeared in Sunday's Washington Post.

That story involves the heartbreaking story of Joseph Cooke, who, for the last 7 years, has been unable to retrieve his three children from a German foster home. In Mr. Cooke's case, his German-born wife had taken their three children on what was supposed to be a 3-week vacation to her homeland to visit her parents.

One day, though, during the trip, Mrs. Cooke took her children, boarded a German train, and essentially disappeared. She called her husband and only gave him a cryptic explanation as to where she was going and what she was doing with their children.

Joseph contacted his wife's parents in Germany, but they gave him little help or information. What Joseph eventually discovered was that his wife had checked into a German mental health facility and had placed their children in the care of the German Youth Authority, who, in turn, put the children in a foster family. And even though Mrs. Cooke eventually left the mental health clinic and returned to the United States, the children remained with the German foster family.

With very little information as to the whereabouts of his children, Mr. Cooke tried desperately to get his children back. But despite the fact that the children are U.S. citizens, and were living in the United States when they were taken—despite the fact that Joseph was awarded eventual custody of the children by a U.S. court, and despite the very plain terms of the Hague Convention, an international treaty setting forth a process for the timely return of children wrongly removed or retained from their home country—German courts, in spite of that, ruled that the children were to remain in Germany.

The Cooke case is a perfect example of how the Hague Convention, of which I point out Germany is a signatory, just isn't working. It isn't working because the nations that have agreed to it, including the United States, refuse to make it work.

The United States complies with the Hague Convention. When another country makes an order, the United States, in over 80 percent of the cases, complies. That is not what I am talking about. What I am talking about is we make no attempt to enforce it. It isn't working—let me repeat—because the

nations that have agreed to it, including the United States, refuse to make it work.

Member countries are not complying, and, tragically, our State Department and our Justice Department are not doing anything about it. The State Department is too reluctant to use the appropriate diplomatic channels to encourage foreign nations to comply with the treaty.

As the Washington Post article pointed out on Sunday:

The State Department says it cannot enforce the Hague convention or interfere in decisions overseas. ''There are no consequences for noncompliance,'' said a U.S. official with the embassy in Germany. ''I look at it as a voluntary compliance sort of thing.''

''I look at it as a voluntary compliance sort of thing.''

With that kind of attitude on behalf of our State Department, is it any wonder no country pays any attention to us?

''. . . a voluntary compliance sort of thing.''

As a Senator and as a parent and as a grandparent, I find that kind of approach to treaty enforcement appalling and unacceptable. The fact of the matter is, international parental abduction goes far beyond Joseph Cooke's tragic situation.

Currently, the State Department has on file at least 1,100 cases of international parental kidnapping, when one parent illegally takes his or her child out of the United States and right out of the life of the parent left behind.

These kidnappings and ensuing custody battles devastate families. They are devastating not only for the left behind parent but also for the child who is denied what every child should have; that is, the love of one of his or her parents.

Equally devastating is that during the media hype surrounding the Elian Gonzalez case, the State Department tried to use that case as a public relations opportunity to boost their own miserable record on getting our kids back from international parental abductions.

Amazingly, in one media account a State Department official actually said that in cases of international parental kidnappings: ''We don't take no for an answer.'' That is simply not true. The sad reality is that both our State Department and our Justice Department are, in fact, taking no for an answer. Their actions or inactions are speaking a lot louder than their words.

For example, the Justice Department rarely pursues prosecution under the International Parental Kidnapping Act, and, in the last 5 years, just 62 indictments and only 13 convictions have resulted from thousands and thousands and thousands of cases of abductions.

Every parent who has been left behind when a spouse or former spouse has kidnapped their children knows that our Government is not making the return of those children a top and immediate priority. The message this Government—our Federal Government—continues to send to these parents is that once their children are abducted and taken out of the United States, they just don't matter anymore.

When I have asked the State and Justice Departments about this, when I have asked repeatedly about why they are not doing more to help these parents get their kids back, all I get are excuses.

Contrast that message and that inaction toward American children with the dramatic and very different message that those same officials sent by forcing, at gunpoint, the reunion of Elian Gonzalez with his dad. That, indeed, paints a very different picture.

The excuses are endless. State and Justice blame their inaction on complicated extradition laws. Other times, they say these cases are private disputes between parents so the Federal Government should be left out of such matters. They figure, too, that these children are really not being kidnapped by strangers —they are with a parent, after all, so what is the big deal?

Taken all together, these factors suggest that the State Department is more interested in maintaining positive relationships and diplomatic ties with foreign governments than in helping American parents. In essence, these agencies are saying: You may steal American kids and get away with it.

Quite frankly, when it comes to a stolen child, there should be no excuses. Our Federal agencies must make these abductions a top priority. They need to coordinate efforts to offer more assistance to distraught parents seeking a safe return of their children from abroad. They should begin a training program for U.S. attorneys and designate one attorney in each of their offices across our country to be responsible for these international abduction cases.

Additionally, I am writing to President Clinton about his upcoming meeting with the German Chancellor and am encouraging him to discuss Joseph Cooke's case, and the other cases that we have pending in Germany, as well as the overall pattern of German noncompliance with the Hague Convention.

Further, with regard to the Hague Convention, specifically, in March, I submitted a resolution which now has the support of 35 Senate cosponsors to encourage all of the countries that have signed the Hague Convention, particularly those countries that consistently violate the convention—namely, Austria, Germany, and Sweden—to comply fully with both the letter and the spirit of their obligations under the convention that they signed.

This resolution we have introduced urges countries to return children under that convention without reaching the underlying custody dispute and to remove barriers to parental visitation. I am pleased to report that the resolution has been approved by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and is awaiting floor consideration.

Governance is about setting priorities. Policymaking is about setting priorities. Yes, our State Department has a lot to do and, yes, our Justice Department has a lot to do and, yes, there is no real teeth in the Hague Convention, other than international opinion, other than good, hard negotiations between countries. What I am asking the State Department and the Justice Department to do is begin to prioritize these cases.

The Attorney General of the United States should say to every U.S. attorney across this country that parental kidnapping cases should be at the top of the list of your priorities. Pay attention and deal with these cases. The Secretary of State should say to our embassies overseas, to our ambassadors, yes, trade is important; yes, immigration issues are important; yes, whatever is the topic of the day is important as you sit down and discuss these issues with the President of the country you are dealing with, or the Prime Minister; these are all important things; but also don't forget the children who have been stolen from their parents in the United States are important, also, and they should have a high priority.

So it is not an excuse that should be accepted by the parents of these children, nor by this Senate, by this Congress, nor by the American people, that we just don't have time to do this, or it just can't be enforced or other things are going on. This should be a priority.

I am calling on our Government today to make judgments and set priorities. Our children should always be our first priority. I think it is ironic that it is easier today to get our ambassadors and our State Department engaged on a trade matter than it is on a matter regarding the stealing of one of our children. The stealing of our children is important, and it is equally as important, I hope, and would be so considered by the Justice Department and by the State Department as a trade matter or the enforcement or the prosecution of any number of other types of cases.

In the end, we are succeeding in bringing parentally abducted children back to their homes in the U.S. Our Federal Government must take an active role in their return. Ultimately, our Government has an obligation to these parents and, more important, to the children who have been kidnapped. It is time our Government agencies put American parents and their children first.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF JOHN BROWN

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, today, May 9, is the 200th anniversary of the birth of a famous American who remains probably the most controversial figure in U.S. history. On May 9, 1800, John Brown was born. It is his birth and his life and the institution of slavery that I will speak about this evening for a few minutes.

I grew up in eastern Kansas. As a child, I played on the ground where John Brown stayed most often while he was in Osawatomie, KS. He was known as Osawatomie Brown for his fighting during the early phases of what led to be the Civil War. He stayed at the Adaire cabin. His brother-in-law was a minister in Osawatomie. It was on property which my grandparents owned that the cabin was later moved, to the park where the Battle of Osawatomie took place. That park was dedicated by Teddy Roosevelt. Such was the importance of what took place there in the epic struggle in this country to end the institution of slavery.

John Brown, the renowned abolitionist, was hanged for his attempt to incite a slave rebellion at Harper's Ferry, VA. Yet even though everyone objects to his tactics, his death has become ''the symbol of every element opposed to slavery.'' His contemporary, Frederick Douglass, the great African American abolitionist, acknowledged that ''John Brown began the war that ended American slavery and made this a free Republic.''

This 200th anniversary is a reminder of the heartache wrought by slavery in America. It is a humble tribute to the suffering of millions of African Americans who lived and died under dehumanizing bondage. John Brown is a part of that story.

He was born in Litchfield County, CT, on May 9, 1800, and absorbed a deep hatred of the pervasive institution of chattel slavery early in his life. Once, while herding his father's cattle to market a long distance, he watched as a slave boy his age, whom Brown had befriended, was violently beaten with an iron shovel. He was acquainted with the common forms of punishment wherein ''slaves were stripped of their clothing, faced against a tree or wall, tied down or made to hang from a beam, their legs roped together with a rail or board between them, and severely beaten.'' Such things surely motivated his increasing disdain. He internalized a passage from the Bible, Hebrews 13:3, which says:

> Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them; and them which suffer adversity, as being yourselves also in the body.

The English Parliamentarian, William Wilberforce, and other people of courage, had ended slavery in Great Britain by 1807. Yet in John Brown's America, slavery thrived and grew as the American cotton trade boomed from 1815 until 1860, aggressively capturing the European market. By 1860, there were 4 million slaves in America. No one knows the total number of slaves from the time of the first settlers in 1619 to the end of the Civil War in 1865, but the number is staggering—in the several millions.

Particularly during the 17th and 18th centuries, multitudes of people had been abducted from Africa to America. Their month-long passage epitomized the degradation to follow:

> Segregated by gender, the blacks were chained together and packed so tightly that they often were forced to lie on their sides in spoon fashion. Clearances and ships' holds often were only two to four feet high. In bad weather or because of some perceived threat, they had to remain below, chained to one another, lying in their own filth. ''The floor of the rooms,'' one 18th-century ship observer wrote, ''was so covered with blood and mucus which had proceeded from them in consequence of dysentery, that it resembled a slaughter house.'' Slave ships were smelled before they were seen, as they entered the harbor in heinous conditions.

It is said that slavery contemporary to this time was the largest manifestation of human bondage in the history of mankind. I ask, how could this great nation, birthed in freedom, systematically and shamelessly reap great fortunes, in part, on the backs of abducted, brutalized people? How could human beings be branded like cattle, bought and sold at will in the middle of a busy market place, ripped from their families, raped with impunity resulting in children who were then also enslaved, lashed with bullwhips, murdered without consequence, worked to death, their very humanity mocked in every possible way? One American commenting on our slave trade overseas remarked, ''We are a byword among the nations.'' It was in this evil time that John Brown began to champion political and social equality for African-Americans, as did a growing number of abolitionist societies which mushroomed in the 1830's.

In 1850, the Fugitive Slave Act was passed by Congress whereby harboring people escaping from slavery, even to the free states, became a Federal crime. This crime carried a penalty of up to 6 months of incarceration and a $1,000 fine, which was a substantial sum considering that the average daily wage was $1.50. Moreover, the act provided that Federal agents would not be charged in tracking escapees, even in the North, forcing slaves back to their masters. Consider that American taxes were paying for this wretched service of slave catching, in a country whose revolution was synonymous worldwide with a renowned liberty.

In protest, John Brown, like many abolitionists of his day, provided assistance to fugitive slaves seeking freedom in the northern United States and Canada. Also, fugitive slaves lived with him and his family, despite the threatened penalties. At one point, he moved his family to North Elba, NY, to live with a community of escaped and redeemed slaves, to teach reading and faming.

Another blow occurred in 1854 when the Kansas and Nebraska Act was passed by Congress, repealing earlier legislation which had outlawed slavery in the territory from which Kansas was created. This new act allowed residents to vote on whether or not slavery would be adopted by the new state, making it an option for the first time. so Kansas and Nebraska could be slave States.

It was the common thinking of the time that actually what would happen was Nebraska would become a free State and Kansas a slave State; that Iowans would pour over into Nebraska, making it a free State; Missourians would pour over into Kansas, and Kansas would become a slave State; thus, the balance would be maintained.

In response, John Brown and family members moved to Kansas in 1855 to oppose the expansion of slavery into the western territories, as did a flood of Free Soilers, as free state advocates were called, from the East. The free state epicenter was the city of Lawrence, which attracted many Eastern anti-slavery people and became a target for destruction by the Border Ruffians.

During this time, pro-slavery forces terrorized Kansan free state settlers with beatings, shootings, looting, and ballot stuffing. An English traveler observed that ''murder and cold-blooded assassination were of almost daily occurrence . . . Murderers, if only they have murdered in behalf of slavery, have gone unpunished; whilst hundreds have been made to suffer for no other crime than the suspicion of entertaining free-state sentiments.'' Numerous Kansas conflicts included the Wakarusa War, the sacking of Lawrence, and the battles of Black Jack, Osawatomie, and the Spurs. In this brutal period, Brown became a national symbol of ''Bleeding Kansas'' and the free state struggle. During his 3 years of activity in the Kansas Territory, he orchestrated offensives against the Border Ruffians, and helped to liberate dozens of enslaved African-Americans by force from Missouri farms. Sadly, he participated, tacitly or overtly, in the killing of 5 men at Pottawatomie Creek in a shameful incident which