I suspect my time has expired, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. DODD. Again, I urge my colleagues to vote to waive the budget point of order that I know my friend from Pennsylvania will have to make. I thank him again.

I will end where I began. He has been a very good friend on a lot of these issues. I realize his objections to this are not on the policy issue as much as it is a problem financially.

But I wanted to offer this amendment because it is a critically important one. My hope is we get back to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and that we spend more time on that bill before this session ends. We have a chance to address these kinds of policy questions, on which I think more of my colleagues would like to be heard.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 125, the adjournment resolution, which is at the desk. I further ask consent that the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 125) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 125

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, June 29, 2000, Friday, June 30, 2000, or on Saturday, July 1, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, July 10, 2000, or until such time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, June 29, 2000, or Friday, June 30, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Monday, July 10, 2000, for morning-hour debate, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 2001—Continued

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a vote on or in relation to the Dodd amendment not take place at the conclusion of argument; that it be stacked later this afternoon at a time to be mutually agreed upon after consulting with the leaders on both sides.

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

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, there is not too much need for me to respond to the Senator from Connecticut. I think he has already stated my position in toto. I do think this afterschool program, which he has proposed to add to, is a worthwhile program. But it is beyond the limits with which our subcommittee has to work. He is correct that I will make a motion that it exceeds the allocation to our committee at the appropriate time.

Afterschool is very important. It is sort of a twin brother to day care. Last year, I agreed with the Senator from Connecticut to scrimp and save and use a sharp pencil to find $817 million more to bring day care up to $2 billion, which we did. I thought that kind of an allocation might have satisfied the Senator from Connecticut for a year. But it has not. So we will have to face this when it comes along.

He said to me: That is day care.

I said: Day care is very important. Bringing it up by more than $800 million to $2 billion was a tough job, Senator DODD.

I called him CHRIS at the time.

We thought that being a twin brother to afterschool, we might have avoided an amendment.

Mr. DODD. If my colleague will yield.

Mr. SPECTER. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. DODD. I was as complimentary as I could be. But I will be even more complimentary. I am deeply grateful to the Senator.

Mr. SPECTER. It is very tough being the manager of a bill that funds the Department of Education because there is no priority higher than education. The only one on a level with it is health care. And we have the funding coming out of the same pool of money.

We made the allocations as best we could. I know of the devotion of the Senator from Connecticut to this cause. He and I were elected at the same time. He withstood the Reagan landslide in 1980 to be one of two Democrats elected to open seats, when 16 Republicans came in. And he and I cochaired the Children's Caucus at that time.

In 1987, when he proposed family leave, I was his cosponsor, with a lot of turmoil just on this side of the aisle. We have worked together over the years for education and for children. I commend him for all that he has done.

We have added to education some $4.6 billion. We are $100 million more than the President in education this year.

We have increased funding tremendously for children and young people in America. The Head Start Program comes, curiously enough, under the Department of Health and Human Services. There is an increase this year of $1 billion to Head Start, coming up to $6.2 billion. We have increased special education by $1.3 billion, bringing it up to $7.3 billion. We have increased innovative State grants by $2.7 billion for more teachers, class size, and for school construction, with the proviso that it is limited. It is up to the local school district if they decide to do something else with it.

When it comes to the program the Senator from Connecticut is talking about, the 21st Century Learning Centers, we have added $146.6 million to bring the figure up to $600 million. In fiscal year 1999, it was $200 million. So we are moving right along on it to provide the maximum amount of money we can.

It is not an easy matter to allocate $104.5 billion—as much money as that is—for the National Institutes of Health and for drug programs and for school violence programs. We have done the best job we could. It is with reluctance that I raise a point of order.

How much time remains, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPECTER. I have made the essential arguments which are relevant. In the interest of moving the bill along and saving time, I make a point of order under section 302(b) of the Budget Act, as amended, that the effect of adopting the Dodd amendment provides budget authority in excess of the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation under the fiscal year 2001 concurrent resolution on the budget and is not in order.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive the applicable sections of that act for consideration of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, as previously agreed to by unanimous consent, the vote will be delayed to a time agreed upon by the leaders later today. I yield back the remainder of my time so we may proceed with the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3659

(Purpose: To increase funding for the technology literacy challenge fund)

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3659 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], proposes an amendment numbered 3659.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount made available under this title to carry out the technology literacy challenge fund under section 3132 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 shall be $517,000,000.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that time on the Kerry amendment be 1 hour equally divided. We have already talked about this. I understand there is agreement.

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

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators BINGAMAN and MIKULSKI be added as original cosponsors of the amendment.

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

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, let me pick up, if I may, on the comments made by the Senator from Connecticut. There is a relationship between these amendments that are proposed by Senator KENNEDY, Senator BINGAMAN, Senator DODD, and myself. They are made with great respect for the leadership of the appropriations subcommittee. I share the feelings expressed by Senator DODD that they are working within the constraints that have been imposed on them by the Congress in a sense through the budgeting process.

What we are asking of our colleagues is to begin a process by which we more accurately reflect the truth of the budgeting process and the choices we as Senators face. The fact is, we have the ability to provide 60 votes to waive and to proceed to make a statement as the Senate that we believe a specific priority is significant enough that we ought to depart from the constraints. The constraints under which we are operating, that were very properly and articulately listed by the Senator from Pennsylvania, are restraints imposed by a Budget Act and by allocations that do not reflect the reality of the budget choice we face as a country because of the level of surplus. Since those allocations were made, we have in fact learned that we have a significant amount of additional funds available to us to begin to choose how we will reflect the priorities of our Nation.

I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, a lot of us on this side of the aisle joined with them to put in place the fiscal discipline we all laud and believe is appropriate. It was a 1993 vote, in fact, that put in place the Deficit Reduction Act. Many of us are pleased that we finally were able to set this country on a course where we now have the current surpluses. We have to start to be smart about what kind of choices we are going to make.

I keep hearing colleagues on both sides of the aisle come to the floor. They lament what is happening to children in America. They lament what is happening with respect to young people who are increasingly feeding into the juvenile justice system of the Nation. We hear the cries of anguish about children having children out of wedlock, about the failure of marriage in this country. But we don't seem to connect our legislative actions to things that really might make a difference in the lives of young people so they will choose a more moral, traditional, affirmative course for their own life.

How do kids make those kinds of choices? Traditionally, in the America we always hear Members talking about, we have family, which is the best teacher of all, the most important connection of a child to their future. We have schools and teachers. History in America is replete with great personalities who harken back to a particular teacher who affected their life. We hear less and less of those stories in modern America. Finally, there is organized religion. Organized religion is the other great teaching entity. Not one that we are supposed to, in this body, specifically legislate about, but it is proper to acknowledge the role that religion plays as one of those three great teachers in the lives of children.

The truth is, in America today we have an awful lot of young children who don't have contact with any one of those three teachers, not one. Their teachers are the streets. Colin Powell talks about it in his America's Promise, which appeals to people to make a voluntary commitment to try to intervene in the lives of some of those children and replace the absence of those three great teachers.

What kids learn in the streets is not the real values of America; it is what I call ''coping skills.'' They learn how to get by. They learn how to survive. They learn the sort of ''law of the jungle,'' as some used to call it. The fact is, we are not doing enough, we Senators are not doing enough, to leverage those things that make a difference in the absence of the three great teachers.

I ask any one of my colleagues: How do we break the cycle of a kid having a kid out of wedlock? How do we break the cycle of a child raised in an abusive household, whose role models in life are people who beat up on each other, shoot drugs, get into trouble, such as the role models for that 6-year-old kid who shot a 6-year-old classmate living in a crack house with an uncle, a parent in jail, no one responsible?

What is that child's future, unless adults make the decision to somehow provide those positive forces that make a difference? What are the positive forces? Well, the positive forces are often some of the faith-based interventions, whether it is the Jewish Community Center or a Baptist organization or the Catholic Charities; but there are those entities out there that have a wonderful, extraordinary capacity to bring kids back from the brink. And then there are those organized entities that also do it, such as the Boys and Girls Club; Big Brother/Big Sister; YMCA and YWCA; or a program in Boston called Youth Build, or City Year. All of these provide young people with alternatives and the ability to have surrogate parenting, fundamentally. That is what is really taking place. What is really taking place is those entities is providing an alternative.

Now, we will debate in the Senate whether or not we are going to provide 200,000 H–1B visas. I am for it. I think we ought to provide that, or more, because we have an immediate need in this country to provide skilled people in order to keep the economic boom going and provide for critical technologies, to have good working people. But has it not occurred to my colleagues what an insult it is to our own system that we have to go abroad and import skilled labor to the United States, even as we are putting thousands of young kids into prison, into the juvenile justice system, and out into the streets, as the Senator from Connecticut just said, because we don't have afterschool programs? What are we going to do? We are going to import 200,000 skilled people to make up for the unskilled people whom we leave unskilled because we are unwilling to make the adult choices in the Senate that would make a difference in their lives.

How can we boast about the extraordinary surplus we have in this country, with the stock market climbing to record levels, the most extraordinary amounts of wealth ever created in the history of any nation on the planet right here in the United States, but poverty among children has increased by 50 percent and the number of kids who are at risk has increased.

I don't believe in the Federal Government taking over these programs. I don't believe in Washington dictating the solutions. But I do believe in Washington leveraging the capacity of people at the local level to be able to do what they know they need to do. So we are reduced to a debate where the Senator from Pennsylvania has to say, well, oh, my gosh, under our 201(b) allocation—or whatever the appropriate section is—we don't have enough money to be able to allocate because we have a total cap that has no relationship to the reality of what we must do.

We keep saying, isn't it terrific that we have raised the amount of money—and it is terrific—when the real question is, are we doing what we need to do to get the job done? That is the question we ought to be asking.

What is it going to take to guarantee that children in the United States of

America are safe? What does it take to guarantee that we don't dump 5 million kids out into the streets in the afternoons, unsafe, and exposed to drug dealers and to all of the vagaries of the teenage years and all of the pressures that come with it in a modern society that doesn't have parents around to be able to help those kids make a better choice? We don't have to do that. We ought to make it the goal of the Senate to guarantee that every child in America is going to be safe and secure between the hours when teachers stop teaching and when those parents are coming home. And we can ask 100,000 questions about why it is we are not providing arts and music and sports and libraries that are open full-time, and Internet access.

That is where my amendment comes in, Mr. President. Senator KENNEDY has an amendment on teacher quality, which is linked to the capacity of kids to fill those high tech jobs that we talk about. Senator DODD has an amendment talking about making those kids safe after school. My amendment seeks to increase the funding for the technology literacy challenge fund, which is a critically important education program that helps provide technology access, education, professional development, and instruction in elementary and secondary schools.

All we say is that to qualify for the money, States have to submit a statewide technology plan that includes a strategy on how the States will include private, State, local, and other entities in the continued financing and support of technology in schools.

There are two points that I can't stress enough. One is the importance of providing young people with the opportunity to learn how to use technology. I am not one of those people. I don't want to celebrate technology to the point of it being put up on a pedestal and it becomes an entity unto itself. Technology is not a god; it is not a philosophy; it is not a way of life. Technology is a tool, a useful tool. It is a critical tool for the modern marketplace and the modern world. But we are preordaining that we are going to have to have next year's H–1B plan, and the next year's H–1B plan, and another prison, and another program to deal with a whole lot of young kids for whom the digital divide becomes more and more real, who don't have accessability or the capacity to be able to gain the skills necessary to share in this new world. The fact is that there are too many teachers who don't have the ability to even teach; we have the schools wired; we have the e-rate.

We are beginning to get increased access to the Internet. But what do you do with it? How many teachers know how to use the technology to really be able to educate kids? How many kids are, in fact, having the benefit of the opportunity of having teachers who have those skills so that they can ultimately maximize their opportunities?

All we are suggesting is that we ought to be doing more to empower—not to mandate, not to dictate, but to empower—those local communities that desperately want to do this but don't have the tax base to be able to do it. Let's give them that ability. That is the best role the Federal Government can play—to leverage things that represent national priorities, leverage the things that represent the best goals and aspirations of ourselves as a Nation. It is not micromanagement; it is, rather, putting in place a mechanism by which we have national priorities—to have good, strong families, to have kids who are computer literate, and to have more skilled workers. Those are national priorities. But if we turn our heads away and say the only priority in this country is to sort of sequester this money for the senior generation in one form or another, without any regard to the generation that is coming along that needs to fund Social Security, that needs to have a high value-added job so they can pay into it and adequately protect it, that is not Social Security protection.

We have gone from 13 workers paying in for every 1 that is taking out—13 workers paying into the system for every 1 worker taking out—to three paying in and one taking out. Now there are two paying in and one taking out.

We have a vested interest as a nation in making sure those two paying in are capable of paying in; that they have a high value-added job that empowers them to pay in; when they pay in, it doesn't take so much of their income that they feel so oppressed by the system that they are not able to invest in their own children and in their own future.

That is in our interest. That is a national priority.

If we don't begin in the Senate tomorrow to adequately reflect the needs of our children in the money that we allocate, we will be seriously missing one of the greatest priorities the country faces.

All of us understand the degree to which there is an increase in the digital divide of the country. The technology literacy challenge fund is a critical effort to try to provide those kids with an opportunity to close that gap.

Last year, my home State of Massachusetts received $8.1 million. Some of the programs it put in place are quite extraordinary. Let me share with my colleagues one of the examples of this program that works so effectively. It is called the Lighthouse Technology Grant.

The Lighthouse Technology Grant incorporates new technologies into the State curriculum framework so that it better motivates children to be able to learn.

One of the schools in my State—the Lynn Woods Elementary School in Lynn—is integrating technology into the classroom by virtue of this grant. Fifth grade students at the Lynn Woods school are studying Australia. They have been able to videoconference directly with Australian students who are studying the Boston area.

You have students engaging in a very personal and direct way, all of which encourages their learning and enhances their interest in the topic. They have also developed writing skills through special e-mail pen pal programs with Australian students.

In addition, they have been able to connect more directly with the experience of life, thereby asking very direct questions and engaging in a personal exchange that they never could have experienced before because of telephone rates and because of the difficulties of communication under any kind of telephone circumstance.

The Lighthouse Technology Grant is only one of eight programs funded by this challenge grant in Massachusetts. It also provides grants to a virtual high school program which enables school districts to offer students Internet courses ranging from advanced academic courses to technical and specialized courses. Let me emphasize the importance of that to my colleagues.

A few weeks ago, I visited a high school in Boston, an inner-city high school, Dorchester High. I found that in this high school of almost 1,000 students in the inner city they are not able to provide advanced placement courses. I ask everybody here to imagine a high school that is supposed to be state of the art that doesn't have advanced placement courses.

Yet, because of the virtual high school and because of the access to the Internet, if we close the digital divide, we can in fact make it affordable and accessible for schools that today have difficulty finding the teachers, affording the teachers, and providing the curriculum—and be able to do so immediately.

That is the difference between somebody being able to go to college or being college ready or being able to go to college and advance rapidly in the kinds of curriculum and courses that will make even a greater difference in their earning capacity and in their citizen-contributing capacity at a later time. We need to recognize that unless we encourage this to happen, the transformation could take a lot longer than we want it to take.

For example, it has taken only 7 years for the Internet to be adopted by 30 percent of Americans. That is compared to 17 years for television to be adopted by 38 percent, and for the telephone, 38 percent during the same amount of time.

The world of work is obviously so much different and at a faster rate. But if we leave kids behind for a longer period of time, we will greatly restrain their learning capacity as well as our growth capacity as a country.

The technology literacy challenge fund has been funded under the committee's mark at about $425 million. The administration actually asked for $450 million. The House has set a figure

of $517 million. I think that is more reflective of the level of funding that is necessary in order to achieve the kind of transition that we wish for in this country. Some might argue we could even do more. But it is clear to me that by measuring the priorities as expressed by other colleagues we can, in fact, do more if we will challenge the system a little bit, if we will push the limits a little bit, and if we will look at the reality of the budget choices that the Congress faces.

I think nothing could be more important for all of us as Senators and as Congress this year. I hope my colleagues will embrace the notion that we can in fact do an appropriate waiver of the budget and set this as a priority of the Senate.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, here again, there is little doubt that technology literacy is a very important matter for America. There is no doubt about that at all. Here again, it is a matter of how our allocations are going to run.

We debated the Dodd amendment earlier today about afterschool programs—again, a good program. There is a question about the amount of money and where the priorities are.

We debated the Kennedy amendment about teacher recruitment—another good program.

We had to turn down amendments yesterday by Senator WELLSTONE who wanted more money for title I; Senator BINGAMAN, also more money for title I; Senator MURRAY asked for an additional $325 million on top of $1.4 billion which was supplied for class size. There is no doubt that so many of these programs are excellent programs.

The Senator from Massachusetts in offering this amendment noted the constraints we are operating under with respect to how much money we have in our allocation. We have established priorities. We have greatly increased the education account by some $4.6 billion. That is a tremendous increase, coming to a total of $40.2 billion. In our education account, we have $100 million more than the President asked for.

I have already today gone over a long list of items where we have increased funding on education on very important items. It is a matter of making the appropriate allocation and the setting of priorities.

I say to my colleague from Massachusetts that the House of Representatives has established a mark of $517 million in this account. It is entirely plausible that the figure that is in the Senate bill will be substantially increased.

We will certainly keep in mind the eloquence of Senator KERRY's arguments. There is no doubt about technology and about the need for more funding in technology.

I believe that a country with an $8 trillion gross national product can do better on education. I said earlier today and have said many times on this floor that I am committed to education, coming from a family which emphasizes education so heavily, my parents having very little education and my siblings and I being able to succeed—I guess you would call it success to come to the Senate—because of our educational opportunities.

That is the essence of our position. We have substantially more time.

I inquire of the Chair: How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 26 minutes remaining. The Senator from Massachusetts has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I could direct a question to the manager of the bill, it is my understanding Senator WELLSTONE will offer one of his amendments next.

Mr. SPECTER. That is fine.

Mr. REID. I will also have Senator WELLSTONE agree to a time limit.

Mr. SPECTER. Speaking of the time limit with Senator WELLSTONE on the floor, may we agree to 30 minutes equally divided, 20 minutes equally divided, 15 minutes equally divided? How much time does Senator WELLSTONE desire?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I suggested a time agreement of 30 minutes equally divided, perhaps 20 minutes equally divided.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to my colleague from Pennsylvania, my guess is it will take me about 40 minutes on my side. I prefer not to agree to a time limit. I don't think I will go more than that.

Mr. SPECTER. Would the Senator from Minnesota be willing to enter a time agreement of an hour, 40 minutes for the Senator from Minnesota, and 20 minutes for our side?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am pleased to do so.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask unanimous consent the time be set on the Wellstone amendment at 1 hour, with the Senator from Minnesota having 40 minutes and our side having 20 minutes.

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

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that no second-degree amendments be in order prior to the vote.

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

Mr. KERRY. If the Senator from Pennsylvania wants to yield back time, I am prepared to do the same. I want to reserve one comment.

I appreciate everything the Senator has said. I appreciate his comments. I know he wants to do more. Unless we in the Senate tackle this beast called the allocation process, and unless we begin to challenge the constraints within which we are now dealing, we are not doing our job.

These votes are an opportunity to try to do that. My plea is to the Senator, the Appropriations Committee, and others, that we begin to try to change these shackles that are keeping us from responding to the real needs of the country. The measurement should not be what we are doing against a baseline set by us. The measurement should be, what will it take to guarantee we can turn to Americans and say we are addressing the problem, we are getting the job done.

We need to close that gap.

I am happy to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the vote on the Kerry amendment be deferred, to be stacked later today at a time to be mutually agreed upon by our respective leaders.

I raise a point of order under section 302(f) of the Budget Act, as amended, that the effect of adopting the Kerry amendment provides budget authority in excess of the subcommittee's 302(b) allocations under the fiscal year 2001 concurrent resolution on the budget, and is not in order.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act, I move to waive the applicable section of that act for consideration of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KERRY. I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

AMENDMENT NO. 3644

(Purpose: To provide funds for the loan forgiveness for child care providers program, with an offset)

Mr. WELLSTONE. I call up amendment 3644.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] proposes an amendment numbered 3644.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 71, after line 25, add the following:

SEC. ____. (a) In addition to any amounts appropriated under this title for the loan forgiveness for child care providers program under section 428K of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1078-11), an additional $10,000,000 is appropriated to carry out such program.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, amounts made available under titles I and II, and this title, for salaries and expenses at the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, respectively, shall be reduced on a pro rata basis by $10,000,000.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I come to the floor to offer a very simple amendment. This amendment asks only that we appropriate an additional $10 million to fund the loan forgiveness program which was authorized under the Higher Education Act. This is a loan forgiveness program for women and men who go into child care work. This would be taken from administrative expenses in the overall budget.

Despite the fact that we know that child care workers struggle to pay back their student loans, and that all too many of them earn poverty-level wages without benefits, which means in turn that many of them are forced to leave their work for higher paid work, we have yet to appropriate one penny for this forgiveness program.

I originally offered this amendment calling for loan forgiveness for those men and women who go into the child care field with Senator DEWINE. My thought was this is sacred work. This is important work. This is work with small children. If people are going to be paid miserably low wages—many having no health care benefits at all, and we understand the importance of early childhood development—then let's at least have a loan forgiveness that will encourage men and women to go into this area.

Right now the child care situation in the United States is critical. We have a system in place where child care is prohibitively high for working families. It is not uncommon for a family to be paying $6,000 per child, $12,000 per year, $10,000 per year. Maybe the family's overall income is $35,000 or $40,000.

At the same time, we have child care workers who are taking care of children during the most critical years of development and they don't even make poverty wages.

It seems counterintuitive. How can it be that on the one hand child care is so expensive, but on the other hand those men and women who work in this field are so underpaid?

The problems of the high costs and the low wages are inevitable under the current system of child care delivery in the United States. Colleagues, this amendment is just one vote, but this is a central issue of American politics. Talk to working families in this country and they will list child care as one of their top concerns. They are not just talking about the cost of child care, but they are also saying when both parents work, or as a single parent working, they worry most of all that their child is receiving the best care—not custodial, not in front of a television for 8 hours, but developmental care.

On a personal note, I can remember as a student at the University of North Carolina, barely age 20, Sheila and I had our first child. I will never forget, 6 weeks after David was born, Sheila had to go back to work. That is all the time she could take off. Six weeks is not enough time to bond with a child. We had hardly any money. We asked around and we heard about a woman who took care of children. We took David over. After about 3 days of picking him up, every day he was listless. Before he had gone to this child care, this home child care setting, he was engaged and lively. It was wonderful.

I was at school, I was working; Sheila was working. At 5 o'clock or 5:30 we would come to pick him up and he was listless. Finally, after 3 days I got concerned and I showed up at her home in the middle of the day. The problem was she had about 20 children she was trying to take care of. Most of them were in playpens and she had stuck a pacifier in their mouth and they were receiving no real care. There was no real interaction. Parents worry about this.

I argue today on the floor of the Senate, one of the keys to making sure there is decent developmental child care—not custodial child care—is to have men and women working in this field being paid a decent wage. Right now, we have a 40-percent turnover in this field. Who pays the price? The children.

I have said on the Senate floor before, when I was teaching at Carleton College as a college teacher for 20 years, I had conversations with students who came to me and said: Look, don't take it personally. We think you are a good teacher, Paul, and we really appreciate your work as a teacher. But we would like to go into early childhood development. The problem is, when you make $8 an hour, with no health care benefits, and you have a huge student loan to pay off, especially at a college like Carleton, you can't afford to do it. Some of the people want to go into this field, which we say is so important, but they can't afford to do it.

The least we could do is have a small loan forgiveness program.

The result of the system we have right now is poverty-level earnings for the workforce.

By the way, who are the child care providers in the country today? Mr. President, 98 percent of them are women, and one-third of them are women of color. We can do a lot better. We pay parking lot attendants and men and women who work at the zoos in America twice as much as we pay those men and women who take care of our small children. Something is profoundly wrong when we pay people who care for our cars and our pets more money than we do for those who care for our children.

Let me go over the facts. The average teacher based at a child care center earns roughly $7 an hour. Despite above average levels of education, roughly one-third of the child care workers earn the minimum wage. Even those at the highest end of the pay scale, who are likely to have a college degree and several years of experience, make about $10 an hour. Family child care providers—a lot of child care is in homes—make even less money. People who care for small groups of children in their home make on average about $9,000 per year after all expenses are figured in.

A recent study by the Center For The Childcare Workforce finds that family child care providers earn on the average, when you take into account their costs, $3.84 an hour, given their typical 55-hour week. Not only that, but the majority of child care workers in our country receive no health benefits, despite high exposure to illness. A lot of kids, when they come, have the flu and they pass it around. Fewer than one-third of the child care providers in this country today have health insurance, and an even smaller percentage of child care workers have any pension plan whatsoever. A recent study in my State of Minnesota found that only 31 percent of child care centers offered full-time employees fully paid health care.

The consequences of these dismal conditions are clear. Let me just put it into perspective for colleagues. In the White House Conference on the Development of the Brain, they talked about how important it is that we get it right for children in the very early years of their lives. The medical evidence is irrefutable and irreducible that these are the most critical years. We all want to have our pictures taken next to children —the smaller the children are, the better. Yet at the same time we have done so precious little to make a commitment to this area. We have child care workers, men and women who work in these centers, who do not even make half of what people make who work in our zoos. I think work in the zoo is important, but I also think work with small children is important.

We have the vast majority of child care workers barely making minimum wage or a little bit above, only about a third at best having any health care coverage whatsoever.

Senator DEWINE and I, several years ago, help pass a bill that authorized some loan forgiveness so you would have men and women who could go to college, with the idea they would go into this critically important field and their loans would be forgiven. What I am trying to do, taking it out of administrative expenses, is just finally to get a little bit of appropriation; start out with $10 million so we finally set the precedent that we are willing to fund this. We have not put one penny into this program so far.

What happens is that we have this high turnover. As I said before, probably about 40 percent or thereabouts of child care workers in any given year go from one job to another. That figure may be a little high, but it is a huge turnover. Who pays the price? The children pay the price. As I look at my own figures, I guess it is about a third, a third of this country's child care workforce leaves the job each year because they are looking for better work. This leads to a dangerous decline in the quality of child care for our families. The most dangerous decline in quality is the care for toddlers, for infants.

They are exposed to the poorest care of all.

We have not appropriated one cent for the loan forgiveness program we authorized 2 years ago, and at the same time you have 33 percent of child care workers every year leaving, and you don't have the continuity of care for our children, for families in this country. At the same time, it is the infants and the toddlers who are the ones who are most in jeopardy. At the same time, we have not made any commitment whatsoever to at least—at least, this doesn't change everything in the equation—make sure we have a loan forgiveness program.

Another thing that is happening is that as we begin to see a severe teacher shortage, a lot of child care workers are saying that they can't make it on $8 an hour with no health care benefits. A lot of younger people say they can't make it on $8 an hour with no health care benefits and a big loan to pay off. They now become our elementary school teachers or middle school teachers.

As a result, what you have is, at the same time the number of child care providers is decreasing, the number of families who need good child care for their children is dramatically increasing. That is not just because of the welfare bill, but because the reality of American families today, for better or for worse—sometimes I wonder—is that you just don't have one parent staying at home. In most families, both parents are working full time. This is a huge concern to families in this country. We could help by passing this amendment.

I want to talk about one study in particular that I think, in a dramatic way, puts into focus what I am talking about. It was a recent study by the University of California at Berkeley and Yale University. They found that a million more toddlers and preschoolers are now in child care because of the welfare law. That wouldn't surprise anyone, given the emphasis on people going to work. So far, so good.

But they also found that many of these children are in low-quality care, where they lag behind other children in developmental measures. This was a study of 1,000 single mothers moving from welfare to work. They wanted to know where were their children. What they found out was their children were, by and large, placed in child care settings where they watched TV all the time, wandered aimlessly, and there was little interaction with caregivers. Here is the tragedy of it. Many of these toddlers from these families showed developmental delays.

Would anybody be surprised? Anyone who has spent any time with small children would not be surprised. When asked to point to a picture of a book from among three different pictures, fewer than two in five of the toddlers in the study pointed to the right picture compared to a national norm of four out of five children.

One of the study's authors is quoted as saying:

> We know that high quality child care can help children and that poor children can benefit the most. So we hope that this will be a wake-up call to do something about the quality of child care in this country. The quality of daycare centers is not great for middle class families, but it is surprising and distressing to see the extent to which welfare families' quality was even lower.

I simply want to point out that just because a family is a welfare family or just because a family is a poor family does not mean these small children are not as deserving of good child care. That is not the situation today in the country.

Ironically, as we see the child care system deteriorating, we are now putting more and more emphasis on the importance of developmental child care. We are saying at the same time that we want to make sure single parents work and families move from welfare to work. We are putting the emphasis on work, and more families have to work to make it.

The median income in our country today is about $40,000 a year. The income profile is not that high. We know investment in early childhood development pays for itself many times over. We know good child care programs dramatically increase the chances for children to do well in school, for children to go on beyond K–12 and go to college and do well in their lives, and we know the lives of low-income families, in particular, quite often lack some of the advantages other families in this country have. Children from low-income families do not always have the same vocabulary; there is not always the opportunity for a parent or parents to read to them. Therefore, the learning gap by kindergarten is wide. Some children start way behind, and then they fall further behind.

I cite one study which began in the seventies on the effects of early childhood intervention. Children who received comprehensive, quality, early education did better on cognitive, reading and math tests than children who did not. This positive effect continues through age 21 and beyond. Parents benefit as well. I do not understand where our priorities are. We should want to make a commitment to working families in this country and make a commitment to children.

I want to give some evidence from the State of Minnesota, and then I will finish up at least with my first comments. This loan forgiveness program works. First, it gives people an opportunity to go to college who want to become child care workers. Second, the turnover is reduced. Third, this means we get better people.

My own State of Minnesota has experimented. We have a State level loan forgiveness program. In 1998, we offered child care providers up to $1,500 in forgivable student loans for the first time. Fifty percent of the money was set aside for what we call the metro area, and 50 percent of the money was set aside for greater Minnesota, outside the metro area. The money was awarded on a first come, first served basis. People began lining up on the first day. In the metro area, all the money was gone by 5 p.m. on the second day, and all of the money for rural Minnesota was awarded within 2 weeks.

This year, Minnesota has made over $900,000 available through their loan forgiveness program. They started accepting applications in March, and they have committed nearly half the money to family care providers and 50 percent to center-based providers. A lot of it goes to rural Minnesota and a lot of it goes to urban Minnesota.

I am saying to my colleagues, I am hoping I can win on this amendment. I take it out of administrative expenses. We know the budget is going to be better for this Health and Human Services bill. We know we do not have a good budget with which to work right now. We know the cap is going to go up. We know we are going to have more resources with which to work.

We all say we are committed to developmental child care.

It is one of the top issues of working families. It seems to me several years ago—I did this with Senator DEWINE—we authorized legislation that called for loan forgiveness to men and women who want to go into this critical area, and we have not appropriated one penny. We can at least find it in our hearts and find our way to put some appropriations into this legislation. I am calling for $10 million as a start.

I am saying to Senators today—and I do not think anybody can argue with me—there is not one Senator who can dispute the clear set of facts that we have to get it right for children. We have to get it right for them before age 3, much less before age 5. Nobody can argue with that.

Nobody can argue these are not critical developmental years. Look at the spark in their eyes. They are experiencing all the unnamed magic in the world before them, as long as we encourage them. No one can argue that for working families this is not a huge issue, both the expense of child care, which I cannot deal with in this amendment, and the quality of the care for their children. If both parents are working or a single parent is working, there is nothing more important to them than making sure their child is receiving the best care. They do not want their child warehoused. They do not want their child in front of a television 8 hours a day. They want to make sure their child is stimulated. They want to make sure there is nurturing for their child. They want to make sure there is interaction with their child.

I do not know how some of the people who work in the child care field do it. They are saints; they do it out of love for children; but they should not be the ones who subsidize this system. We are not going to have good people in the child care field if they are making $8 an hour. We are not going to have good people if they do not have any health

care benefits. I cannot deal with that in this amendment, but I can deal with one thing. I can call on my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, who say they are committed to good child care, who say they are committed to family values. If they are committed to family values, what better way to value families than to make sure that when people are working, their children are receiving good care? What better way to make sure that happens than to do something about the one-third turnover every year?

How can we best deal with the one-third turnover? We need to do a lot of things, but this amendment in its own small way helps. I am simply saying we ought to at least put $10 million into this loan forgiveness program so we can encourage men and women—frankly, I would like to see more men in this field; it is almost all women in this field. At least they know their loan will be forgiven. That will make a huge difference. That is all this amendment is about.

I also say to my colleagues, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself and Senator DEWINE. I am so pleased Senator DEWINE is a cosponsor. I have done a number of different bills and legislation with Senator DEWINE. We did the Workforce Investment Act together, and we did this authorization together. I do not think we are asking too much.

This is actually a crisis. The fact is, the studies that have come out about the quality of child care in this country are pretty frightening. Sometimes it is downright dangerous, but almost always it is barely adequate, and we have to do something about it. One of the best ways we can show we care is to at least begin putting some funding into this loan forgiveness program.

I reserve the remainder of my time if, in fact, there is substantive debate on this issue. Otherwise, I will make a few other points. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time on the amendment?

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, we are prepared to accept this Wellstone amendment which provides $10 million for loan forgiveness for child care providers. The program was authorized by the Higher Education Amendment of 1998 and has never been funded.

The administration did not request funding, I might add. A $10 million offset in administrative expenses will pay for this amendment.

If the Senator is agreeable, I will accept the amendment to forgive loans for child care providers who complete a degree in early childhood education and obtain employment in a child care facility located in low-income communities. That is acceptable to us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Alaska. And if this is not presumptuous of me to say, normally I like to call for a recorded vote, but I would be pleased to have a voice vote, if that is what my colleague wants. And there is one reason why. I can't get an ironclad commitment from the Senator from Alaska, but I make a plea to him to please try to help me keep it in conference. It would be a small step toward getting funding for this. I know the Senator is very effective. I don't need to have a recorded vote if he can at least tell me he will certainly try.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator does not need a recorded vote. This amendment probably applies to my State more than any other State in the Union. I assure him I will be asserting his position in conference.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am very glad to hear that. I think I would be pleased to go forward with a voice vote.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do both Senators yield back their time?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield back our time.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3644) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we are awaiting clearance—I understand there is a Kennedy amendment on job training. We would like to get a time agreement on that. I would urge that we consider that at this time.

Does the Senator wish the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to the manager, the chairman of the full committee, Senator STEVENS, we would like to have Senator REED of Rhode Island offer the next amendment. He is on his way over to do that.

Mr. STEVENS. Is it possible to get a time agreement on that?

Mr. REID. Yes, it is.

Mr. STEVENS. We would like to get time agreements so it would be possible to stack votes later, if that is possible. Is the Senator prepared to indicate how long it might be?

Mr. REID. We will wait until he gets here, but I don't think he will take a lot of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, might I ask my colleagues, there is some order here. There is going to be a Reed amendment—is that correct?—next, and then a KENNEDY amendment. I have an amendment with Senator REID that deals with mental health and suicide prevention. Might I add that I follow Senator KENNEDY? I am ready to keep rolling.

Mr. STEVENS. I am not prepared to agree to that yet. We are not sure Senator KENNEDY wants to offer his amendment yet. We are prepared to enter into a time agreement on the KENNEDY amendment.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I might state for the information of the Senate, we are trying to arrange amendments from each side of the aisle. We urge Members on the Republican side of the aisle to come forward with amendments if they wish to call them up today.

For the time being, I ask unanimous consent that on the amendment offered by Senator REED of Rhode Island there be a time limit of 30 minutes equally divided, with no second-degree amendments prior to a vote on or in relation to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. We presume that there may be a Republican amendment offered after the Reed amendment. But in any event, the next Democratic amendment to be offered would be that of Senator KENNEDY, his job training amendment, and prior to that vote, there would be—let's put it this way, that time on that amendment be limited to 60 minutes equally divided, with no second-degree amendments prior to a vote.

It is my understanding there would be 2 minutes on each side. Is that the procedure now prior to the vote? Is that correct, may I inquire? Is that your desire?

Mr. REID. That is appropriate.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that on each of these consents there be a 4-minute period prior to the vote to be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Can I ask my colleague in that sequence, that following Senator KENNEDY there be a Republican and then I be allowed——

Mr. STEVENS. It is my understanding the third Democratic amendment to be offered would be the amendment from Senator WELLSTONE. We are awaiting the Republican amendments to see. But it will be the Reed amendment, then a Republican amendment, then the Kennedy amendment, then a Republican amendment, and then the Wellstone amendment.

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

Mr. REID. Senator WELLSTONE has agreed to 1 hour evenly divided.

Mr. STEVENS. I don't know what the subject matter is.

Mr. REID. Mental health.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Suicides.

Mr. REID. It deals with suicides.

Mr. STEVENS. We haven't seen it, but we will be pleased to consider an hour on that amendment and get back to the Senator.

Mr. REID. If you need more time, we don't care. If you decide you do, we will add it on to ours.

Mr. STEVENS. Let's decide the time on that amendment once we have seen it.

Mr. President, while we are awaiting the next amendment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3638

(Purpose: To provide funds for the GEAR UP Program)

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, No. 3638, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED], for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. MURRAY, proposes an amendment numbered 3638.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. . GEAR UP PROGRAM.

In addition to any other funds appropriated under this Act to carry out chapter 2 of subpart 2 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, there are appropriated $100,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this amendment would increase funding for GEAR UP by $100 million. GEAR UP is a critical component of our efforts to provide disadvantaged young people a chance to go on to college. GEAR UP reaches out very early in their educational careers, giving them the mentoring, the support, and the information necessary to succeed, not only in high school but to go beyond, to enter and complete college.

I offer this amendment along with Senator KENNEDY and Senator MURRAY. We are offering it because we believe—as I am sure everyone in the Chamber believes—that the opportunity to go on to postsecondary education is central to our country and central to our aspirations in the Senate.

This opportunity is particularly difficult to achieve if one is a low-income student in the United States. The GEAR UP program is specifically designed to reach out early in the career of a child, the sixth or seventh grade, and give them not only the skills but the confidence and the expectation that they can succeed and can go on to college. Both these skills and information, together with the confidence that they can succeed, are essential to their progress and to our progress as a Nation.

GEAR UP is based upon proven early intervention models such as the I Have a Dream Program and Project GRAD. These programs have succeeded in improving low-income student achievement, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates. We are building on a successful set of models.

GEAR UP provides students with very specific services tailored to help them prepare for college. These services include tutoring, mentoring, and counseling. They are critical to ensure that students are equipped both academically and emotionally to succeed in college. We often hear about the lack of opportunities available to low-income families. This is particularly the case when we talk about entering and succeeding in college. Low-income children are the least likely individuals in the United States to attend college. In fact, if we look at high-achieving students from low-income schools and backgrounds, they are five times less likely to attend college as comparable students in higher-income schools across this country. By focusing on college preparation for these needy students, GEAR UP is directly targeted at eliminating this disparity.

There is something else that is important about GEAR UP. There are many talented young people who, if they are the first child in their family to seriously contemplate college, do not have the advantage of parents who are knowledgeable about the system. Their parents often do not have the information and the incentives to provide the kind of support and assistance these young people need. That, too, must be addressed, and GEAR UP does that.

In fact, GEAR UP addresses the needs not only of students but also of parents. In a recent survey, 70 percent of parents indicated they have very little information or they want more information about which courses their child should take to prepare for college. Eighty-nine percent of parents wanted more information about how to pay for college. This information disparity is particularly acute in low-income areas. Again, GEAR UP provides that type of information and assistance.

It is well documented that continuous programs that are integrated into the daily school life of a child are the best types of programs to provide for successful outcomes. That is exactly what GEAR UP does. It starts early in a career, sixth and seventh grade, follows the child through their middle school years and into high school, and is integrated with other subjects so there is both continuous support and an integrated approach to preparing a child for college.

GEAR UP does this through partnerships and collaborations among State departments of education, high-poverty school districts, institutions of higher education, businesses, and other private or non-profit community organizations. GEAR UP is a college preparatory program, a Federal program that focuses on children in early grades. As such, the existence of other programs such as TRIO does not eliminate the need to fully fund GEAR UP. We have to recognize that we have not only the responsibility but also an opportunity to fully fund the GEAR UP program.

I commend Senator HARKIN and Senator SPECTER. They have dealt with a variety of educational issues in a budget that constrains their choices—indeed, their desires—significantly. They have done remarkable work, including funding for the LEAP program, which provides low-income students with funds to go to college. But if you don't have the first piece, if you don't have a GEAR UP program that gives students the skills, the confidence, the insights to get into college, Pell grants and LEAP grants are irrelevant because these deserving young students won't even be in the mix.

GEAR UP is important. It is fundamental. The budget that Senators SPECTER and HARKIN were dealing with did not give them the full range of choices they needed to ensure they could fund these important priorities. That is why we are here today, to provide a total of $325 million for GEAR UP, an increase of $100 million over what is in this current appropriations bill. If we do this, it will allow every State to have a GEAR UP program. As a result of the additional $100 million, GEAR UP would serve over 1.4 million low-income students across the country. That would be a significant and commendable increase in our efforts.

If we don't provide this full $325 million, we will see over 400,000 needy students denied essential academic services which are provided through GEAR UP. Without this amendment, the need for these types of skills and support systems will not be met.

Furthermore, the demand for GEAR UP is not being met. In 1999, GEAR UP received 678 partnership and State grant applications covering all 50 States. However, due to limited resources, only one out of four partnerships and half of the State applications could be funded. Clearly, the need is there. The demand is there. We must meet it with sufficient resources.

Today GEAR UP's reach is limited because of the constraints on our appropriations. We need to provide sufficient resources so we can do our best to

reach all the needy students in the United States.

My home State of Rhode Island was fortunate to be one of the States to receive GEAR UP funding. The current Rhode Island GEAR UP program is comprised of a partnership of 21 nonprofit organizations known as the College Access Alliance of Rhode Island. They reach out to schools. They reach out to homes. They provide community support, a network which helps these young students understand their potential and tells them: Yes, you can go on to college; yes, you can succeed; yes, you can be part of this great American economy and this great American country.

Providing these resources has helped countless young Rhode Islanders to reach their full academic potential. In just one year, Rhode Island GEAR UP has provided invaluable services. It has helped 1,300 students enroll and participate in summer academic programs. It has tracked the academic progress of over 8,000 highly mobile, disadvantaged students. They move many times from school to school, city to city. Rhode Island GEAR UP has been able to track these youngsters, keep in contact with them, keep encouraging them, keep getting them ready to go on to college. It has also identified 1,000 low-income students in need of extra support. It has linked these students to academic tutoring and mentoring, the kind of help they need to succeed.

Although these are impressive numbers, because of limited resources we currently cannot duplicate this type of effort in every State, in every community across the country. I believe we should.

My amendment is cosponsored by Senators KENNEDY and MURRAY. It is also supported by a broad coalition of interested groups: the United States Student Association, the California State University; the College Board, the National Association for College Admission Counseling, the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, the American Association of Community Colleges, the National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs, the American Association of University Women, the American Counseling Association, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Association of State Boards of Education, and the National PTA.

I have a letter representing their support. At this time, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES STUDENT ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2000.

Hon. JACK REED,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR REED: On behalf of the undersigned, I wish to express my strong support and appreciation for your amendment to provide $325 million for GEAR UP in FY 2001.

As you know, early intervention and mentoring programs drastically increase the chances that low-income students will attend and graduate from college. GEAR UP takes a unique approach to early intervention. First, GEAR UP involves whole cohorts of students, beginning in middle school and extending throughout high school. Research clearly demonstrates that we must help students to begin preparing for college no later than the middle school grades.

Second, GEAR UP is sparking the development of university/K–12 partnerships that often include businesses and community-based organizations. In fact, more than 4,500 big and small businesses, community-based organizations, religious and civic organizations, chambers of commerce, and others joined the states, universities, and middle schools that submitted applications for the first round of GEAR UP awards in 1999. Clearly, our nation's business and community leaders recognize that the quality of tomorrow's workforce depends, in large part, upon what we do today to prepare middle and high school students for the rigors of college-level work.

Because such programs are crucial to increasing access to higher education, we believe that it is important to point out that the undersigned strongly support all efforts to increase access through early intervention programs, including TRIO. Although the objectives of these programs are similar, the approaches that TRIO and GEAR UP employ are quite different. In view of the tremendous challenges we face in breaking down the barriers to college attendance for students from low-income families, we also support funding the TRIO program at the highest possible level.

Some $231 million in FY01 funding is needed just to keep year-one and year-two GEAR UP grantees on their current trajectory. Should the Senate fail to adopt your amendment, needy students in communities that have not yet received GEAR UP grants will be denied the opportunity to gain the skills and information essential for going to college.

Senator Reed, we thank you for all you are doing to ensure that the door to higher education is opened wide to low-income students in Rhode Island and throughout our nation.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

KENDRA FOX-DAVIS,
PRESIDENT,
The United States Student Association.

This letter is sent on behalf of the following entities:

American Association of University Women
American Counseling Association
The California Community Colleges
The California State University
Chicago Education Alliance
Chicago Teachers' Center
Cincinnati Public Schools
Cincinnati State Technical and Community Colleges
Cincinnati Youth Collaborative
The College Board
Council of the Great City Schools
DePaul University
Gadsden State Community College
Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities
Loyola University
National Alliance of Black School Educators
National Association for College Admission Counseling
The National Association for Migrant Education
National Association of School Psychologists
National Association of Secondary School Principals
National Association of State Boards of Education
National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs
National Education Association
The National HEP-CAMP Association
National PTA
New York State Education Department
Northeastern Illinois University
Ohio Appalachian Center for Higher Education
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
Pennsylvania State System for Higher Education
Roosevelt University
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Saint Olaf College
State Higher Education Executive Officers
State University System of Florida
United States Student Association
University of Cincinnati
University of North Carolina
University of Washington
Vermont Student Assistance Corporation

Mr. REED. Mr. President, one of our primary educational goals should be to ensure that all students with the skill, talent, and ambition to go to college can go to college. In order to accomplish that goal, we have to fund, of course, Pell grants; we have to fund the LEAP program. We have to do many of the things Senators SPECTER and HARKIN have insisted upon in this bill. But we also have to do something which helps students early on through the GEAR UP program, and give these young students the skills, the confidence, and the expectation that they can and should go on to college. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

At this time, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, there is no doubt that the GEAR UP program is a very fine program. It has been in existence for a fairly short period of time. It originated with Congressman CHAKA FATTAH from Philadelphia, who had the initial idea and took it to the President, who agreed with it. It was put into effect just a few years ago. It started out at a funding level of $120 million. Last year, the President requested an increase, and we came up to some $200 million, and our Senate bill has $225 million in the program.

Coincidentally, I happened to attend the President's program where he did one of his Saturday speeches on it. So I know the program thoroughly. In fact, with Congressman CHAKA FATTAH, I visited a school in west Philadelphia where this program was being used. Regrettably, there is simply not enough money to accommodate all of the programs, which are good programs, which we would like to have. It is not possible to accommodate the program Senator KERRY of Massachusetts offered about technical training, or the Bingaman amendment on an extra $250 million for title I, or the Wellstone amendment of $1.7 billion.

We have put substantial money into job training programs. Job Corps is up to more than $650 million, with almost a $20 million increase. We have structured a program on school safety as to

violence and a program as to drugs. These are programs we have structured to do the best we can.

The Senator from Rhode Island has commented about what Senator HARKIN and I have attempted to do in this bill, which is the maximum stretch, as I had said earlier, that can be accommodated on this side of the aisle at $104.5 billion. Regrettably, the money is simply not present. I wish it were.

The House has $200 million, which is less than the $225 million we have on the Senate side. We will do our best to maintain that kind of an increase, which would be $25 million, which is as far as we can realistically go.

How much time do I have remaining, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 12 and a half minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. I have 12 and a half minutes out of the 15?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SPECTER. I have said what I had to say. I will not use all of my time. How much time does the Senator from Rhode Island have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has 4 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. I intend to raise a point of order under section 302(f) of the Budget Act, as amended, that the effect of adopting the Reed amendment would provide budget authority in excess of the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation and therefore it is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair notes that the Senator from Rhode Island still has time pending and the motion would not be in order.

Mr. SPECTER. As I said, I intend to raise that point of order after he has completed his statement.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I recognize Senator SPECTER's dilemma with the budget resolution, as it fairly constrains his ability and the ability of his colleagues on the committee to fund programs that are worthwhile. In fact, I note that GEAR UP is a program that evolved from a model that was very popular in Pennsylvania, the I Have a Dream Program, and others. The Senator is familiar with it and is supportive of it. My point is that this is one of those critical programs, and we have to reach beyond this budget resolution and budget constraints and try to find the resources.

It is particularly appropriate at this moment, as we are looking ahead at significant surpluses that are growing—dividends from tough fiscal decisions we have made over several years—that we begin to develop a strategy to invest more and more into education. GEAR UP is a worthwhile program—eminently worthwhile. One could argue it is the first step in so much of what is included in this legislation, such as Pell grants, LEAP, and all of those programs that actually give these youngsters the money to go to college. But if they don't have the skill, motivation, and the confidence to try, those grants won't be useful to them.

So I once again urge that we move forward with this amendment. I understand that the Senator from Pennsylvania will make a budget point of order. At that time, I will make a request to waive that applicable section. If the Senator is ready to make the motion, I am happy to yield back all my time and then be recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I will just add one thing. I appreciate the sincerity of the comments of the Senator from Rhode Island that this is a more important program. That is what the proponents of all of the amendments have had to say. If the Senator from Rhode Island could find offsets within the budget resolution and tell me and Senator HARKIN what programs are less important and have offsets, I would be pleased to entertain that consideration. To add to the budget, it is the same point that has been made repeatedly—that everybody's program is special. And I happen to agree with them; they are all special programs. But if you made it more special than something already in the program and have an offset, we would not raise the rule.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the Reed amendment be stacked to occur later today at a time to be agreed upon by the leaders.

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

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I yield back all time if the Senator from Rhode Island is prepared to do the same.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, it is now relevant to raise the point of order under section 302(f) of the Budget Act that the amendment would exceed the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation and therefore it is not in order.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive the applicable sections of that act for the consideration of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, sequencing now comes to the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY. Parliamentary inquiry: It is my understanding that there is a time agreement for 1 hour equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum on my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3678

(Purpose: To adjust appropriations for workforce investment activities and related activities)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], for himself, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. ROBB, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. REED, Mr. DODD, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. BAYH, proposes an amendment numbered 3678.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 12, strike ''$2,990,141,000'' and insert ''$3,889,387,000''.

On page 2, line 13, strike ''$1,718,801,000'' and insert ''$2,239,547,000''.

On page 2, line 15, strike ''$1,250,965,000'' and insert ''$1,629,465,000''.

On page 2, line 17, strike ''$1,000,965,000'' and insert ''$1,254,465,000''.

On page 2, line 18, strike ''$250,000,000'' and insert ''$375,000,000''.

On page 5, line 6, strike ''$153,452,000'' and insert ''$197,452,000''.

On page 5, line 7, strike ''$3,095,978,000'' and insert ''$3,196,746,000''.

On page 5, line 26, strike ''$153,452,000'' and insert ''$197,452,000''.

On page 6, line 1, strike ''$763,283,000'' and insert ''$788,283,000''.

On page 20, line 1, strike ''$19,800,000'' and insert ''$22,300,000''.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this amendment is based upon a rather basic and fundamental concept; that is, every worker who enters the job market is going to have seven or eight jobs over the course of his or her lifetime.

A number of years ago when I first entered the Senate many of the workers in my own State got a job at the Fall River Shipyard, and their father or mother had a job there, and many times their grandfather had a job there, as well. They knew early in their lives that they would enter the same career as their family before them. They acquired their skills through training. They lived their lives more often than not with only a high school diploma. They acquired their skills and upgraded their skills at the place of employment, but usually their job changed very little. They were able to have a very useful and constructive and satisfying life.

The job market has changed dramatically in recent years. It is changing more every single day with the obvious globalization and the move towards the information economy. New technologies are creating new careers and new businesses, and many people are in jobs that didn't exist a generation ago. These new businesses are an important part of our new economy, and they also create many new jobs. But they have

also created new challenges for our workers. Education has become increasingly important to move up the ladder in the job market. And the idea of continuous skill development has become a critical part of workplace success.

We have learned that continuing ongoing training has to be a lifetime experience. We know that some companies are providing training programs. More often than not, those training programs are directed to those in the upper levels of the management of those companies. For too long we have left behind those who have been the real backbone of so many of these companies—the workers who often lack basic academic and technical skills.

These programs which have been included in the amendment that I have offered are basically to try to make sure we are going to offer more workers the skills necessary in order to continue to be the world leader in terms of our economy.

I don't know how many others in this body go back home over the weekends and meet with various groups, including various business groups. I find in my State of Massachusetts and generally throughout New England that the first issue people raise is: When are we going to do something about the H–1B issue? People who listen to talk about H–1B wonder what in the world it is. H–1B is a visa program. It permits importation of highly skilled foreign nationals to work in our plants and corporations. That is a key question on the minds of those involved in so many of the expanding economies in this country.

I always say: Yes. We ought to move ahead. I hope we can move ahead and expand that program before we leave this Congress.

H–1B visa provides a temporary solution to a labor market shortage of highly skilled workers. I think the answer to this is not only in the temporary way to have an expansion of the highly skilled workers coming to the United States, but to develop the skills for American workers so they can have those jobs in the future. Those are good jobs. They are well-paying jobs. Americans ought to be qualified for those. The only thing that is between Americans gaining those jobs are the training programs for upgrading their skills. We need to strengthen our secondary education and provide better access to post-secondary education for more students. And we have to improve the access to on-the-job training for current workers, and provide the resources to support dislocated workers with training and re-employment services.

What happened in the Senate? It is almost as if this appropriations bill just fell off the ceiling. It has lacked, with all due respect, the focus and attention to what we have tried to do in some of the authorizing committees.

This fall, for the first time, we will put in place the Workforce Investment Act, which I was proud to cosponsor with Senators JEFFORDS, DEWINE and WELLSTONE, to consolidate the 126 different workforce programs in 12 different agencies that too often are tied up with a good deal of bureaucracy. We started working on that legislation with Senator Kassebaum and it took three years before we passed that program.

I had the opportunity on Monday of this last week to go out to Worcester, MA. There were 800 people gathered there interested in the work training programs from all over New England. They are eager to know how they are going to get the resources to try to put together this consolidation of training programs in order to get the skills for people in our region of the country. Workers know that they have to increase their skills, especially in the area of computer technology, and they want to know how to access those programs. Those discussions are taking place in cities and towns all over the country.

Part of that consolidation was what we call one-stop shopping where a worker, for example, who has been dislocated or has lost their job, maybe because of the merging of various industries, would be able to come to one place to learn about all the options that they have for training. They would be able to have their skills assessed. They could get information on jobs that are available in their areas and the skills that they would need to compete for those jobs. And they would get an accurate assessment of their current skills.

They could see how long each training program takes, and a look at the employment prospects. They also get information about how many former participants in those programs did in the job market. How many of them got jobs right away, and at what salary? They also get a look at how many of those workers were still employed after a year, and how many were able to move up in those jobs to better paying jobs with their companies.

The person can make up their mind. They can say: OK. I want to take that particular program, and they are going to be able to go to that program and acquire the skills. It could be at a community college, a four year college or at a private center. Wherever they choose, they are aware of how participants of that program performed in the workplace.

That is what we attempted to do in a bipartisan way 3 years ago. Those programs are ready to go. What happens? The appropriations bill pulls the rug out from under those programs.

Our amendment is trying to restore the funding at the President's request to make sure we are going to have the training programs that are necessary so American workers can get the skills to be able to compete in the modern economy.

That is what this is all about. It may not be a ''front-page issue.'' It may not be a ''first-10-pages issue.'' But as workers can tell you all over this country, skills are the defining issue as to what your future is going to be and what you are going to be able to provide for your family.

This provides additional resources out of the surplus to be able to fund these programs in the way that the President has recommended.

There has been a lack of serious attention to the various programs which we mentioned. Tragically, I think the most dramatic has been in the Summer Jobs Program.

Here is the story in the Wall Street Journal: ''Fewer youths get a shot at the Summer Jobs Program. This summer the Workforce Investment Act replaces the Nation's previous federally supported summer jobs.''

We tried to upgrade it and tighten it to eliminate some of the bureaucracy. We know that there needs to be a year-round connection to the job experiences that young people have in the summer. What happens? The minute we expand the mission of the Summer Jobs program, they cut out all of the funds for the Summer Jobs Programs for youth. We mandate a year-round approach to getting some of the neediest youth equipped for the world of work and we critically under-fund that effort. In doing that we doom those young people to fail.

While local groups agree that the expansion will make the program more effective, it will be more expensive. Washington hasn't provided the funds. The Labor Department estimates participation will drop 25 percent to 50 percent from last year's 500,000 young people.

Dropping over 500,000 young people—most of them in the cities of this country—and cutting them loose is probably about as shortsighted of a decision as could be made by this Congress.

At a time where we just had the announcement yesterday of surpluses going up through the roof, we are talking about today cutting out effectively the Summer Jobs Program for the most economically challenged urban and rural areas of our country.

You can't talk to a mayor in any city of this country, large or small, who won't tell you that is the most shortsighted decision that could possibly be made by the Congress today.

I know in my own city of Boston where they have anywhere from 10,000 to 12,000 Summer Jobs Programs, what happens? The private sector comes in and provides maybe 2,000 to 3,000 jobs. They try to build upon the jobs program that existed in previous summers. High school students get a chance to improve their academic skills and learn important workplace skills that enable them to get higher paying jobs in future summers. Many of them make business connections that give them employment opportunities throughout high school and college.

They will find children who have completed 1 year in the Summer Jobs

Program, a second year in the Summer Jobs Program, and the third year the private sector picks them up, and more often than not they get the job. If the young person is interested enough to continue the Summer Jobs Program and acquire some skills, more often than not in my city of Boston they will be picked up and given a job to move ahead.

I wonder how many Members of this body have ever been with a young person in the summer youth program the day they get their first paycheck and see the pride and satisfaction and joy of those young people? They have a paycheck, many of them for the first time. They have a sense of involvement, a sense of participation, a responsibility, a willingness to stay the course.

We are saying to those young people: No way, we are cutting back. We have record surpluses, but not for you, young America. Then we wonder around this body about violence in school, we wonder why young people are upset, disoriented, or out of touch with what is going on. We send them back into the confusion of the inner city, send them out there without any supervision, send them out there without any sense of training or pride. That is what we are doing. We are basically abdicating our essential and important responsibility to the children of this country and abandoning our commitment to give workers help and assistance.

Soon the Senate will discuss the issue of expanded trade with China. The votes are there to pass it. Many have pointed out that some are concerned because some will benefit, and benefit considerably, while others are going to sacrifice, and sacrifice considerably. We have heard those arguments about this providing new opportunities for many aspects of our American economy. Many have said yes. But what about others who will be laid off? They ought to get a little training to find a future for themselves and their family.

What is happening now? We are closing the door for them. We are denying them the right to have that kind of job training. We are denying young people their first job experience and we are denying older workers the training programs to give them job security. It is fine for those who will make the big fortunes. Increase the number of billionaires in our society. What about those men and women who are laid off? The only way they can survive is to get training in a different job. That training will not be there with this budget.

Our amendment provides $1 billion additional dollars to the various training programs and the summer job programs. This is a tangible way to show Americans that we are going to provide the tools for them to fully participate in this growing, expanding, and global society. We need to send a clear message that workers are the backbone of this country, the backbone of our economy, and every hard-working American is going to be able to gain skills to be useful and productive workers in the future in our society. This amendment ought to pass.

How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 6 minutes to each Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, for yielding time. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the Democratic skills training amendment to the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001. This amendment further increases our country's human capital by adding $1.05 billion to skills training programs at the U.S. Department of Labor.

Mr. President, while I commend the chairman and ranking member for their efforts in coming forward with a bill that avoids many of the drastic cuts approved by the House of Representatives, there are still a number of vital programs that continue to be seriously underfunded. This amendment provides adequate funding for Federal skills training programs to serve more individuals who are seeking to improve their ability to contribute to the workplace. Today's global economy demands that the United States do all it can to ensure that every member of our workforce is prepared to meet new workplace chllenges. Unfortunately, the gap between high-skilled and low-skilled workers continues to grow, leaving many at the lower end of the spectrum even farther behind.

One particular program I would like to mention is the Fathers Work, Families Win program. This important initiative improves the employment potential of certain low income individuals who generally have lower levels of education and work experience. As a result, these individuals usually end up accepting jobs that pay relatively low wages and have few benefits. They often have irregular track records in employment: they hold several jobs at a time, work part-time or intermittently, or endure periods of unemployment. Many of these individuals have been on the welfare rolls or are living under conditions that make them vulnerable to becoming dependent on Federal assistance.

We must not forget that these individuals have the potential to make meaningful contributions to the economy and, given the opportunity, can become self-sufficient and successfully support their families. This is one reason why I am interested in seeing the Fathers Work, Families Win program funded. The portion of the program entitled Families Win provides $130 million in competitive grants for programs to help low income parents stay employed, move up the career ladder, and remain off welfare.

The program's Fathers Work component provides $125 million for competitive grants to help certain non-custodial parents find a job, maintain employment, and advance on their career path. This is important because many fathers, rather than being ''deadbeat dads,'' are ''dead broke dads.'' They have the desire to support their families through child support payments and other means, but cannot do so because they cannot secure or maintain steady employment paying a living wage.

Fathers Work, Families Win would build on the investments and partnerships started under the Workforce Investment Act and the Welfare-to-Work program. State and local Workforce Investment Boards are eligible applicants under both parts of Fathers Work, Families Win. These boards have been implementing WIA [weeeea] across the country, reforming the way in which job training and job placement services are conducted. The competitive grant program funds enable the Boards to further integrate services for the population of low income workers under programs such as WIA, Wagner-Peyser [wag-ner pie-zer] grants, Welfare-to-Work grants, and grants under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program. This integrated approach will help to ensure that many low income families will not fall through the cracks and will find it easier to use the network of services at their disposal.

I continue to be a strong supporter of the Welfare-to-Work program. Last year, I introduced the Welfare-to-Work Amendments of 1999 which included provisions to reauthorize the program and to improve access to the program for more low income individuals. The eligibility changes were included in the consolidated appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000, which I thank my colleagues for working on and supporting. However, the Welfare-to-Work program itself has not yet been renewed. With eligibility changes taking effect for competitive grantees at the beginning of 2000 and for formula grantees later this year, Welfare-to-Work efforts must be given more time to run. If the program is not reauthorized, worthwhile efforts at the State and local levels to help low income families will be adversely impacted.

Because the Welfare-to-Work program has not been extended, many local communities are concerned because their efforts to help Welfare-to-Work participants have just begun. An abrupt end to the program would cause significant investments to go to waste. As the U.S. Conference of Mayors states in a letter dated June 10, 2000, ''Without the extension of the Welfare-to-Work program, welfare reform will be dealt a serious set back in our nation's cities which are home to the highest concentrations of people still on welfare.'' I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES
CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
Washington, DC, June 10, 2000.

DEAR MEMBER: The United States Conference of Mayors, assembled in Seattle, is gravely concerned about the future of the Welfare-to-Work Program. We urge you to extend the Welfare-to-Work program as proposed in the Clinton FY 2001 budget. Without the extension of the Welfare-to-Work program, welfare reform will be dealt a serious set back in our nation's cities which are home to the highest concentrations of the people still on welfare.

Mayors are aware that some members of Congress have legitimately raised concerns about the low expenditure rate in the current Welfare-to-Work program. Unfortunately, a large percentage of the funding did not reach the local level until the last quarter of 1998. In addition, the initial Welfare-to-Work eligibility requirements have excluded a large segment of the hardest-to-serve welfare population and thus inhibited the expenditure of the first $3 billion in funding.

We were pleased that Congress made the necessary changes in the eligibility requirements in the FY 2000 appropriations bill. However, these eligibility changes were not effective immediately. The changes are not effective for WTW formula grant funds until October 1, 2000. For WTW competitive grant funds, the changes became effective January 1, 2000.

We believe that the need for the extension of this funding will become increasingly evident as the program becomes fully operational and the eligibility changes are enacted. In fact, indications from the U.S. Department of Labor's quarterly reports on WTW spending are he expenditures for formula and competitive grant funding have increased overall and that expenditures for competitive grant funding has increased significantly since January 1, 2000, when the eligibility changes became effective. It is also expected that spend-out rates will also increase significantly as larger numbers of TANF recipients reach their time limits and lose eligibility for cash assistance.

Mayors more than anyone else recognize that although welfare roles have declined significantly across states, great numbers of former welfare clients living in cities who are in need of services still remain. Many of these individuals who are still not working have little or no skills, are unable to read and write beyond the 8th grade level, and have no work experience. When they are able to go to work, the jobs often pay below minimum wage, have no health benefits and are insufficient to support the individual, let alone his or her family.

As Mayors we realize that while many in the nation believe the job of welfare reform is complete, we know that much work remains to be done. The targeted and direct resources provided by Welfare-to-Work are essential for us to address the concentrated welfare caseloads in our cities and ensure that those still on welfare make the transition into the workforce. Discontinuing the Welfare to Work program at this time would be a great disservice to those welfare recipients still unable to find self-sustaining jobs.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors urges you to extend the Welfare-to-Work program until we can honestly say that most of those in need of these services are working in permanent, self-sustaining jobs. Now is not the time to stop the progress already made on Welfare Reform and Welfare-to-Work. Now is the time to ensure that those remaining on the welfare rolls who have the greatest challenges to employment are served.

Sincerely,

WELLINGTON E. WEBB,
President Mayor of Denver.

BEVERLY O'NEILL,
Chair, Jobs, Education and the Workforce Standing Committee, Mayor of Long Beach.

H. BRENT COLES,
Vice President, Mayor of Boise.

MARC H. MORIAL,
Chair, Advisory Board, Mayor of New Orleans.

DAVID W. MOORE,
Chair, Health and Human Services Standing Committee, Mayor of Beaumont.

Mr. AKAKA. The letter goes on to note that although welfare rolls have decreased significantly across the country, ''great numbers of former welfare clients living in cities who are in need of services still remain.'' These are the hardest-to-help families who need our greatest assistance. Furthermore, many of these individuals will be reaching their lifetime limit on welfare benefits imposed by the 1996 welfare reform law and will no longer be able to rely on regular cash assistance to support their families. We cannot allow these families to be left without any safety net and should continue pursuing efforts to ''teach them how to fish''—this is what the amendment before us would do.

While I am disappointed that the bill before us does not extend the Welfare-to-Work program, I hope that under the eligibility changes I helped to pass last year, Welfare-to-Work program accomplishments will continue to grow and provide strong impetus for the program's reauthorization. In the meantime, I strongly urge my colleagues to support programs such as Fathers Work, Families Win for low income individuals.

It is interesting to note that in 1998 and 1999, while the nation was experiencing low unemployment, layoffs were still widespread. This trend was mainly due to companies requiring new skills to meet the demands of a new economy. Unfortunately, as we have seen by the announcements of large-scale layoffs from companies such as Coca-Cola, J.C. Penney Company, and Exxon Mobil Corporation, the situation is not getting any better.

So, why are we in Congress looking at reducing or eliminating funding for vital programs that empower former welfare recipients and low-wage workers with the information and skills necessary to become viable citizens in their communities? Skills Training programs are essential to ensure that displaced workers will be able to transition into another trade. We must not forget that the Federal Reserve Board is reviewing the possibility of raising interest rates in an effort to slow down U.S. economic growth. This could negatively impact not only Hawaii's economy, especially the construction industry that is one of Hawaii's leading areas for job growth, but the nation as a whole. Hawaii's economy is just recovering from a decade of economic stagnation and layoffs and cannot afford another recession without providing the necessary funds for skills training programs.

The current and proposed funding levels for skills training programs are inadequate to ensure the availability of a trained workforce. We must remain committed in our efforts to equip employers with an employment system capable of addressing potential labor shortages. For the State of Hawaii, eliminating all new funding for One Stop Career Centers/Labor Market Information will adversely impact Hawaii's ability to comply with the Workforce Investment Act. Hawaii will not be able to develop core employment statistics products used by employers, job seekers, educators, students, and others. More specifically, valuable labor market information would no longer be provided to the public.

I commend Hawaii's Job Corps program for its successful placement rate of 70 percent. This is significant given Hawaii's fragile economy in recent years. The success of this program clearly illustrates the positive effect the skills training programs have on our communities. We should not reduce or eliminate funding for these vital programs that enhance employment opportunities for individuals and their families.

The amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, would address the potential shortcomings in funding as proposed in the House and Senate. This amendment provides appropriate funding for the Department of Labor's Youth and Adult Employment and Training Programs, especially funding for Dislocated Worker assistance, Youth Opportunity grants, Job Corps, and One Stop Career Centers. In addition, this amendment also provides appropriate funding for the Summer Jobs program resulting from implementation of the Workforce Investment Act.

We must continue to improve our skills training program to ensure that America's workforce remains competitive to the global economy. I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we have just learned within the last few minutes that a decision has been made on Capitol Hill to eliminate the Summer Jobs Program for this year. That decision was made by Republican leaders who have decided that it costs too much—$40 million.

We have to sit back, from time to time, and measure the relative cost of decisions we make. If we are going to say to literally tens of thousands of young people across America that there will not be a Summer Jobs Program, what price will we pay for that decision? For many of these kids, it

means there will not be an opportunity for the first time in their lives to have a real job, a real learning experience in the workplace.

In this country we are prepared to pay whatever it takes when we sentence someone to prison. In Illinois, it costs about $30,000 a year to keep someone in prison. That failed life that led to crime and conviction ends up costing us $30,000 a year. Is it too much to pay? No, we will pay it. But when it comes to jobs for kids during the summer, the Republican leadership has decided it is too much to pay.

How about school dropouts? When kids drop out of school, they not only ruin their own lives but often affect the communities in which they live. These are the kids hanging out on the street corners. These are the ones who may never have a job. These are the ones who become chronic statistics in our society. We will pay for those statistics one way or the other. We have decided that is a cost we will pay. But when it comes to providing jobs in the summer for kids going to school, the Republican leadership decided today it was too high a cost to pay. Of course, when we talk about tomorrow's workers, we realize that kids who are not put on the right track with the right values early in life may not go on to finish school or to become the workforce of the 21st century for America. That is an expense to this country. It is obviously something the Republican leadership is willing to pay, rather than pay for a Summer Jobs Program.

What does this program mean? In my home State of Illinois, the decision today by the Republican leaders to take out the Summer Jobs Program means that 10,000 kids coming out of schools in the Chicagoland area will not have a 6-week minimum wage summer job. Is that an important life experience? Boy, it sure was for me. Going to work meant a lot for me. As my folks used to say: We want you to learn the value of a dollar. When I went to work, I understood the value of a dollar. I added up every paycheck and how I was going to save it, how I was going to spend it. It also teaches you the value of hard work, the fact that you do get up with the rest of the world and go to work and don't expect somebody to hand you something. That is the value of a summer job, a value that will be denied to tens of thousands of kids because of a decision the Republican leadership made to kill the Summer Jobs Program. The value of showing up on time to work, dressed properly, prepared to work with your coworkers, you cannot teach all that in school. Some of that is a life experience. It is an experience I had and virtually everyone has on their way to a successful life. For tens of thousands of kids, they will be denied that opportunity because of this decision by the Republican leadership.

Of course, for me and a lot of others, that summer job taught us the value of staying in school. How many times did I stop behind that shovel and think: I don't want to do this the rest of my life. I am going to go back to school. I am going to get my college degree and go on. That is the value of a summer job, too.

Senator KENNEDY is right. If we have the values, the same values of families across America, we would be voting for this program and this amendment he is proposing for summer jobs for kids so they can have a valuable work experience. We would be voting for this amendment so there will be job training for those dislocated from their jobs. We don't want to give up on workers. I believe in free trade, but I know that millions of workers in America lose their jobs each year because of technology and trade and change. We should be there with programs to help them move to the next job so they do not lose pace with the economy and the quality of life they are used to.

This amendment gets to the heart of the values of the Members of the Senate. Senator KENNEDY is right. I am happy to cosponsor it. The mayor of the city of Chicago said: The School Jobs Program keeps kids away from gangs, guns, and drugs. He hit the nail on the head. If we put more and more kids into positive programs where they learn how to work and continue to learn in the workplace, their lives can be transformed. If there is one value we share as Americans, it is the value of hard work.

The decision by the Republican leadership to close down the Summer Jobs Program is a decision that flies in the face of the values of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Who yields time? The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, I welcome the superb statement made by my friend and colleague from Illinois. The Commission for Economic Development says that half of manufacturing companies nationwide do not offer any training programs. Nationally, all employer training programs equal just 1 percent of their payroll costs.

I have here this ''Opportunity Knocks,'' a study done as a Joint Project of Mellon New England and Massachusetts Institute for a New Commonwealth. It says:

> Which workers get employer-provided job skills? For large employers with 50 workers or more, 80 percent are management. These employers are more likely to provide job skills training for managers, computer technicians, and sales workers that for production or service workers. How are these lower skilled workers supposed to improve their skills and move up the ladder? This really is the case. Companies are doing more hiring and firing simultaneously than ever before. Workers who need a new set of skills are often replaced rather than retrained. We need to get workers the skills that they need to compete in this information-age economy. That is quite different from Europe, for example, where the companies are required to provide a range of different skills training so there is an investment in a company's workers. They value the individual, and they know that continual, ongoing training programs in each of those major industries makes good business sense.

This study goes on to say that the poor odds of an employer offering any training is only part of the problem. Access to employer-provided training is by no means equal across categories of workers. Most businesses are unlikely to provide any training opportunities to clerical or production workers and when they do offer training it is in the form of an orientation to their present job. There is no attention to up-grading the skills of those workers.

I want to mention, as we reach the end of this presentation, the comments of Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan. He recently said:

> [The] rapidity of innovation and unpredictability of the directions it may take imply a need for considerable investment in human capital.

Workers in almost every occupation are being asked to strengthen their skills to ensure long-term success in the workplace. The technical know-how that workers need to stay on the cutting edge is being redefined every day.

We are being told by the head of the Federal Reserve that this is what is necessary to keep America's economy strong. We are being told that by the business community. We are being told that by workers. We are being urged to do that by the President of the United States. It makes no sense to undermine that.

We have taken action in a bipartisan way to develop a workforce development system that will be effective. In the next month every state will come on board to implement the new law. Without this amendment we are effectively undermining this Nation's commitment to provide important, necessary skills for America's workers so they will be able to be full participants in the American economy of tomorrow.

It is wrong. I hope the Senate will accept my amendment.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print letters from the U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Association of Counties, and the Mayor of Boston.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2000.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I am writing to express the strong support of The U.S. Conference of Mayors for the Skills Training Amendment that you will be offering to the Labor-Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill. At our recent Annual Conference in Seattle, we sent a letter

to Majority Leader Lott urging him to do just what your amendment does—restore critical funding to the Department of Labor for youth and skills training.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors just released a survey, Examining Skills Shortages in America's Cities, which shows that 86 percent of cities suffer shortages in technology workers; 73 percent suffer shortages in health workers; 72 percent lack enough construction workers to fill available jobs; 71 percent lack manufacturing workers; and 50 percent lack enough workers to fill retail and wholesale jobs. It is imperative that we make the critical investment in our nation's current and future workforce by supporting the President's budget proposals and increasing year-round funding for youth. It is crucial that sufficient resources are provided to address the needs of our nation's youth and the skills gap that seriously affects our nation's economy.

The funding level for the Summer Jobs and year-round youth programs currently proposed in the FY 2001 appropriation bill is unacceptable, especially as programs gear up under the recently enacted Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA). The funding level of the Youth Opportunity Grant Program for out-of-school youth is also shortsighted, as there are massive unmet needs of unemployed, out-of-school youth in high poverty areas.

We applaud your leadership in addressing these issues and your efforts to restore this critical funding. We should be investing in our current and our future workforce—the health and vitality of our cities, and our nation, depend on it.

Sincerely,

J. THOMAS COCHRAN,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES,
June 28, 2000.

Subject: Sen. Kennedy's amendment to the Labor/H appropriation to increase funding for skills training.

DEAR SENATOR: The National Association of Counties (NACo), the only organization representing America's counties in Washington, DC, fully supports Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY's amendment to increase appropriations for workforce investment activities by $792 million for fiscal year 2001. NACo urges the Senate to adopt this amendment to H.R. 4577, the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations bill.

NACo has identified increased funding for workforce development programs as a critical funding priority for 2000. Therefore, we will be tracking your vote on this amendment and any related motion to waive the Budget Act. Your vote will be recorded on our web site (*www.naco.org*) and the information will be made available to county commissioners in your state.

This amendment is of critical importance to America's counties. Current and proposed funding levels for inadequate to ensure that America's counties can effectively implement the Workforce Investment Act. Sen. Kennedy's amendment would address the substantial shortfall in funding currently proposed in the House and Senate by addressing funding for youth programs, incumbent and dislocated worker programs, and one-stop career centers.

Sincerely,

LARRY E. NAAKE,
Executive Director.

CITY OF BOSTON, MA,
Boston, MA, June 27, 2000.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I am writing to express my outrage at efforts to cut funding for summer jobs programs and other youth and skills related programs. As you know, Boston operates one of the nation's largest summer jobs programs. While we are at record low unemployment levels nationally, youth unemployment rates in our cities are still unacceptably high. There is a crisis among our young people as evidenced by the violence and despair among youth in many of our cities. The move to strip summer jobs funding from the Emergency Supplemental comes at a time when we should be investing in our young people, not cutting the future out from under them.

I applaud your efforts to restore critical funding to the Department of Labor for our youth and our nation's workers. The Skills Training Amendment you are offering to the Labor-Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations bill will do exactly what we need to be doing—providing sufficient resources to address the needs of our nation's youth and the skills gap that seriously affects our nation's economy.

As always, thank you for your tremendous efforts on behalf of our youth.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. MENINO,
Mayor of Boston.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, we start from the proposition that this bill, for various education and health care and job training efforts, is dramatically larger than the bill that was passed in this body last year, to everyone's satisfaction, increasing at a rate far more rapid than the pace of inflation or population growth in the United States.

Obscured in the debate so far is the fact that there is some $5.4 billion in job training programs in this bill, at a time of record low unemployment. This represents an increase of more than $16 million over the bill that is currently in effect for the present year. The greater increases in the bill, of course, were for education and for biomedical research, both of which exceed the amounts requested by President Clinton. Even so, the bill provides funding for two new programs requested by the Clinton administration: Worker training and responsible reintegration of youthful offenders, each at $30 and $20 million respectively, a 22-percent increase for dislocated workers in the course of the last 4 years, and a 25-percent increase in the same period of time for the Job Corps.

The private sector, of course, now looking more than ever for qualified employees, has dramatically increased its own hiring and training programs. Of course, in comparison with the House bill, this rejects the $400 million cut in the House bill in that field.

As for summer training, the argument of the Senator from Illinois was a peculiar one. The current law for summer jobs, a law passed last fall, of course, well after last summer was over, has $1 billion in it for just exactly that purpose: $1 billion for summer jobs for youth.

We have another in a series of amendments that illustrates the proposition that no matter how generous this body is, even I may say in many cases no matter how generous the administration is, some Members will come to the floor and demand more, whatever its impact on the budget.

To quote the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board implicitly as being in favor of programs such as this is to fly in the face of logic. It is the clear position, often quoted by Members on the other side, that the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board believes that the single most important means to the goal of a stronger economy we can follow is not to increase Federal spending and, in fact, to decrease it. He has consistently, over the years, held to the position that for the economy as a whole, for future job growth, the best thing we can do is be modest in our spending, not to increase it, I suspect, as much as it is increased in this bill.

In any event, as has been the case with previous amendments of this nature, it will simply add millions, in some cases billions, of dollars to the bill. It is subject to a point of order under the Budget Act. At the appropriate time, that budget point of order will be presented.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to express my enthusiastic support for the amendment offered by my colleague and friend, Senator KENNEDY. Mr. President, Labor Secretary Herman summed up the challenge of today's economy when she declared at the National Skills Summit in April that in this country we have ''a skills shortage, not a labor shortage.''

Right now we have the lowest unemployment rate in this country in the last 30 years. But even as we celebrate this remarkable feat—and it is remarkable—we must remember that there are still some 13 million people in this country who want, but do not have, a full-time job. The Kennedy amendment would make full-time employment a real possibility for homeless veterans, young people, and for youths seeking summer employment.

I appreciate that the Labor-HHS subcommittee's allocations were inadequate to fund at sufficient levels all of the programs in this legislation and I think they have done a good job with what they had to work with. But clearly Mr. President this bill retreats from our commitment to fund many critical education, training, and health programs. I am troubled that the bill before us does not adequately fund job training programs for homeless veterans. Veterans issues are especially important to me, and I know it is of great importance to my fellow veterans here in the Senate. The Kennedy amendment would allow 1,400 more veterans to receive employment placement and economic security than does the bill put forth by the Republicans.

This appropriations bill severely under-funds many important programs, but none more critical than the youth job programs like Job Corps, Youth Opportunity Grants program, and the Summer Jobs program.

Mr. President, Job Corps is the nation's largest residential education and

training program for disadvantaged youth. This program takes head on the issues and the people who have been left behind in this period of economic expansion. While many Americans enjoy unprecedented prosperity, the nation's unemployment rate among African-American teenagers is 22%, almost double the national teenage unemployment rate. Twenty-six percent of those who dropped out of high school between October 1998–99 are unemployed. We cannot relegate these people to the margins of our society, especially during this moment of great national wealth.

There are 120 Job Corps centers in 46 states, including three in my state of Massachusetts. Since 1964, Job Corps has given 1.7 million young people in this country the academic and vocational training they need to get good, entry-level jobs, join the military, or go to college. Job Corps offers GED or high school equivalency programs and training in various occupations, as well as advanced training and additional support services. Graduates of Job Corps go on to work in every field from automotive mechanics and repair, to business, and to health occupations. This amendment would allow Job Corps to serve more than 70,000 additional students and reduce staff turnover by offering Job Corps employees a more competitive salary.

This amendment would also greatly increase funding for the Youth Opportunity Grants. These grants serve some of the poorest inner-city areas and Native American reservations in the country, where unemployment levels are well above the national average. Unfortunately, the Republican legislation would not allow the Department of Labor to expand this program. Last year, the Department of Labor was able to fund only 36 of 150 grants under the Youth Opportunity Grant program, two of which are in Boston and Brockton, Massachusetts. This amendment would allow the Department of Labor to fund 15–20 new grants, allowing us to provide job skills and real work experience to people who live in areas that have only heard rumors about our nation's economic growth, but have not seen it for themselves.

I would also like to voice my support for increasing funding by $254 million to restore cuts in the Summer Jobs program. In late March I met with 20 members of the Boston Mayor's Youth Council, who raised money to travel to Washington. We met right outside this chamber on the Senate steps. The 20 young people that I met with spoke extremely eloquently and passionately about their experiences in summer jobs programs, and they asked me to speak on their behalf in Washington in support of the Summer Jobs program.

Well, Mr. President, I intend to speak on their behalf. Approximately 85% of youths in the summer jobs program last year were between the ages of 14–17. Teens in that age group typically do not find private-sector work. But these young people were afforded the opportunity to learn job skills and responsibility. We have all heard teachers lament that students often greet lessons with cries of ''When are we ever going to have to use this again?'' Summer jobs make education relevant to teenagers, helping to reduce drop-out rates and fostering an interest in higher education.

The Workforce Investment Act consolidates the Summer Jobs program and year-round jobs program into a comprehensive system of services for at-risk, low-income youth. But under the bill before us, 13,000 teens will be eliminated from this program. The Kennedy amendment would add back $254 million, allowing us the opportunity to provide summer jobs to 152,400 low-income students, 85% of whom would not otherwise be able to find summer employment.

In March I received a letter signed by 22 mayors in the State of Massachusetts, urging me to fight for Summer Jobs program funding. In this letter, the mayors write ''The state has benefitted because with the young people working, negative behaviors that often result from idleness are prevented.'' Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the record following my statement. I know these programs are important and are working. And I know they should receive greater funding.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I don't want to end today without pointing out the importance of this amendment to our national trade policy. I believe very strongly in free trade. I know that the Trade and Development Act that we passed earlier this year and granting PNTR to China—if we ever get the chance to debate it in the Senate—will grow Massachusetts's economy and produce long-term benefits for workers in Massachusetts and across the country. But the budget put forth by the Republicans takes no responsibility for protecting those who are most at risk for being left behind. This amendment does claim that responsibility. As we continue with our push to open new markets, we have got to ensure those who lack the skills, the income or the education to get quality jobs can have an opportunity to succeed in the new economy. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

EXHIBIT I

MASSACHUSETTS MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION,
Boston, MA, March 22, 2000.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
Russell Senate office Building,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN F. KERRY,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS KENNEDY AND KERRY: We are writing to urge you to advocate for summer jobs funding in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill currently before Congress.

As you are aware, the Workforce Development Act (WIA), which was signed into law in August 1998, will become effectively July 1st, 2000. While we certainly support the WIA goal of offering more comprehensive services for youth on a year-round basis, we are concerned that the additional requirements of WIA and the lack of an increase in funding for year-round youth programs will result in the Commonwealth's inability to provide the number of jobs that we need to serve our youth population this summer. Estimates project that we may have to turn over half of the eligible youth away this summer barring an increase in summer jobs funding.

The summer jobs program in Massachusetts has been phenomenally successful, both for our young people and the state as a whole. The young people gain work experience (many for the first time), earn a paycheck (which many contribute to household expenses), and have the chance to gain academic skills (as summer is often a time when young people slide backwards academically). The state has benefited because with the young people working, negative behaviors that often result from idleness are prevented.

This year we face a double threat, as Governor Cellucci has chosen not to fund the state summer jobs program in his budget. We are working with the Legislature and others to restore this funding to the state budget. We will certainly have a major problem if we lose funding from both the federal and state programs.

At its winter meeting in January, the U.S. Conference of Mayors passed a resolution to support: (1) an emergency appropriation to address the shortfall of funds needed to serve youth this summer; and (2) increased funding in the FY2001 budget to meet the projected doubling of program costs resulting from the new requirements of the Workforce Investment Act. A copy of the resolution is enclosed.

Please keep us updated on the efforts to include funding for summer jobs in the emergency appropriation and increased funding in the FY 2001 budget. Thank you for your continued support and assistance on this high priority issue.

Sincerely,

Thomas Menino Mayor, Boston; Daniel Kelly Mayor, Gardner; Mary Whitney Mayor, Fitchburg; Michael Tautznik Mayor, Easthampton; Robert Dever Mayor, Woburn; William Scanlon Mayor, Beverly; Mary Clare Higgins Mayor, Northampton; Lisa Mead Mayor, Newburyport; John Yunits Mayor, Brockton; Thomas Ambrosino Mayor, Revere; Ted Strojny Mayor, Taunton; David Madden Mayor, Weymouth; Edward Lambert, Jr. Mayor, Fall River; Gerald Doyle Mayor, Pittsfield; Patrick Guerriero Mayor, Melrose; Peter Torigian, Mayor, Peabody; James Rurak, Mayor, Haverhill; John Barrett III Mayor, North Adams; Richard A. Cohen Mayor, Agawam; David Ragucci Mayor, Everett; Frederick Kalisz, Jr. Mayor, New Bedford; James A. Sheets Mayor, Quincy.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly about the amendment my good friend from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, has offered to the Labor/HHS appropriations bill to restore critical funding to skills training programs at the Department of Labor.

Mr. President, I appreciate the work that Senators SPECTER and HARKIN have put into this bill. Finding the appropriate balance in this bill is particularly difficult. And, while I am disappointed with the funding levels for

many of the programs at the Department of Labor, I do understand that Senator SPECTER and Senator HARKIN care deeply about the programs affected by this amendment.

There are several components of the amendment offered by Senator KENNEDY but I would like to take a minute to discuss one in particular that is of critical importance to my state of New Mexico.

Mr. President, the amendment calls for an additional $181 million for dislocated worker assistance This additional funding would meet the President's request for fiscal year 2001.

When Congress passed the Workforce Investment Act a couple years ago, an important component was the funding stream for dislocated workers. While much of the Nation has prospered over the past eight years, many in my home state have not. I have seen plant closing from Roswell and Carlsbad in the east, to Las Cruces in the south, Albuquerque in the north and Cobre in the west. Thousands of high paying jobs have been lost, and especially hard hit has been the extractive industries. I don't need to tell my colleagues how devastating a plant closing can be on a community and families.

The Workforce Investment Act authorizes grants to States and local areas to provide core, intensive training and supportive services to laid off workers with the aim being to help them return to work as quickly as possible at wages as close as possible to those received prior to the layoff. These funds are critically important as the nature of our economy has changed over the last decade from an industrial base economy to a technologically based one. Workers who are laid off today, particularly those who have been with the same company for a number of years, are often unprepared to reenter the work place or for the new economy they face. Training and retraining is critical to develop the skills they need to quickly find a decent paying job and get back on their feet.

Under President Clinton, dislocated worker funding has tripled from $517 million in Program Year 1993 to $1.589 billion in Program Year 2000. Yet despite these increases, the need for these services has unfortunately kept pace with, and in some cases exceeded, the availability of funds. The President's budget for year 2001 continues the commitment to dislocated worker programs by providing adequate funding levels that will give dislocated workers the tools to compete in the new economy. This is the second installment of a five-year Universal Reemployment Initiative. Under the Universal Reemployment Initiative, dislocated worker funding was to be increased each year to ensure that by 2004 every dislocated worker would receive training and reemployment services if they want and need it, every unemployment insurance claimant who loses their job through no fault of their own would get the reemployment services they want and need, and every American would have access to One-Stop Career Centers.

However, and unfortunately in my opinion, unless the level of funding in the Senate's Labor/HHS bill is not increased, this will be the first year since 1994 that there will be no increase in these funds, and our commitment to universal reemployment will be in serious jeopardy. Specifically, this bill cuts over $181 million from the President's request which will mean the Department of Labor will be able to serve 100,825 fewer recipients. While the bulk of this cut would fall on State/local formula funding, it is important to note that 20 percent of the cut—over $36 million, would be in the Secretary's reserve funds, reducing her capacity to make National Emergency Grants to respond to disasters and large scale layoffs.

Mr. President, as my colleagues know, New Mexico has been through a couple rough months. These funds for dislocated workers are extremely important and I urge my colleagues to support the Kennedy amendment to bring the level of funding for this, and many other important programs, up to the level of the President's request.

Finally, Mr. President, I would also encourage my colleagues to support this amendment because of the increased funding levels for Youth Opportunity Grants, the Summer Jobs Program, and for Job Corps, among others. These programs, and the funding levels contained in this amendment are likewise critical to meeting the needs of young people in my state.

Again, Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will support this amendment and commend my friend, Senator KENNEDY, for his leadership on issues that are so important to families and working men and women throughout this country.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Senator KENNEDY's skills training amendment. This amendment contains important measures to provide individuals with the necessary skills to succeed in the workforce. The amendment addresses the need to provide employment skills training to noncustodial parents, particularly fathers. The ''Fathers Work, Families Win'' initiative begins to address a very troubling epidemic, fatherlessness.

The number of children living in households without fathers has tripled over the last forty years, from just over five million in 1960 to more than 17 million today. Although the work of single mothers is truly heroic, father absence has caused unnecessary burdens on women and has forced millions of children to overcome difficult social hurdles. For example, children that live absent their biological fathers are five times more likely to live in poverty. They are more likely to bring weapons and drugs into the classroom, to commit a crime, to drop out of school, to be abused, to commit suicide, to abuse alcohol or drugs, and to become pregnant as teenagers. The $255 million requested for this initiative is dwarfed in comparison by the amount of money the Federal Government spends on dealing with the consequences of fatherlessness.

There are several pieces to this puzzle, one of which is employment services. Too many fathers are unable to provide financial support for their children. Although many of these fathers have the desire to take responsibility for their children, they do not have the means. In short, these fathers are not dead-beat, they are dead-broke. The ''Fathers Work, Families Win'' initiative gives us a way to work through the current infrastructure to deliver employment services to fathers and noncustodial parents. Skill-building and employment services will help to increase the employment rate among noncustodial fathers and therefore, increase child support payments.

Our challenge is to give fathers the tools necessary to be successful parents. While employment services for noncustodial parents is an essential component to making fathers responsible, it is not the only service that is needed to ensure these fathers become good parents. Senator DOMENICI and I have introduced a comprehensive package designed to address the fatherlessness epidemic. S. 1364, the Responsible Fatherhood Act of 1999 would provide states with funds to promote the maintenance of married, two-parent families, strengthen fragile families, and promote responsible fatherhood. In addition to the program grants available to states, states would receive funds for a media campaign. A media campaign would be an effective way to communicate the message of father responsibility across ethnic, racial, and income barriers. The bill also recognizes the need to remove federal disincentives to pay child support.

We face a great challenge, but we must not let it overwhelm us. We must instead begin to put the pieces of the puzzle together. I commend Senator KENNEDY for including the ''Fathers Work, Families Win'' initiative in his amendment. It is my hope that the Senate will enact this legislation and continue to pursue other solutions to the epidemic of fatherlessness.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I'm here to speak about the Kennedy Workforce Investment amendment restoring cuts to the Department of Labor's training funds.

This amendment is just plain common sense. The single best thing we can do for our society, and for every working family, is to make sure that every American who wants a decent paying job has the skills necessary to obtain a decent paying job. By helping youths and adults get the job training they need, we help turn them into taxpaying citizens who can purchase goods and services, buy homes and afford health care, and contribute to our growing economy.

This amendment, in a multitude of ways, tries to address the most basic challenge facing our country: How do we help American workers develop the skills they need to excel in an increasingly complex and constantly evolving economy?

First, our amendment helps by fully funding the Dislocated Worker Assistance Program. It restores $181 million in funding to a program that has made a substantial difference in the lives of Rhode Island workers. We, like many formerly industrial states, have suffered great worker dislocation as industries have left, often to go somewhere overseas where labor was cheaper. Restoring this funding to the President's request would allow 100,000 more workers, dislocated through no fault of their own, access to training, job search and re-employment services.

Our amendment also grants the Administration's request for $44 million to improve access to One-Stop services for million of Americans and make the job search process less overwhelming and more efficient. The Director of the Rhode Island Department of Labor and Training informed me that the current cuts to this program will ''seriously impact'' the ability of our state to provide the services and information now required by the Workforce Investment Act for use by job seekers and employers.

In addition to fully funding adult worker skills programs, our amendment would add $254 million to restore cuts in the Summer Jobs Program resulting from implementation of the Workforce Investment Act. Many states, like my own, were unprepared for this dramatic change in the federal funding stream. Thousands of kids in Rhode Island, especially 14- and 15-year-olds, are now going without summer jobs. Many of these kids are from small towns, others are from inner city Providence—both are limited by their age and the lack of job opportunities in their respective communities.

Giving young people job experience benefits the entire country. The development of good work habits and a respect for the virtues of labor alone are strong payoffs. Everyone in this Congress should be supporting a restoration of these cuts.

Finally, our amendment would restore $29 million to the Job Corps program, one of the most effective programs in the country for kids between the ages of 16 and 24. A recent Mathematica Policy Research Inc. study shows that 16- to 17-year-old youths who go through the Job Corps program are 80 percent more likely to earn a high school diploma or GED than a control group excluded from the program. This group also earned salaries that were 20 percent higher and had arrest rates that were 14 percent lower. This program works, and we should be fully funding it.

Strengthening our workforce strengthens our families, and ultimately makes our entire country stronger. Adopting this skills training amendment is good for both American business and American workers, and every member of this Chamber should be in support of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). Who yields time?

The Senator from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining. The Senator from Washington has 26 minutes remaining.

The Senator from Washington.

The Chair notes there is time still pending on the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GORTON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

I raise a point of order under section 302(f) of the Budget Act, as amended, that the effect of adopting the amendment provides budget authority in excess of the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation under the fiscal year 2001 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget and, therefore, is not in order.

Mr. KENNEDY. Pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive the applicable sections of the Budget Act for consideration of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the time being we lay aside the current amendment.

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

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the conclusion of the debate on the Wellstone amendment on the subject of suicide, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the previously debated amendments, with 2 minutes prior to each vote for explanation. Those votes are as follows:

Dodd amendment No. 3672 on community learning centers;

Kerry of Massachusetts amendment No. 3659 on technology literacy;

Reed of Rhode Island amendment No. 3638 on the GEAR UP program; and Kennedy amendment No. 3678 on workforce investment.

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

Mr. GORTON. Those votes, Mr. President, will start at about 3:30 p.m., for the information of my colleagues.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

AMENDMENT NO. 3680

(Purpose: To provide for a certification program to improve the effectiveness and responsiveness of suicide hotlines and crisis centers)

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for himself and Mr. WELLSTONE, proposes an amendment numbered 3680.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 34, line 17, insert before the period the following: ''*: Provided further,* That within the amounts provided herein, $3,000,000 shall be available for the Center for Mental Health Services to support through grants a certification program to improve and evaluate the effectiveness and responsiveness of suicide hotlines and crisis centers in the United States and to help support and evaluate a national hotline and crisis center network''.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding there are 30 minutes that have been designated for the amendment being offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No formal time agreement has been entered regarding this amendment.

Mr. REID. If the Chair would be kind enough to advise me when I have used 15 minutes, I won't ask for a unanimous consent agreement, but there was an agreement that there would be approximately a half hour on this.

This amendment would provide $3 million to certified crisis centers. This deals with the plague of suicide that is sweeping this country. Every year in America, 31,000 people kill themselves. This is probably far fewer than the actual number. It is something that is very devastating to those who are survivors. But there is also a situation in this country that creates a tremendous loss of economic benefits for everyone concerned.

I offered this amendment on behalf of Senator WELLSTONE because I was asked to by his staff. Since Senator WELLSTONE is the prime sponsor of this amendment and is now on the floor, I would like for him to proceed. I will be happy to proceed when the Senator has completed his remarks. The amendment has been offered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: Is there any pending business at the moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business before the Senate is amendment No. 3680.

Mr. SPECTER. Is that the amendment by the Senator from Minnesota?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I believe we were scheduled to vote at 3:30 on four amendments. So I inquire of my colleague from Minnesota how long he will be on this matter.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will be quite brief. I apologize. I didn't realize the amendment was coming up now. Senator REID and I were doing this together. Probably 10 minutes is what I will need. My understanding is that the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has been focused on suicide prevention and trying to do better with mental health treatment, would accept

the amendment. I think I can do this in 10 minutes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I was going to take 15 minutes, but 10 minutes would be fine.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to the Wellstone amendment on a 10-minute time agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises Senators that there is no time agreement, unless we get this unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time on the Wellstone amendment be divided with 7 minutes for Senator WELLSTONE and 3 minutes for this Senator.

Mr. REID. I haven't spoken yet. I have only spoken for 1 minute.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I object. I say to my colleague from Pennsylvania, I haven't been out here on the amendment. He knows that, and I don't want the Senator from Nevada to only have a few moments. It is an important issue. I don't think we can do it in that time.

Mr. SPECTER. I withdraw my request and suggest that we proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, we will move forward and not go through any unnecessary delay. This amendment would support a certification program to improve and evaluate the effectiveness and responsiveness of suicide hotlines and crisis centers in the U.S. and to help support and evaluate a national hotline and crisis center network.

Let me go through these figures here on the chart.

Suicide facts for our country:

Every 42 seconds someone attempts suicide.

Each 16.9 minutes someone completes suicide.

Suicide is the eighth leading cause of all deaths.

Death rates from suicide are highest for those over age 75.

The incidence of suicide among 15- to 24-year-olds has tripled over the past 40 years, making it the third leading killer in that age group of 15- to 24-year-olds.

In the State of Minnesota, it is the second leading killer of young people from age 15 to 24. These statistics that deal with mental illness and suicides are disturbing. I point out to my colleagues that one of the factors that makes it so disturbing is that so much of suicide is connected to mental illness, especially depression or substance abuse, and so much of it is diagnosable. Frankly, it is treatable.

Really, there should be a hue and cry in the country for corrective action. I do a lot of work with Senator DOMENICI, and I get to do this work with Senator REID and Senator KENNEDY as well. There are a whole host of issues that deal with our failure to provide decent mental health coverage for people.

I thank Surgeon General David Satcher for doing marvelous work. The Surgeon General's report, which came out recently, talks about 500,000 people every year in our country requiring emergency room treatment as a result of attempted suicide. In 1996, nearly 31,000 Americans took their own lives.

I think of Al and Mary Kluesner in the State of Minnesota who started this organization called SAVE. They themselves have lost two children to suicide. Several of their other children have been unbelievably successful in their lives. There has been, up until fairly recently, this shame and people feeling as if it is their own moral failure. But it has so little to do with that.

I met a couple weeks ago with Dr. David Shaffer from Columbia University and Kay Jamison from Johns Hopkins University. She has done some of the most powerful writing. It was Dr. Jamison who said before Senator SPECTER's committee, ''The gap between what we know and what we do is lethal.''

We know so much about the ways in which we can treat this illness and we can prevent people from taking their lives, but we have not done nearly as much. We have many different organizations that support this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that this list be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING THE WELLSTONE-REID-KENNEDY SUICIDE PREVENTION AMENDMENT TO THE LHHS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, JUNE 28, 2000

38 ORGANIZATIONS

American Association of Suicidology (AAS).
American Foundation for Suicide Prevention (AFSP).
Suicide Prevention and Advocacy Network (SPAN).
Suicide Awareness/Voices of Education (SA/VE).
National Mental Health Association (NMHA).
National Alliance for the Mentally Ill (NAMI).
Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law.
American Psychiatric Association.
American Psychological Association.
National Mental Health Awareness Campaign.
Light for Life Foundation (Yellow Ribbon Campaign).
QPR Institute (Question/Persuade/Refer).
National Organization of People of Color Against Suicide (NOPCAS).
National Institute for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender (NIGLBT).
With One Voice.
Contact USA.
Crisis Support Services of Alameda County.
Contra Costa Crisis Center.
Didi Hirsch Community Mental Health Center.
San Mateo Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention Center.
Pueblo Suicide Prevention Center.
Alachua County Crisis Center.
CrisisLine of Lantana.
Switchboard of Miami.
Cedar Rapids Foundation 2.
Prince George's County Hotline and Suicide Prevention Center.
St. Louis Life Crisis Services.
Crisis Call Center, Reno, Nevada.
Covenant House.
Fargo HotLine.
HelpLine of Delaware County.
HelpLine of Morrow County.
CONTACT of Pittsburgh.
Sioux Falls, Volunteer Information Center HelpLine.
Nashville Crisis Intervention Center.
Houston Crisis Center.
Crisis Link of Northern Virginia.
Friends of Mental Health of Loudon County.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, what this amendment does is add $3 million to SAMHSA to support, through grants, a certification program that would evaluate the effectiveness and responsiveness of crisis centers and suicide hotlines across the United States.

It also helps to support a national hot line and crisis center network. There are 750 such crisis services in place across the country today. These centers are documented in the directory kept by the American Association of Suicidology.

To date, there has been little or no funding to help support the training and to improve the quality of guidance through these hot line and crisis services. This amendment does exactly that. These funds will be used to improve the training and the skills of the staff at the crisis hot lines for suicides. There will be a variety of ways in which we can get the money to people so this work can be done.

In awarding these grants, I encourage the Secretary of Health and Human Services to collect an experienced nonprofit organization with significant expertise to administer this program.

According to U.S. Surgeon General David Satcher, approximately 500,000 people each year require emergency room treatment as a result of attempted suicide. In 1996 alone, nearly 31,000 Americans took their own lives. In the U.S., suicide is the third leading cause of death of people age 15–34. A suicide takes place in our country every 17 minutes.

In some parts of our country, including my own state of Minnesota, suicide is the second leading cause of death for these young people. Three times the number of Minnesotans die from suicide than from homicide.

We know, without a doubt, that 90 percent of all completed suicides are linked to untreated or inadequately treated mental illness or addiction. To prevent suicide requires an all-out public health effort that will recognize this problem, and will educate our country that we can no longer afford to turn our eyes away from the unthinkable reality that our citizens, even our children, may want to die.

Dr. Satcher and other national mental health experts, such as Dr. Steve Hyman, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, have helped bring this issue forward, and to help us understand that, with proper treatment, this is one of the most preventable tragedies that we face as a country.

In 1996, the World Health Organization also issued a report urging members worldwide to address the problem of suicide, and one result was the creation of a public/private partnership to seek a national strategy for the U.S., involving many government agencies and advocacy groups. This is clearly a serious problem throughout the world.

For too long, mental illness has been stigmatized, or viewed as a character flaw, rather than as the serious disease that it is. A cloak of secrecy has surrounded this disease, and people with mental illness are often ashamed and afraid to seek treatment, for fear that they will be seen as admitting a weakness in character. For this reason, they may delay treatment until their situation becomes so severe that they may feel incapable of reaching out.

Although mental health research has well-established the biological, genetic, and behavioral components of many of the forms of serious mental illness, the illness is still stigmatized as somehow less important or serious other than illnesses. Too often, we try to push the problem away, deny coverage, or blame those with the illness for having the illness. We forget that someone with mental illness can look just like the person we see in the mirror, or the person who is sitting next to us on a plane. It can be our mother, our brother, our son, or daughter. It can be one of us. We have all known someone with a serious mental illness, within our families or our circle of friends, or in public life. Many people have courageously come forward to speak about their personal experiences with their illness, to help us all understand better the effects of this illness on a person's life, and I commend them for their courage.

The statistics concerning mental illness, and the state of health care coverage for adults and children with this disease are startling, and disturbing.

One severe mental illness affecting millions of Americans is major depression. The National Institute of Mental Health, an NIH research institute, within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, describes serious depression as a critical public health problem. More than 18 million people in the United States will suffer from a depressive illness this year, and many will be unnecessarily incapacitated for weeks or months, because their illness goes untreated. Many will die.

I recently had the good fortune to meet with a group of some of the foremost experts on suicide prevention, including Dr. David Shaffer, from Columbia University, and Dr. Kay Jamison, from John Hopkins University. They gave me an extraordinary overview of the many critical points of intervention where suicide may be prevented, and it is my intention to develop a larger bill, in collaboration with Senator HARRY REID, and hopefully many of my colleagues, that will address many of these issues.

But this amendment will meet an important need right now, one that is timely, and even with its modest funding can help save many lives. This amendment has the support of Senators REID and KENNEDY, as well as the support of the national groups:

American Association of Suicidology,

American Foundation for Suicide Prevention,

SPAN (Suicide Prevention and Advocacy Network),

National Mental Health Association,

National Alliance for the Mentally Ill,

American Psychiatric Association,

American Psychological Association,

Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, and SA/VE, a group based in Minnesota (Suicide Awareness/Voices of Education), headed by Al and Mary Kluesner.

My amendment will add $3 million to SAMHSA to support through grants a certification program to improve and evaluate the effectiveness and responsiveness of crisis centers and suicide hotlines across the United States, and to help support a national hotline and crisis center network. Although there are 750 such crisis services in place across our country—these centers are documented in the directory kept by the American Association of Suicidology—to date there has been little or no funding to help support the training and improve the quality of the guidance that is provided through these hotline and crisis services.

This amendment will do exactly that. These funds will be used to help improve the training and skills of the staff at crisis hotline suicides, through guidance provided by the American Society of Suicidology, the Center for Mental Health Services, the National Institute Mental Health, and other mental health professionals. It will also help support the development of a national hotline and network of certified crisis centers.

In the awarding of grants, I would encourage the Secretary of HHS to select an experienced non-profit organization with significant expertise in this area to administer the certification process, so that this process of training can begin as quickly as possible.

Telephone hotlines are only one of the points of intervention, and are not and cannot be the only solution to those who suffer from severe mental illness and the extraordinary despair that leads to suicide. Our country also needs to ensure that Americans have fair access to medical care, that the stigma associated with mental illness is reduced, and more education and training for health care providers is made available. But the hotline does provide a lifeline for those who need to reach out for help and have nowhere else to turn too when they reach the point of despair.

The crisis centers that run suicide hotlines are often patched together through a variety of funding sources, and struggle to keep their staff trained and their services of the highest quality. Although some centers are certified by the American Association of Suicidology, and some are connected through the Hope Line Network that is working to establish a national network, this process has only just begun. These centers perform a critically important service and would benefit enormously from a national certification process and regular staff training. The time is right to fund such a process.

Staff at crisis centers need to be trained to conduct a suicide risk assessment to determine the seriousness and urgency of someone who may be contemplating suicide. They also need to know when to refer the individual to a local community mental health provider if the person is not in crisis. But most importantly, they need to know when to send the police to the person's home or workplace if the staff person is convinced that a suicide is about to take place.

Most people think that there is a national suicide hotline already in place that links people throughout the country. But until recently, this was not so. Crisis centers operated on their own, with volunteer help, and few resources. Recently, a national hotline number (1–800–SUICIDE) was established through the Hope Line Network, through the National Mental Health Awareness Campaign. As an example of the incredible need for such a number, the national hotline found itself flooded with calls after recently advertising on MTV and Fox Family Channel. Additionally, 1.5 million Americans logged onto their website during the 2 weeks after this advertising began. There are obviously many people who are in need of this service. And it needs to be the best possible service, and linked as best it can be to local help.

By improving the training and skills of crisis hotline operators, such contact can be of the highest quality. Certification would require rigorous on site training and visits, evaluation of operations, records reviews, verification of staff training and skills, and the like.

The Surgeon General is to be commended for bringing this issue of suicide forward as a major public health crisis in his 1999 report, Call to Action to Prevent Suicide. In his report, he specifically cited the need for instituting training programs concerning suicide risk assessment and recognition, treatment, management, and aftercare intervention. He also asked that community care resources be enhanced as referral points for mental health services. This amendment helps to support both of these requests.

I must emphasize that suicide is often linked to severe depression and other forms of mental illness. These illnesses are not the normal ups and downs everyone experiences. They are illnesses that affect mood, body, behavior, and mind. Depressive disorders interfere with individual and family functioning. Without treatment, the person with a depressive disorder is

often unable to fulfill the responsibilities of spouse or parent, worker or employer, friend or neighbor. And far too often, without treatment, a person can reach such a level of despair that they will take their own life. This amendment will fund programs to help people get the treatment they need before it is too late. As Dr. Kay Redfield Jamison stated in a recent Senate hearing on suicide, when it comes to treatment for mental illness, ''the gap between what we know and what we do is lethal.''

The issue of suicide prevention is one that we have discussed before, at a hearing held by Senator SPECTER, and during other discussions about mental health research and treatment. I am proud of my colleagues who have supported these efforts, including the cosponsors of this amendment, Senator REID and Senator KENNEDY. I am proud to join them in bringing this amendment forward, and I ask you for your support.

There is a piece of legislation I have with Senator DOMENICI called the Mental Health Equitable Treatment Act. We believe, especially when it comes to physician visits and days in hospitals, that people with a mental illness should be treated the same way as people with a physical illness. We think it is time to end this discrimination.

I have two other amendments that are included in other legislation which deal with the problem of suicide and mental health—especially with young people—and ways of getting money to communities that can then put the money to use, whether it be substance abuse treatment programs, whether it be family counseling, or whether it be pharmacological treatment, or you name it.

The amendment I introduced with Senator REID is very basic. It is very straightforward.

It basically provides the grants through a certification program to improve the effectiveness of these suicide hot lines and crisis centers in the United States. It will help them support and evaluate a national hot line and crisis center network.

I say to my colleague from Nevada that this is really incremental. It is not the be all or the end all. But the additional resources will really help SAMHSA. It will help us make sure these crisis hot lines are put to the very best use; that the people who are working there have the best training; that people who will be working these lines will do their very best in taking calls and know how to help people.

This is important. It is a network of support for people. It is one step and only one step.

But I will finish my remarks and then hear from my colleague from Nevada who really is taking the lead on this amendment.

Again, every 42 seconds someone in our country attempts suicide. Every 16.9 minutes someone completes suicide. Suicide is the eighth leading cause of all deaths.

This one really gets to me. I admit that until I saw this—I believe I do a lot of work in the mental health area—I didn't realize the suicide rates are highest for those over age 75. I didn't realize that. My focus has really been on young people because in my State of Minnesota, for the age of 15 to 24, suicide is the second leading cause of death.

We need to do better. In this piece of legislation, we take this funding from administrative services and put it into this program. I think it will make a very positive difference.

I am delighted that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to support this amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I strongly support this amendment, which is a long overdue attempt to deal more effectively with suicide, a serious public health threat in the United States.

In 1998, suicide was the cause of more than 29,000 deaths —nearly 60 percent higher than the number of homicides in that year. The nation's Surgeon General, Dr. David Satcher, issued a Call to Action to Prevent Suicide in 1999, in which he recommended a national strategy to reduce the high toll that suicide takes. Our amendment will provide grants through the Center for Mental Health Services to help support a national network of suicide hotlines and crisis centers, and to provide a certification program for the staff members of the network. This program will ensure that people who seek help during a crisis will receive an effective response from appropriately trained and certified personnel.

In Massachusetts, the state's 1999 Youth Risk Behavior Survey found that one of every five adolescents had seriously considered suicide in the previous year, and one in twelve—more than 20,000 teenagers—made an actual attempt. But this serious problem is not limited to young Americans. It affects all age groups. In fact, suicide rates increase with age, and are highest among men aged 75 years and older.

Suicide also affects all racial and ethnic groups. Between 1980 and 1996, the rate of suicide among African-American male teenagers more than doubled. Native American communities have long experienced high suicide rates.

Suicide and suicide attempts affect both genders. Although males are four times more likely to die of suicide, females are more likely to attempt suicide. Each year in the United States, half a million people require emergency room treatment for a suicide attempt.

But suicide and suicide attempts can be prevented. Ninety percent of people who complete suicide have depression or another mental or substance abuse disorder. These disorders respond to effective treatment.

The amendment we offer today will ensure that when a person is in crisis anywhere in our nation, there is a network of hotlines and crisis centers to call for help, and that a trained and certified staff member will be available to intervene effectively. Every 17 minutes another American completes suicide. We can do much more to prevent this national tragedy. Our proposal is a small, but significant, step toward preventing the unnecessary loss of American lives, and I urge the Senate to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend from Minnesota has been a great partner on this issue. He has been very understanding. He is a very caring person, as indicated by the work he has done. He has outlined very generally and in many cases specifically the problems we have in America today relating to suicide.

There is no question about it. Suicides occur more often in this country than can be calculated. As I have indicated, the statistics that the Senator from Minnesota gave us are reported suicides. There are many deaths that appear to be accidents that are suicides, and they cannot be calculated.

The State of Nevada leads the Nation in suicide. It doesn't matter what age group it is. It doesn't matter whether they are teenagers or senior citizens. The State of Nevada has the dubious distinction of leading the Nation in suicide. That is too bad.

This amendment is a step in the direction of helping people not only in Nevada but all over the country. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Nevada will set up a number of crisis centers. Today, we have about 78 crisis centers that are certified. This would allow hundreds more to be certified.

What does this mean? It means that when you call 1–800–SUICIDE, which was activated a little more than a year ago —people who are depressed or suicidal or those concerned about someone else who is depressed or suicidal—you are automatically connected to someone who is at one of these centers and who is trained. These calls are routed to the crisis center nearest to the person where the call is placed.

The crisis center calls are answered by certified counselors 24 hours a day, 7 days a week—on Thanksgiving and on Christmas; it is sad to say but Christmas is one of the biggest suicide days in this country.

In the event the nearest crisis center is at a maximum volume, the call is routed to the next nearest center. There is never a busy signal, or a voice mail. People in crisis usually reach a trained counselor within two or three rings, or about 20 to 30 seconds from the moment they dial 1–800–SUICIDE.

What does this suicide crisis line mean?

Let me read excerpts from a few letters.

This one is written to the Northern Virginia hot line. It says, among other things:

I would like to name NVHL (Northern Virginia Hotline) as one of my beneficiaries on my life insurance policy . . .

The reason for this act of kindness is to give back to your organization what your organization has given to me. You see, over the past twenty years I have used your listeners during moments of crises in my life. When I had no one to turn to, I could turn to your listeners for insight and support . . .

I want to give back to the organization that has been responsible for helping me through many tough late nights over the past twenty years.

We have a letter from the Catholic Newman Association in Houston, TX. It is a three-paragraph letter. I will read only one paragraph.

I simply want to say that because of you, Karen, a girl named _____ is alive today and has, for perhaps the first time in her life, a real hope and desire to live. She called you a few weeks ago, with a razor blade in her hand, and she had already begun to cut her wrist. You talked to her for almost an hour, though she tried to hang up a number of times. You were able to get information about the fact that she had recently talked to me, as well as where she lived. You were able to keep her on the line while you had someone contact me and I got to her apartment in time to keep her from completing the suicide attempt. She has been hospitalized and has undergone intensive therapy and is soon to be released, with real hope that there are good reasons to stay alive. You must have been very skillful, Karen because she is a very sharp girl and it was a true suicide attempt prevented only by the fact that she wanted to talk to one human being—you—before killing herself. Because you took her seriously, because you cared, because you knew what to say and do, she is alive today and wants to continue to live.

We also have a letter addressed to Arlene, someone who works at one of these hot line centers.

Among other things, this woman says:

A member of my staff had come to me with some family problems, both financial and emotional, which were causing that person to be very despondent . . .

Fortunately, I was able to refer my employee to the Hotline. I don't know the details of the conversations but I can see the results. Having someone available to talk to, combined with the follow-up counseling, has helped this person to find a solution to problems which had seemed overwhelming. I now have a valuable, productive employee and the individual now feels in control of life and circumstances.

Finally, I have a letter from the Fairfax County Police Department. This is from Capt. Art Rudat. He is a commander in the McLean substation. He is writing a letter to say having this hotline helps the police department, freeing them to do other things. He says:

Upon our arrival, we found the subject in his room and he was extremely upset and agitated. He was holding a 4″ knife to his jugular vein, threatening to kill himself. This threat was not taken lightly because he had already cut his left wrist and was bleeding. The atmosphere at the time was tense, not knowing if anything that the officers would say would further upset the subject. There was a moment, when the subject stood up screaming and pressing the knife into his throat almost cutting his jugular vein, that it was thought the incident would have a tragic ending. * * *

Even this was occurring, the subject was on the phone, still deep in conversation with Miss Dicke. He would go from being out of control to a very peaceful state. Slowly though, he became less upset and eventually sat down and began listening to Miss Dicke reason with him and win him over. Of course, the officers didn't know what Miss Dicke was saying, but it was enough for him to eventually give up his knife and go to the hospital with rescue to receive much needed assistance.

It is my understanding that of the nearly 18,000 calls that are received at the hotline center per year, approximately 600 are suicide calls and only 5 involve weapons. We at Fairfax County Police Department were quite fortunate to have had both Miss Dicke and Miss Ross working that night. Without their teamwork, tenaciousness and training, this incident could have had a tragic ending. * * *

Although hotlines do not historically receive the fanfare and headlines that other public service groups do, we at the Police Department realize what a tremendous resource you are to us and the outstanding service which you provide to the community.

I ask unanimous consent these letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVENUE RECOVERY CONSULTANTS, INC.,
Fairfax, VA, October 8, 1998.

MS. ARLENE KROHMAL,
Northern Virginia Hotline,
Arlington, VA.

DEAR ARLENE: I just wanted to take a moment to thank you and to compliment the Hotline for the assistance your staff provided to one of my employees recently.

A member of my staff had come to me with some family problems, both financial and emotional, which were causing that person to be very despondent. This attitude was affecting the individual's work and life. An appointment with a counselor had been set, but it was ten days away and it seemed as if help was needed immediately. This person told me that, if not for worry about two children, life wouldn't be worth living.

Fortunately, I was able to refer my employee to the Hotline. I don't know the details of the conversations but I can see the results. Having someone available to talk to, combined with the follow-up counseling, has helped this person to find a solution to problems which had seemed overwhelming. I now have a valuable, productive employee and the individual now feels in control of life and circumstances.

Thank you for providing a valuable service to the community.

Sincerely,

FRAN FISHER,
President.

CATHOLIC NEWMAN ASSOCIATION, RELIGION CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON,
Houston, TX.

PEACE!

I am writing this letter simply out of my own need to express gratitude, plus the fact that I am aware you likely don't get much positive feedback for what you are doing. It is addressed primarily to one of your people named ''Karen'' whom I have been unable to contact personally, but really to all of you because it could have been any one who happened to answer the phone that day.

I simply want to say that because of you, Karen, a girl named _____ is alive today and has, for perhaps the first time in her life, a real hope and desire to live. She called you a few weeks ago, with a razor blade in her hand, and she had already begun to cut her wrist. You talked to her for almost an hour, though she tried to hang up a number of times. You were able to get information about the fact that she had recently talked to me, as well as where she lived. You were able to keep her on the line while you had someone contact me and I got to her apartment in time to keep her from completing the suicide attempt. She has been hospitalized and has undergone intensive therapy and is soon to be released, with real hope that there are good reasons to stay alive. You must have been very skillful, Karen because she is a very sharp girl and it was a true suicide attempt prevented only by the fact that she wanted to talk to one human being—you—before killing herself. Because you took her seriously, because you cared, because you knew what to say and do, she is alive today and wants to continue to live.

I am writing this, as I say, simply because I want to let you know—and all of you who work at Crisis Hotline—that what you are doing is beautiful as beautiful as life compared to death, as beautiful as hope compared to depression, as beautiful as loved compared to apathy. I realize, because of my own life-work in this way that you often don't know the effects of your listening, your caring, your loving, that you very likely wonder sometimes if it's worth the time and effort. All I can say is: ''Hey, today I saw the sun shine in a girl's eyes!'' It's worth it!!!

Thank you, Karen, I love you,

REV. JIM BARNETT.

ASHBURN, VA, *June 14, 1999.*

ARLENE KROHMAL,
Director, Northern Virginia Hotline,
Arlington, VA.

DEAR ARLENE, I have a request. Please send to me information about your organization, for you see, I would like to name NVHL (Northern Virginia Hotline) as one of my beneficiaries on my life insurance policy. I need to know exactly how to word NVHL as a beneficiary so that there would be no loop holes for anyone to contest.

The reason for this act of kindness is to give back to your organization what your organization has given to me. You see, over the past twenty years I have used your listeners during moments of crises in my lie. When I had no one to turn to, I could turn to your listeners for insight and support.

I came to know about the benefit of your hotline due to meeting the original director Bobby Schazenbach and hearing her story why this wonderful and unique organization was set up. I have very fond memories of Bobby and everytime I call your hotline, I often think of her and wonder how she is doing. Her creation of this hotline has been a link to my survival for many years. I won't bother you with the details, but I want to give back to the organization that has been responsible for helping me through many tough late night over the past twenty years.

Please sent to me any information on your organization that might help facilitate in changing my beneficiary to your organization. I also want you to know that I will be naming the Loudoun Abused Women's Shelter as well.

Thank God for all of you and thank God for Bobby.

Fondly, and forever grateful, _____

FAIRFAX COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Fairfax, VA, March 31, 1998.

MS. ARLENE KROHMAL,
Northern Virginia Suicide Hotline,
Arlington, VA.

DEAR MS. KROHMAL: I would like to bring to your attention, the actions of two of your volunteers and the impact it had upon a family's future. On March 7, 1998, at approximately 5:59 pm, officers from the McLean

District Station responded to the Ritz Carlton, near Tysons Corner, for a subject threatening to commit suicide with a knife. The 911 call was made to the Fairfax County Police by Miss Katie Ross, of the Northern Virginia Suicide Hotline, who was assisting Miss Marilyn Dicke, also with the Suicide Hotline, The information received was that the subject had been involved in a continuing domestic dispute with his parents and was at the end of his rope.

From the beginning, the information given to us by Miss Ross was clear and concise and left little for us to wonder about. This is a key element in our response to a complaint and how the officers will handle the case from the onset. Upon our arrival, we found the subject in his room and he was extremely upset and agitated. He was holding a 4″ knife to his jugular vein, threatening to kill himself. This threat was not taken lightly because he had already cut his left wrist and was bleeding. The atmosphere at the time was tense, not knowing if anything that the officers would say would further upset the subject. There was a moment, when the subject stood up screaming and pressing the knife into his throat almost cutting his jugular vein, that it was thought the incident would have a tragic ending.

Even this was occurring, the subject was on the phone, still deep in conversation with Miss Dicke. He would go from being out of control to a very peaceful state. Slowly though, he became less upset and eventually sat down and began listening to Miss Dicke reason with him and win him over. Of course, the officers didn't know what Miss Dicke was saying, but it was enough for him to eventually give up his knife and go to the hospital with rescue to receive much needed assistance.

It is my understanding that of the nearly 18,000 calls that are received at the hotline center per year, approximately 600 are suicide calls and only 5 involve weapons. We at Fairfax County Police Department were quite fortunate to have had both Miss Dicke and Miss Ross working that night. Without their teamwork, tenaciousness and training, this incident could have had a tragic ending.

This exemplifies how the citizens of Fairfax County and the Police Department benefit from programs such as yours. Although hotlines do not historically receive the fanfare and headlines that other public service groups do, we at the Police Department realize what a tremendous resource you are to us and the outstanding service which you provide to the community. It is without any reservation that I commend Miss Dicke and Miss Ross for the outstanding job they did that evening. They should be very proud of themselves and the organization they are affiliated with.

Sincerely,

CAPTAIN ART RUDAT,
Commander, McLean District Station.

Mr. REID. I extend my appreciation to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REID. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I support the legislation dealing with the issue of suicide. It is very important.

Many, many years ago, early one morning I came to an office and found a coworker had taken his life. It was, of course, a morning I will remember the rest of my life, finding a coworker and a friend who had, over the nighttime hours, taken his life.

I suppose only those who have been acquainted with that circumstance can barely imagine the kind of horrors that persuade someone to take their own life. I think anything we can do as a country in public policy to reach out and say to those who are visited by those emotional difficulties, those pressures and internal problems that persuade them to consider taking their life, anything we can do to reach out to them to say, here is some help, we ought to be able to do that.

This amendment is very small. Incrementally, it will be helpful.

I appreciate the work of Senator WELLSTONE and Senator REID. I think someday—we may never know the name—adding these resources will help someone who is ravaged by these emotional difficulties and can be prevented from taking their own life, and we will be rewarded for having paid attention to this issue.

Mr. REID. The Senator from South Dakota knows I had the misfortune of my father committing suicide. As the Senator from North Dakota, I saw my father lying there after having shot himself. This is something that never leaves you.

People think suicide always happens to someone else, but it doesn't. I say to my friend from North Dakota, we could go around this room and we would be surprised; almost everyone in this Senate Chamber has had a relative, a neighbor, or a friend who committed suicide. It is remarkable and sad.

I appreciate the Senator from North Dakota sharing his story. The reason it is important he shares it is to recognize what a universal problem this is, at 31,000 people a year. We know, as I indicated a number of other times on this floor, many more people commit suicide.

I think the mere fact that we talk about it is going to help the problem. We now have this crisis hotline established. We also, of course, have support groups that we didn't have 15, 20 years ago. The problem is not getting easier, but it is getting better with people better understanding the issue.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, two things. First, I thank the Senator from Nevada for his comments. Second, I say to Senator SPECTER, I am sure he remembers when Kay Jamison testified before his committee, saying the gap between what we know and what we do is lethal. This is just a small step. I am hoping that the Senate—the sooner the better—will embrace this issue and put some resources back to communities that can put this money to work in terms of suicide prevention. Much of this is diagnosable and preventable.

We have some confusion. Before I agree, I say to Senator REID, I want to suggest the absence of a quorum. We have a disagreement about how we will deal with this amendment.

Mr. SPECTER. Let me make a short statement. We are anxious to move ahead with our votes scheduled at 3:30.

The amendment is acceptable. The subcommittee held a hearing on this matter in February and had extraordinarily heartrending testimony from families who had been touched directly by suicide. The hearing was held at the request of the Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID. It was quite compelling.

The subcommittee and the full committee allocated $662 million to the mental health services, an increase of $31 million over last year. A number of amendments have been offered seeking to reallocate the money in a variety of ways. I have responded that, unless they have offsets, we have made the allocations as best we can.

I think the fact we have such a large sum of money in mental health services on a relative basis, including a $31 million increase for this year, is a testament to the propriety or the value judgments which have gone into the structure of this bill. The $3 million for the hotline can be accommodated easily within the existing funds. We had already urged the mental health services to find ways through their research to prevent suicides—to find other means of communicating with people who were emotionally stressed coming to grips with the issue, and preventing suicides. The substantial allocation the Appropriations Committee has made is a testament to the value judgments and the priorities we have established.

I thank Senator REID for sharing his own experiences. It is a very telling matter. At his request, we had a very informative hearing in February, with quite a few people coming forward, including Danielle Steel, the noted authoress who talked about her own son's experience. It made quite an impact. I think it is true that while the C–SPAN 2 audience may not be enormous, people will hear what is being said and it can have a salutary effect.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPECTER. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. REID. It was very difficult for the Senator to work this hearing into the very busy schedule of this huge subcommittee. The Senator did that. I think it has done so much good across the country to have people such as Danielle Steel and Kay Jamison, who are experts, to come in and talk about their experiences. I am grateful to you for doing this, as I think anyone is who has had the misfortune of having had some connection with suicide. You are to be applauded for having done this with schedule that was really a burden to you.

We appreciate this very much.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for those kind remarks. Perhaps we could move ahead to acceptance of the amendment.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for his genuine concern, and the ways in which, as the chair of this committee, he has supported this initiative. He cares about it deeply. I thank

him. I am pleased he will accept the amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3680) was agreed to.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SPECTER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3672

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending motion to waive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes equally divided on the motion to waive the Budget Act with regard to the Dodd amendment.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: Which is the first amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Dodd amendment No. 3672 on community learning centers.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the point of order has been raised because, although the Dodd amendment for afterschool programs takes up a meritorious subject, we have already added approximately $150 million to that account, bringing it up to $600 million.

The program has been in effect for only a few years. We have provided for additional funding in many similarly related situations. We believe the priorities established were appropriate. Had there been a suggestion for an offset, had the Senator from Connecticut made a suggestion that this priority was more valuable than others, we would have been willing to consider it. But it simply breaks the allocations and therefore the point of order has been raised. We urge it be sustained and not waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in favor of the motion to waive the Budget Act?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business before the Senate is a motion, to the Senator's amendment, on the Budget Act.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as I understand it, I have 2 minutes to explain the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was reduced to 2 minutes equally divided. Those opposed to the motion have already spoken. The Senator has 1 minute to speak.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, to my colleagues, very briefly, this amendment is a carryforward to what has been offered by Senator KENNEDY, Senator BINGAMAN, Senator WELLSTONE, and Senator MURRAY, all trying to improve the quality of public education in the country. One of the key issues is afterschool programs.

We know from parents all across the country the most dangerous period for 5 million children unattended is between 3 and 6 in the afternoon. Good afterschool programs are meaningful. The country wants it. School boards have asked for it. But despite efforts, we have only funded 310 afterschool programs. Last year, there were 2,500, close to 3,000, applications for afterschool dollars. We could only meet the requests of 310 school districts.

It seems to me we must do something to improve the quality of education with good afterschool programs, when children are most at risk, most vulnerable, when they get involved with habits of smoking, and alcohol, of marijuana, when they are victimized. As we know by every police study, afterschool programs work.

I realize there are budgetary concerns, but we spend less than one-half of 1 percent of the entire Federal budget on the quality of public education in this country. That is a disgrace.

What we have offered in these series of amendments is to improve our Federal investment in education. This amendment is to improve the quality of afterschool programs for the 5 million children in America who need that assistance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive the Budget Act in relation to amendment No. 3672. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 51, as follows:

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 154 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Akaka	Edwards	Lieberman
Baucus	Feingold	Lincoln
Bayh	Feinstein	Mikulski
Biden	Graham	Moynihan
Bingaman	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Hollings	Reed
Breaux	Jeffords	Reid
Bryan	Johnson	Robb
Byrd	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Chafee, L.	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Cleland	Kerry	Schumer
Conrad	Kohl	Smith (OR)
Daschle	Landrieu	Snowe
Dodd	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dorgan	Leahy	Wellstone
Durbin	Levin	Wyden

NAYS—51

Abraham	Bunning	Craig
Allard	Burns	Crapo
Ashcroft	Campbell	DeWine
Bennett	Cochran	Domenici
Bond	Collins	Enzi
Brownback	Coverdell	Fitzgerald
Frist	Inhofe	Santorum
Gorton	Kyl	Sessions
Gramm	Lott	Shelby
Grams	Lugar	Smith (NH)
Grassley	Mack	Specter
Gregg	McCain	Stevens
Hagel	McConnell	Thomas
Hatch	Murkowski	Thompson
Helms	Nickles	Thurmond
Hutchinson	Roberts	Voinovich
Hutchison	Roth	Warner

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 48, the nays are 51. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The amendment would increase budget authority and outlays scored against the allocation of the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and that subcommittee has reached the limit of its allocations. Therefore, the point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SPECTER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next votes in the series be limited to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I think it is only fair to say to the Members that we are going to try to enforce the more limited time on these votes. I know we try to accommodate Senators on both sides when they get delayed because of elevators or the subway or whatever. But it is also unfair to the managers and people trying to do the bill, when we are all here, if we can't do the votes in the prescribed time. We will push for that.

Secondly, I commend the managers for trying to begin to make some progress. We have had a whole series of votes here in this grouping—four, I guess. But we still have an awful lot of pending amendments. I don't want to mention a number because it is too scary.

I can't complain about the Democratic side because there are almost as many amendments on the Republican side. When Members are asked to come and either work out their amendments or offer them, they are too busy to get it done. We need to get this Labor, HHS, and Education appropriations bill done tonight. In order to do that, it is going to take an awful lot of work. The managers, or the whips, HARRY REID and DON NICKLES, can't do it by themselves. Some are beginning to say how about Thursday night. When we get Labor-HHS appropriations done, we are going to the Interior appropriations bill, plus we have the military construction conference report with the emergency provisions, providing funds that we have been wanting to get completed for defense and for disasters and

for Colombia. We may not get that until late Thursday night, so that we can't vote on it until Friday. We will have other votes on Friday. So we have to complete this bill, the Interior appropriations bill, and the MILCON conference report.

I thank Senator DASCHLE for his work in that effort and for his support as we try to complete this work. I know it is a lot to do in 3 days, but I know we can do it if we really stick with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I join in the request made by the majority leader to try to cooperate in a way to allow us closure on this bill. He has proposed an aggressive agenda. At the very least, we have to finish this bill. As he said, there are scores of amendments that have to be addressed before we can complete our work. I want to finish this bill this week. I want to be as cooperative and as forceful with our colleagues on both sides of the aisle in accommodating that kind of schedule. We have been on this bill, and we have had a good debate with good amendments and a lot of votes. There will be more amendments and votes.

There comes a time when we have to try to bring this to a close. I want to do it as soon as we can and still accommodate Senators who have good amendments to offer. Please come to the floor and agree to time limits for each amendment. Work with us to see if we can't winnow down the list a little bit. We have had some cooperation, but it is going to take a lot more cooperation if we, indeed, are going to get the bill done on time.

I believe we are ready to vote, Mr. President.

AMENDMENT NO. 3659

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes equally divided on the motion to waive the Budget Act with regard to the Kerry amendment. Who yields time?

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the pending matter is the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts to waive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, my amendment seeks to address the digital divide that all of us are aware is significantly handicapping the capacity of a lot of Americans to participate in the new marketplace. The House of Representatives has recognized this problem to the tune of $517 million. In our budget, we are only at $425 million. We are going to vote in the Senate on the H–1B visa, allowing 200,000-plus people to be imported into this country because of our lack of commitment to our own citizens in developing their skills for the new marketplace.

This is an opportunity to make it clear that, for teachers and their ability to be able to teach, for virtual high school capacity to have advanced placement, in order to enhance the ability of our young to learn the new marketplace skills and to close the digital divide, we need to make this commitment.

I think everybody in the Senate knows that with this surplus, with our ability to be able to make the choices we have in the budget, we have allowed for a waiver of the budget precisely for this kind of moment. I ask my colleagues to join me in saying the House of Representatives will not have a better sense of this priority than the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I call on our colleagues to oppose the waiver. This bill has $4.5 billion more than last year's, $100 million over the President's request, and it is a matter of allocation of priorities.

There is no doubt that technical literacy is an important objective. We have, in the Senate bill, $425 million. If the Senator from Massachusetts could establish its priority over others, and add offsets, that is something we would be glad to consider. I wish we had more money to spend on things such as technical literacy, but we do not. To accept this amendment would exceed our 302(b) allocations. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to vote no on the waiver.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive the budget act in relation to Amendment No. 3659. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays, 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 155 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Abraham	Durbin	Levin
Akaka	Edwards	Lieberman
Baucus	Feingold	Lincoln
Bayh	Feinstein	Mikulski
Biden	Graham	Moynihan
Bingaman	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Hollings	Reed
Breaux	Jeffords	Reid
Bryan	Johnson	Robb
Byrd	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Chafee, L.	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Cleland	Kerry	Schumer
Conrad	Kohl	Snowe
Daschle	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Dorgan	Leahy	Wyden

NAYS—51

Allard	Domenici	Inhofe
Ashcroft	Enzi	Kyl
Bennett	Fitzgerald	Lott
Bond	Frist	Lugar
Brownback	Gorton	Mack
Bunning	Gramm	McCain
Burns	Grams	McConnell
Campbell	Grassley	Murkowski
Cochran	Gregg	Nickles
Collins	Hagel	Roberts
Coverdell	Hatch	Roth
Craig	Helms	Santorum
Crapo	Hutchinson	Sessions
DeWine	Hutchison	Shelby
Smith (NH)	Stevens	Thurmond
Smith (OR)	Thomas	Voinovich
Specter	Thompson	Warner

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 48, and the nays are 51. Three-fifths of the Senators present and voting, not having voted in the affirmative, the motion to waive the Budget Act is not agreed to.

The amendment would increase the budget authority and outlays scored against the allocations of the Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and that subcommittee has reached the limits of its allocation. Therefore, the point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

AMENDMENT NO. 3638

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes equally divided on the motion to waive the Budget Act by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this amendment would add an additional $100 million to the appropriated funds for the GEAR UP program. GEAR UP is the centerpiece of our efforts to reach out to disadvantaged students and give them both the skills and the confidence to go on to college. It is particularly clear in low-income neighborhoods that young people and families do not have either the access to college or the kind of skills they need to make it all the way through high school into college.

This program does that. It complements the Pell grant. It complements other programs because it actually gives young people, starting the sixth or seventh grade, the tutoring, the mentoring, the confidence, the ability to go through high school, and go on to college.

By voting for this amendment, we will say to scores of disadvantaged children: You can succeed; you can go to college; you can take your place in American society as a college graduate. I urge all of my colleagues to support this incredibly important program, to make opportunities real in the lives of all of our citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, there is no doubt this is a good program. It has been in effect only since 1999 when we put in $120 million; last year, up to $200 million; this year our figure is $225 million.

Again, it is a matter of priorities. This bill has $4.5 billion more than last year's education bill. It is $100 million higher than the President's figure. When the Senator from Rhode Island argued the matter as being a very special program, I posed a practical question: What should be offset? What is less important?

We think we have established the appropriate priorities. As much as we

want to have additional funds for a program of this sort, it simply isn't there. The extra million dollars would exceed our 302(b) allocation. Therefore, we ask our colleagues not to waive the Budget Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive the Budget Act in relation to amendment No. 3638. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 156 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Akaka	Durbin	Levin
Baucus	Edwards	Lieberman
Bayh	Feingold	Lincoln
Biden	Feinstein	Mikulski
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Breaux	Hollings	Reed
Bryan	Jeffords	Reid
Byrd	Johnson	Robb
Chafee, L.	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Cleland	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Collins	Kerry	Schumer
Conrad	Kohl	Torricelli
Daschle	Landrieu	Wellstone
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wyden
Dorgan	Leahy	

NAYS—52

Abraham	Gorton	Nickles
Allard	Gramm	Roberts
Ashcroft	Grams	Roth
Bennett	Grassley	Santorum
Bond	Gregg	Sessions
Brownback	Hagel	Shelby
Bunning	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Burns	Helms	Smith (OR)
Campbell	Hutchinson	Snowe
Cochran	Hutchison	Specter
Coverdell	Inhofe	Stevens
Craig	Kyl	Thomas
Crapo	Lott	Thompson
DeWine	Lugar	Thurmond
Domenici	Mack	Voinovich
Enzi	McCain	Warner
Fitzgerald	McConnell	
Frist	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 47, the nays are 52. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The amendment would increase budget authority and outlays scored against the allocations to the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and that subcommittee has reached the limit of its allocations. Therefore, the point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

AMENDMENT NO. 3678

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes for debate on the Kennedy amendment. Who yields time? The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this amendment basically follows the President's recommendation, and that is to provide a cost-of-living increase to the training programs for youth and adult workers in this country.

At the present time, half of all the employers in this country provide no training whatsoever, the other half of the employers provide 1 percent of payroll costs, and 80 percent of that training goes to management level workers.

We have talked a good deal about H–1B visas and bringing into the United States those guest workers who have special skills, but I think we have a basic responsibility to ensure continuing training programs for America's workers as we continue to expand our economy and compete in the world.

That amendment provides an important increase for training programs. Two years ago, along with Senator JEFFORDS, we consolidated the training programs. We now have an effective one-stop system that will offer real opportunities for workers.

Finally, this amendment also restores the Summer Jobs Program. Without this amendment, there will be no Summer Jobs Program for the youth of this country. I hope this amendment will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, as with so many of the pending amendments, the objective is good if we had more funding. We have increased the funding for the Department of Labor by $400 million. We have funded two new programs requested by the administration: incumbent worker training for $30 million and responsible reintegration of youthful offenders for $20 million.

Over the last 4 years, there has been a 32-percent increase for dislocated workers and a 25-percent increase for the Job Corps. If it were possible to have additional funding, we would be glad to provide it. We think we have established the priorities in an appropriate order for this complex bill. I ask the motion to waive the Budget Act be denied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive the Budget Act in relation to amendment No. 3678. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 157 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Abraham	DeWine	Kerry
Akaka	Dodd	Kohl
Baucus	Dorgan	Landrieu
Bayh	Durbin	Lautenberg
Biden	Edwards	Leahy
Bingaman	Feingold	Levin
Boxer	Feinstein	Lieberman
Breaux	Graham	Lincoln
Bryan	Harkin	Mikulski
Byrd	Hollings	Moynihan
Chafee, L.	Jeffords	Murray
Cleland	Johnson	Reed
Conrad	Kennedy	Reid
Daschle	Kerrey	Robb
Rockefeller	Snowe	Wyden
Sarbanes	Torricelli	
Schumer	Wellstone	

NAYS—50

Allard	Gorton	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Gramm	Nickles
Bennett	Grams	Roberts
Bond	Grassley	Roth
Brownback	Gregg	Santorum
Bunning	Hagel	Sessions
Burns	Hatch	Shelby
Campbell	Helms	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Collins	Hutchison	Specter
Coverdell	Inhofe	Stevens
Craig	Kyl	Thomas
Crapo	Lott	Thompson
Domenici	Lugar	Thurmond
Enzi	Mack	Voinovich
Fitzgerald	McCain	Warner
Frist	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 50. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The amendment would increase budget authority and outlays scored against the allocations to the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and that subcommittee has reached the limit of its allocations. Therefore, the point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request and will then reclaim the floor.

Mr. SPECTER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President: Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for the purpose of propounding a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following listed amendments be the only remaining first-degree amendments in order to the pending Labor-HHS appropriations bill and they be subject to relevant second-degree amendments.

I further ask unanimous consent that with respect to HMO-related amendments, they be subject to second-degree amendments relating to the subject matter of the conferenced HMO bill or the underlying Labor-HHS bill or the original first-degree language.

The list is Specter managers' amendment; Domenici 3561, telecom training center; Domenici 3662, telecom training center; Frist 3654, education research; Jeffords 3655, IDEA; Jeffords 3656, medicine management; Jeffords 3677, Public Health Service Act; Jeffords 3676, high school; Collins 3657, defibrillator——

Mr. REID. Will the Senator withhold for a moment? If I could respectfully request, maybe we could just submit our two lists, Democrat and Republicans lists. The staffs have looked at them. Unless the Senator wants to read

them for some reason, we have 80-some on our side that we don't want to read.

Mr. SPECTER. Well, that would be fine with me, Mr. President. The question would arise as to how we are going to get consent if Members don't know what is on the list.

Mr. REID. We have made on our side numerous hotlines to Members. We had the 11 o'clock time that we were going to submit the amendments. If the Senator wants to read them, that is fine with me.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment lists be printed in the RECORD as they are. ÷Senators knew there was a time. They checked this list. Statements were made. I think it would save some time.

Mr. BAUCUS. Reserving the right to object, I will object until I can get some understanding or we can get some understanding from the majority leader as to when we are going to have a date set for a vote on PNTR. This is an issue which transcends politics, if I might have the attention of the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I know we are in a hurry. We are trying to get through with this bill. I think that is important work, and I am for it. Let me make my point very succinctly.

This bill, in section 515, has a provision that changes current law and shifts the payment date for SSI, the Supplemental Security Income program, from October back to September. What that does is shift $2.4 billion worth of spending out of the budget year for which we are writing this appropriation back into the previous fiscal year. In the process, it allows $2.4 billion more to be spent this year by spending $2.4 billion in the previous fiscal year. This payment shift was specifically debated during the budget resolution debate. It was rejected. Part of the agreement that was made that passed the budget was that there would be no payment shift on SSI.

This provision is subject to a point of order because it violates the budget agreement. It shifts spending into fiscal year 2000 and drives up spending in that year $2.4 billion above the level provided for in the budget.

If we are going to write budgets, they have to have some meaning. This is not just some minor provision. The debate on this issue was a key element of the debate on that budget, and the Budget Committee and the Senate specifically rejected this payment shift.

So on the basis of that, Mr. President, I make a point of order that section 515 of the bill, as amended, violates section 311 of the Budget Act, since it would cause fiscal year 2000 budget authority and outlays to exceed the spending aggregates in the budget resolution.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Budget Act, as amended, I move to waive section 311 of that act with respect to the consideration of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have just had a discussion with the Senator from Texas about setting this issue aside so that we can proceed with other matters and try to make a determination as to how we can solve this issue.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, objection. Respectfully, I know how hard the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Iowa worked on this measure. But with this hanging over our heads, we might as well get this resolved now. We have spent 3 or 4 days on this bill already. If this prevails, we are all through here. So we believe this matter should be resolved now.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, it takes unanimous consent to set it aside. I urge the Senator from Nevada to reconsider. We had an issue yesterday raised by the chairman of the Finance Committee, and there was an agreement between the chairman of the Finance Committee and the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee as to what would happen in conference, that items would be taken out, and that we would seek an additional allocation.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I want to remind my colleagues that sustaining this point of order does not bring down the bill. Under the unanimous consent agreement the bill is being considered under, sustaining this point of order would simply strike section 515.

I am perfectly willing to let the Senate go on with other amendments. I am going to insist on this point of order at some point, and it will have to come to a resolution. But if we can do other business while this is being discussed, I think that is a good idea. The point of order is a very targeted point of order against section 515, not against the bill.

Mr. REID. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada will state it.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the objection of the Senator from Nevada is withdrawn and another amendment is considered, would the Senator still have the same right to object to any further proceedings after this amendment that would be brought up next is disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Normally, the point of order would occur after another amendment had been disposed of.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will propound a question under the reservation.

I am trying to understand the consequences of the amendment. Let me reserve the right to object while I ask the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Pennsylvania this: If the point of order is sustained, can we get some notion of what consequences it will have on the spending in this bill for education, labor, and other issues?

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, if I might respond, if the point of order is sustained, we would lose $2.4 billion and there would be required an adjustment of the bill which would be catastrophic.

So it is my suggestion that we set it aside, taking the willingness of the Senator from Texas to do that, and then proceed with other amendments so we can try to figure out what other allocation might be possible. We have an amendment ready by the Senator from Vermont and one by the Senator from North Carolina. We have not had many Republican amendments. It is my hope that we can proceed. We have to find a way out of this. If we have a little time, we have a chance to find our way out of it. So I hope we will proceed.

If I may have the attention of the Senator from Nevada, he will have the opportunity to—we will have to set it aside, as I understand the parliamentary ruling, each time a new amendment is called up. Is that correct, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SPECTER. So I hope we will set it aside for the two amendments that we now have lined up and ready to go.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, continuing to reserve the right to object, the Senator from Pennsylvania talked about if this prevails, the requirement of an adjustment to the bill would be ''catastrophic.'' That was the word he used. I am trying to understand the consequences of that. What kind of adjustment would we be talking about with respect to this bill on Education and Labor?

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I don't know how this percentage worked. I am advised that with this provision there would be an across-the-board 6.75 percent cut to bring the bill under the allocation.

I am not sure of that math, although that is the representation made to me. If you take $2.4 billion out of $104.5 billion, that, it would seem to me, would be under 3 percent. But it would be very material.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is a critically important piece of legislation. It is a funding bill for education and labor

issues and a range of things that are very important. If the consequence of the motion offered by the Senator from Texas would be to require a substantial across-the-board cut to this piece of legislation, it is of significant interest to virtually every Member of this body.

I don't believe we ought to go on. If the Senator from Nevada chooses not to object, I shall object. But I will leave it to the Senator from Nevada to comment as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, before we break down in the tears and the shock that would come from not shifting spending from one year to another to break the budget by $2.4 billion, let me remind my colleagues that with this shift and with the entitlement changes that Senator STEVENS has said we are not going to make, this bill will grow by 20.5 percent over last year. You can't find that growth rate even going as far back as the Carter administration. You have to go all the way back to when L.B.J. was President to find a bill growing that fast.

If the point of order is sustained eliminating the phony pay shift and an adjustment is made in spending, this bill will still be growing by 17.7 percent. Granted that we each look at the world through different glasses. I don't see that as cataclysm; I see that as somewhat of a movement toward fiscal restraint.

But the important point is this provision violates the Budget Act. We considered this payment shift in the budget. We specifically rejected it. We set out numbers that were meant to meet the targets for spending that were agreed to. This provision violates the Budget Act, and it should be stricken. I will insist on the point of order against it, but I am perfectly willing to let amendments move forward. If the minority doesn't want amendments to be considered, it is up to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I am advised that the 17.7 percent would be the across the board on outlays. I have heard what the Senator from Texas says about those percentages. I do not think they are accurate. We will compute the percentages. That simply is not factually so. I managed last year's bill. But we will tally them up and make representation on the floor at a later point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I believe the pending motion is the motion to waive the Budget Act. Is that not true?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. Is that not a debatable motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a debatable motion.

Mr. HARKIN. Thank you.

Mr. President, the figures we just heard from the Senator from Texas really are quite phony. They include all kinds of advanced funding and everything else to come to that figure that the Senator threw out on the 20 percent.

But you have to ask yourself: Why are we facing this now? What the Senator from Texas is trying to do is to save one day. It is one day, I tell my friend from North Dakota.

This provision was put in there not by me and not by the minority. It was put in there by Senator STEVENS in order to allow us to do the legitimate work we have to do to meet the obligations we have in education and in health and NIH, and all of the other things in this bill which has pretty wide support. It wasn't us. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee put it in.

The Senator from Texas—let's be clear about it—is moving the outlays for SSI paychecks from one day to the previous day—that is all he is doing—one day. But that one day will cause about a 6-percent across-the-board cut in NIH, cancer research, Alzheimer's research, education funding, Pell grants, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, IDEA, you name it—a 6-percent across-the-board cut because the Senator from Texas wants to move by one day the payment of SSI. He wants to move it to one day later. Last year, we moved it one day forward. He wants to move it to one day later.

Who cares about one day? Why is it such a big deal to go from September 30 to October 1? But if it means that it allows us to move forward with this bill and to have the adequate funding in this bill when we go to conference, it means a lot.

This really is a mischievous point of order because it really doesn't do anything. It doesn't save us any money. The money we will spend on SSI will either go out September 30 or it will go out October 1. It is going out. The Senator from Texas is not stopping that money. It is going to go out. It is either going to go out on one day or the next day. He is not saving a nickel. But by doing this, he is causing all kinds of problems on this bill. That is why I say it is just simply a mischievous motion.

Of course, I support my colleague, the chairman, in the motion to waive. Hopefully, we will hear from Senator STEVENS on this. But there is really no substance. I guess what I am trying to say is that there is no substance to the motion—none. You don't save a nickel. You don't help anybody. You don't hurt anybody. You just move the payment from one day to the next. That is all. But you sure hurt this bill.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. Reserving my right to the floor, I will yield for a question.

Mr. DORGAN. If the Senator will yield for a question, I wonder if the Senator recalls last year a technique similar to this used on the Department of Defense bill. I am just curious whether our colleague, the Senator from Texas, came to the floor to make a point of order when it had to do with defense. I don't know the answer to that. I am curious. It seems to me if there is a consistent point of order against the deployment of this technique, one wouldn't just make it on education issues, which, of course, to you, me, and others is very important. It is some of the most important spending we do. It is some of the most important investments we make in the country.

I ask the question, Does the Senator know whether a similar point of order was made by our colleague when it had to do with the Defense Department last year?

Mr. HARKIN. I don't know the answer to that question. I was not involved in the appropriations bill for defense. I will leave that to others. I have no knowledge of that. I accept the Senator's insight into that. I don't know the answer as to whether the Senator from Texas objected to that. The Senator from Texas can certainly speak for himself in that regard. But I guess the RECORD will show one way or the other.

Mr. DORGAN. If I might ask another question, the point here is this bill deals with the effort the Federal Government makes to respond to the education needs in this country. Most of education funding, of course, comes from State and local governments. We provide some funding in a range of areas. We provide assistance in VA, health care, and a range of other issues. This is a very important piece of legislation that invests prominently in the lives of the people of this country.

The technique that is being objected to is not a new technique; it has been employed before. That is the point I was making. Is it a good technique? I don't know. You could find other ways to adequately fund these needed programs. Some in this Chamber may not want to fund these programs. They may think they are not a priority perhaps. This is not a new technique. But apparently when it comes to funding for VA, health care, and education, we have people come to the floor to make a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. BAUCUS. On another matter, Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Iowa to yield for a question.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I will yield, without losing my right to the floor, for a question from my friend from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, if I could consult with the good Senator from Iowa on a matter which I raised earlier, that is, the Senator from Mississippi, the majority leader, asked unanimous consent for the Senate to take up a list of amendments on both sides and to have printed that list of amendments with respect to the pending bill.

I asked the majority leader if it might not be a good idea for the leader to set a date certain in July to bring up PNTR. I am not asking the Senator for his view on the bill, but I ask the Senator if he thinks it is a good idea to bring the bill up and at least have a vote on it, particularly in July. Wouldn't it be better to have a bill brought up in July than, say, in September, given the fact that it has passed the House, given the fact that we will bring it up sometime this session of Congress, and given the fact that delay is dangerous?

Does the Senator agree it would be a good idea to bring it up and have a date certain, at least for insurance that we are going to vote on it this year? The month of July would be the preferable month to vote on it rather than a subsequent month; does the Senator agree?

Mr. HARKIN. I say to my friend from Montana, who is a strong supporter on the Finance Committee of the permanent normal trade relations with China—and he has worked very hard on this issue—I know he desires, as many others, to get on with that, debate it, have a vote and move on.

The Senator is asking this Senator a question on which I do not feel qualified to make an answer. I am not involved in this issue or on the Finance Committee. Right now my interest is getting this bill through. I am trying to help and do what I can to get the amendments through and get adequate funding for education, for NIH, for health care, for human services, to try to educate our kids, and attend to the human needs of our people. We are trying to get this through.

I have not had time now to consider when the PNTR should be brought up. I know my friend from Montana is obviously well versed in this subject. I probably would accede to his knowledge of this issue and when it ought to be brought up. As to my own view, I don't think this Senator is qualified to respond.

Mr. BAUCUS. I thank the Senator. I will not object to a unanimous consent request on this bill today, but I do hope prior to recessing for the July recess we can work out an agreement, that the majority leader will be able to make a statement, the result of which is to make it clear that the vote will come up in July.

I reserve my right as to what action I will take tomorrow. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, back to the point at hand, I want everyone to understand what this mischievous motion is all about. All it does, in order to save the money, is move the date from October 1 to September 30. Last year, we moved it up to October 1; we moved it back to September 30.

The motion of the Senator from Texas says, no, you can't do it September 30; you have to do it on October 1. In fairness and in reality, the SSI checks should go out at the end of the month. If the Senator has an objection, he should have filed it last year because we moved it from September 30 to October 1. SSI checks are to go out the end of the month. All we are doing is bringing it back to where it really ought to be, at the end of the month.

Be that as it may, we are only talking about 1 day. I don't think too many people are hurt by 1 day. The Senator moves it back to October 1 when it ought to be September 30.

What does his motion do if it is upheld? We will have almost a $3 billion cut in education, a $1.4 billion cut in NIH, a $210 million cut from the Centers for Disease Control, a $300 million cut from Head Start, a $77 million cut from community health centers.

I heard some talk earlier about going to conference and taking care of it there. The House bill is lower than ours. If we cut these numbers here, when we go to conference, we will be locked into the lower numbers. So it has a great impact.

We have a lot of amendments that have been filed—not only on the Democratic side but the Republican side as well—from Senators COLLINS, DEWINE, SMITH, LOTT, HUTCHISON, COVERDELL, ASHCROFT, HELMS, NICKLES, SMITH, GRAMM, and a whole bunch on our side, too.

How can we debate these amendments in any kind of a legitimate fashion, if, in fact, we don't even know what kind of money we are talking about? Some of the amendments add money; Some take it away; Some modify.

If we go ahead and have the amendments, we don't know whether the motion from the Senator from Texas is going to hold or whether it will be waived, so we will be debating these amendments in a vacuum without the full knowledge of exactly what dollar amounts we are looking at. Are we going to cut it by 6.75 percent across the board or not? We don't know that yet.

Mr. SPECTER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. SPECTER. In formulating this question as to whether we are going to cut it by 6.75 percent, may I suggest to the distinguished ranking member and comanager that we will not cut funding by 6.75 percent.

What we are seeking to do now is to obtain a reallocation. Discussions are underway with the chairman of the full committee to reallocate some funds to this bill from other bills, which delays the day of reckoning for the whole process. That is the way things are done, not only around here but generally.

It is my hope we can accomplish that. The chairman of the full committee is now busy working on a supplemental, but he will be here in a few minutes. I believe we will find a way on a reallocation to satisfy the issue which has been raised by the Senator from Texas.

Unfortunately, we had three amendments queued up and ready to go to make progress, but seeing the state of affairs on the floor, our amendment offerers have dispersed. We are trying to find some more amendments, and we have an amendment ready to be offered.

It is my hope that on the representation we are making progress on finding an allocation, which will leave our bill at $104.5 billion, we take the Senator from Texas up on his willingness to set his issue aside so we can proceed with the bill.

Mr. REID. It sounds reasonable. We have one person who wanted me to protect him. He is across the hall. I will see if I can get that taken care of. We object for a little bit.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I reclaim the floor. I had yielded for a question. I hope we can get this clearance. I think we probably can move ahead. From what my distinguished chairman said, I hope that can happen in terms of reallocation and we can put this thing to bed.

An objection to laying the motion to waive aside holds right now until we can get clearance on our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I want to respond to some of the comments made by our colleague from Iowa. My point of order can be called many things, but calling it mischievous—not that there is anything wrong with being mischievous in defense of the public interest—but my point of order is anything but mischievous.

Our colleague from Iowa would have us believe that shifting SSI payments from fiscal year 2001 to 2000 does not increase spending. Nothing could be further from the truth. Under current law, the payments for SSI will be made on October 2 and they will be part of the 2001 budget. What this illegal—under the Budget Act—payment shift does is shift this payment back into fiscal year 2000 and raids the surplus that we have all pledged to protect by a total of $2.4 billion, freeing up $2.4 billion more to be spent next year. So the first point is, sustaining this point of order will mean we will spend $2.4 billion less.

Second, a point of order was not raised against the D.C. appropriations bill last year on the pay shift because there was no point of order available. That pay shift did not violate the budget in effect at that time. This SSI payment shift was considered in the budget and it was rejected, specifically rejected.

Let me explain exactly the arithmetic of where we are. In allocating spending for this fiscal year, the Appropriations Committee allocated to Labor-HHS appropriations, a subcommittee that funds many important programs for America, a 13.5-percent increase in spending. That was far and away the largest increase in spending of any budget allocation. You would

have to go all the way back to when Jimmy Carter was President to find that level of spending.

The first thing this committee did was it put some entitlement reforms in the bill, which the chairman of the committee has already said are not going to be made. They are going to be taken out in conference. But by claiming that they are going to be made, they magically raised their increase in spending from 13.5 percent over last year's level to 17.7 percent over last year's level. You are now in the range where going back to when Jimmy Carter was President does not hold up. We are getting to the point where you have to go back to the time when Lyndon Johnson was President to find increases like that.

But even that was not enough. What they did was include a phony payment shift—by taking SSI payments, which by law are to be made on October 2, which is after the beginning of the new fiscal year, in other words, money they would have had to have funded in the 2001 budget—by taking that payment and moving it into fiscal year 2000, they can rob the surplus by $2.4 billion and spend $2.4 billion next year. By doing that, they would then raise the increase in spending over last year's level to 20.5 percent.

These tears that are being shed about my point of order, which simply calls on the Senate to live up to its budget, these tears are being shed because by doing that we could increase spending in this area only by 17.7 percent. By enforcing the budget, rather than increasing spending by 20.5 percent, we would increase spending by 17.7 percent. How many working families have seen their income go up by 17.7 percent in the last year? I submit, not very many families.

So what I have done is simply said: When we adopted a budget we meant it. When we set out what we were going to spend in this coming year, we meant for those constraints to be binding. What is literally happening in the Congress is that this surplus is burning a gigantic hole in our pocket. We are seeing spending increases at levels that have not been approached since Lyndon Johnson was President of the United States. It is very dangerous for two reasons. No. 1, if we have a downturn, those surpluses are not going to be there. Second, some of us had hoped that we would repeal the marriage penalty, so we do not have to make people in America who fall in love and get married pay $1,400 a year in additional income taxes for that right. We had hoped to repeal the death tax so your family would not have to sell off your family farm or your business that your parents worked a lifetime to build up, simply because they died. But if we are going to be increasing spending like this and busting the budget, we are never going to have an opportunity to share the benefits of this prosperity with working Americans.

When our colleague says this point of order does not save money, that is simply not true. It saves $2.4 billion.

Second, I am going to raise a point of order on the supplemental appropriation for military construction. I am going to raise it because what we are doing is obscene in terms of spending, and the bill does violate the Budget Act. I intend to raise the point of order.

Let me finally say that this point of order is important. In fact, we have used it five times today to prevent new spending from being added. The amazing thing is that we have before us an appropriations bill that grows by one-fifth, over 20 percent, and yet we have spent all day long where the minority has been trying to add more and more and more spending. You begin to wonder when is it enough? Is there any appropriations bill that could have been written that would have been enough?

Yet with all this spending, we are all talking about locking away money for Social Security, locking away money for Medicare, but the spending goes on and on and on.

I raised the budget point of order. If Senator STEVENS comes over and reallocates money and takes it away from another use so the total level of spending does not rise, he certainly has a right to do that. That will mean this point of order will stand. This phony payment shift will be stricken. But the money will be allocated to be spent on these programs and taken away from something else. That is how the budget is supposed to work. We are supposed to make decisions like American families make decisions. If they want a new refrigerator they don't buy a new washing machine. If they want to go on vacation, they don't buy a new car. They set priorities.

Our problem is we never set priorities. So I think this point of order is important. This point of order is an enforcement of the budget. We ought to be holding the line on spending. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I compliment my colleague from Texas. I know sometimes it upsets people when we come out and say: Wait a minute, we are breaking the budget.

I work with the Senator from Texas on the Budget Committee and he happens to be right. I also compliment my colleague from Pennsylvania, who is managing the bill. As the Senator from Texas mentioned, no matter what is in this bill, many people—particularly on the other side—say it is never enough. No matter what is in there, it is never enough. The Senator from Pennsylvania put in more money than the President requested for education, and we have had four or five amendments saying let's spend billions more. It is never enough. No matter what, we more than matched the President.

The bill we have before us has outlays greater than the President requested and it is still not enough.

I happen to be one who is, I don't want to say a wonk on numbers, but I am really picky on numbers. I think we ought to be accurate on numbers. I asked people before, by how much does this bill grow? The Senator from Texas just says it grows by a fifth. He understates the growth by just a tad. The growth in this bill is 20.4 percent in budget authority according to CBO. That is a lot of BA growth. Some people say we are growing other areas of the budget, and that is true. No other area of the budget is growing nearly as fast. The Defense appropriations bill we already had before us and passed, if my memory serves me correctly, was growing at 7-point-some percent. That is a lot. It is a big increase. This is growing almost three times as much in budget authority.

People ask: What does that mean? It means the money we authorize to be spent; we are committing the Government to spend that amount.

What are outlays? Sometimes outlays are easier to figure. The growth percentage in outlays is not quite as much. The growth percentage in outlays is 12 percent. The Senator from Texas wants to take off $2.4 billion because that is an offset. That is, frankly, a faulty offset. It is only in there so we can have more money in real growth in outlays, in budget authority, in commitment to growth spending.

There is actually $4.9 billion in outlay offsets. The Senator from Texas might have been able to do the full $4.9 billion. I know he can do $2.4 billion, but there is $4.9 billion in offsets. I believe the chairman of the Appropriations Committee said we will drop those offsets.

The real program growth—and this is what we are talking about in BA—is $104.1 billion. That compares to last year's $86.5 million in budget authority. That is a growth of 20.4 percent. That is a lot.

If we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Texas, the growth will still be in excess of 17 percent. Granted, I know it will cause some consternation. I know the members of the committee will have to reshuffle and limit the growth of the spending in commitment to 17.5 percent. I happen to think that is doable. Maybe it is not the easiest thing in the world because we made commitments to grow spending more than the President did in this area or that area. Certainly, 17-percent growth is adequate, sufficient, and responsible.

As to the bill before us, one can only say it complies with the budget if they take into consideration $4.9 billion of offsets which, frankly, will not happen.

Again, I compliment my colleague from Texas for his amendment. I will submit for the RECORD a chart I put together which shows budget authority and outlays for the Labor-HHS bill for the last 10 years.

For my colleagues' information, in 1990, 10 years ago, budget authority was

$43.9 billion. Last year, it was $86.5 billion. It basically doubled in the last 10 years.

The bill before us is trying to grow at 20 percent. In other words, it will double in about 4 years at twice the rate of growth of what we have done in the last 10 years. I think that would be a mistake.

I am not critical of anyone. I compliment my colleague from Texas. He has a good amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the chart which shows the growth in this particular area of the budget, the Labor-HHS budget, be printed in the RECORD. It shows growth in outlays and in budget authority for the last 10 years.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR/HHS APPROPRIATIONS

	Budget authority	Outlays	BA growth (percent)	Outlay growth (percent)
1990	43.9	49.4	.....	.....
1991	51.0	54.4	16.2	10.2
1992	60.1	58.5	17.9	7.5
1993	63.2	62.7	5.1	7.3
1994	68.1	68.7	7.8	9.6
1995	67.4	70.2	−1.0	2.1
1996	63.4	69.1	−5.9	−1.6
1997	71.0	71.9	11.9	4.1
1998	80.7	76.2	13.7	6.1
1999	85.1	80.2	5.4	5.2
2000	86.5	86.3	1.6	7.7
2001 House Net	97.2	91.1	12.4	5.5
2001 House Gross*	101.8	94.3	17.8	9.2
2001 Senate Net	98.1	93.1	13.5	7.9
2001 Senate Gross*	104.1	96.7	20.4	12.0
2001 President	105.8	94.6	22.3	9.6

*=Gross spending levels do not include mandatory offsets, contingent emergencies, or other adjustments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I will take a couple minutes. I heard the Senator from Texas talking about there is never enough. Of course, he just talked about Democrats on this side offering amendments to increase funding. I thought what is good for the goose is good for the gander.

There are Senators on that side of the aisle who have amendments to increase spending in this bill: Senator COCHRAN, Senator COLLINS, Senator DEWINE, Senator INHOFE, Senator JEFFORDS. Those are the only ones I have right now from their side that I know of who add money to the bill. It is not only Democrats; Republicans, too. There are some on that side of the aisle, as well as on this side of the aisle, who understand we have unmet needs in this country when it comes to dealing with education, health, human services, and research.

I point out there is all this talk about how much this budget has increased. It all depends on how you look at it. It depends on your baseline. It depends on your numbers. The Senator from Texas probably knows that as well as anybody around here. So we can look at it a different way.

Let's look at it this way, for example: Twenty years ago, the share of the dollar that went for elementary and secondary education in this country that came from the Federal Government was a little over 11 cents. In other words, 20 years ago, 11 cents out of every dollar that was put into elementary and secondary education came from the Federal Government. Today, that is down to 7 cents. We are going backwards. We put the burden on our property taxpayers around the country. It is an unfair tax, a tax that can be highly regressive, especially in an area where there are a lot of elderly people who may not be working and live on Social Security, but they still have to pay the property taxes. When one looks at it that way, one can say we are shirking our responsibility. If we had just kept up that 11-percent level for the last 20 years, we would not be having all these amendments.

Second, the figures they are throwing out about a 20-percent increase is about as phony as the piece of paper it is written on because that takes into account a lot of things that are not figured into how much we are actually increasing programs. If one looks at the program increases—education and the other program increases—this year over last year, it comes in at a little over 9 percent, somewhere between 9 and 10 percent.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, 8.2 percent.

Mr. HARKIN. My chairman is always ahead of me on these things—8.2 percent. If one looks at the increases we are making next year over this year, it comes to 8.2 percent, not 20 percent. I wanted to make the record clear. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have one sentence in reply, and that is, we will provide the details as to increasing 8.2 percent instead of the alleged 20.4 percent, but we want to do it at a later point so we can move ahead with amendments.

We have two amendments lined up: one from the Senator from Ohio, Mr. VOINOVICH, and one from the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be set aside so we can proceed with the Voinovich amendment.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. Reserving the right to object, will I be next in line for an amendment?

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the Voinovich amendment, we proceed to the Landrieu amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO 3641

(Purpose: To permit appropriations to be used for programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act)

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. VOINOVICH] proposes an amendment numbered 3641.

On page 59, line 10, insert ''; to carry out part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.);'' after ''qualified teachers''.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, before I speak on this amendment I sent to the desk, I would like to say just a couple of words in regard to the point of order the Senator from Texas has just made.

I was one of the Members of the Senate who worked with the Senator from Texas to place in the budget resolution certain points of order which we believed we needed to have to make sure spending did not increase more than what the budget resolution provided for.

His point of order is directed at exactly what we were concerned about. It is what I might refer to, in all due respect, as a gimmick. In considering the 2001 budget, money that was put into the FY 2001 budget is being moved back into the 2000 budget in order to make available $2.4 billion more than could be spent otherwise.

What does that mean? That means that when you shove the cost back into the year 2000, you are going to use $2.4 billion of the on-budget surplus that many of us recently voted to use to pay down the national debt.

When we put a budget resolution together, at least—I thought it meant something. One of the things that disturbed me last year was that, at the end of the game, we did all kinds of things to exceed what we had originally anticipated to spend. So here we are today, trying to do the same kind of thing we did at the end of last year.

I think this Senate should sustain the point of order; that we ought to live by the budget resolution we agreed to earlier this year, and that the committee should make the hard choices.

One of the things that was brought up is that in order to pay for many of the new increases in spending in new programs, mandatory programs were cut, mandatory programs that I think are fundamental. Things such as the social services block grant, things such as the CHIP program. I have been told they will be taken care of later on.

My belief is that if we have a budget resolution and we agree to spend a certain amount of money, we ought to live within that budget resolution. I hope we sustain the point of order.

Mr. President, few will dispute that each and every child in this Nation deserves to be able to obtain a quality education, a fact Congress recognized 25 years ago when it passed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Since that time, IDEA has helped ensure that all students, regardless of their disability, are able to receive the educational services they need in order to attend their local school.

In my State of Ohio, IDEA has helped thousands of young men and women go beyond their disabilities and obtain a quality education.

Thanks to IDEA, Ohio students with debilitating problems like Cerebral Palsy and autism have been able to receive help in reading and writing from special education teachers. They can use programs like Dragon Dictate—a speech recognition program that can be used to control a word processor— in order to help them better understand their school work.

Before IDEA, these children would have been virtually forgotten elements in our education system. With IDEA, these children are in school, they are learning and they are growing. And IDEA doesn't just help disabled students. Alexandra Shannon, a 16 year old student from Beavercreek, OH, believes that ''enhanced educational opportunities help everyone.'' In a meeting with one of my staff members just a few months ago, she told of her friend, Peter, who had learned to walk at school with the help of his schoolmates. The entire school was brought closer together by the experience that Alexandra called, the ''joy of the year.''

However, even with all the success of IDEA across the Nation, the fact remains that the cost to implement this program is draining money from our schools and significantly impeding the ability of State and local educators to fund their own priorities—priorities that include some of the items my colleagues here in the Senate think should be funded at the Federal level.

The cost of serving a handicapped student is typically twice as much as the average amount spent per pupil, while in some school districts, the cost is higher still. Think of this. In Centerville, OH, Centerville High School superintendent, Frank DePalma estimates that in his school, special education services cost 4 to 5 times as much as do services for nonhandicapped students. He said:

> Costs for services such as occupational therapy, speech therapy and physical therapy continue to skyrocket.

Indeed, the Cincinnati Post wrote in an editorial just 2 months ago that the city's public schools spend:

> $40.3 million a year on disabilities education. That's nearly 11% of its $365 million budget.

That is 11 percent of their budget.

Many school districts recognize that students with disabilities require different, and often, expensive needs. They want to help their students, but they also need and want the financial help that the Federal Government has promised.

As many of my colleagues may recall, when IDEA was passed in 1975, Congress thought it was such a national priority, that it promised that the Federal Government would pay up to 40 percent of the cost of this program.

To date, the most that Washington has provided to our school districts under IDEA is 12.6 percent of the educational costs for each handicapped child; and that was in fiscal year 2000.

The remainder of the cost for IDEA still falls on State and local governments.

Because the Federal Government has not lived up to its commitment, IDEA amounts to a huge unfunded Federal mandate. When I was Governor of Ohio, I fought hard for passage of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act in 1995 so that circumstances like this could be avoided in the future.

And just how large an unfunded mandate has IDEA become?

In fiscal year 2000, Congress allocated almost $5 billion for special education for school-age children. If we had funded IDEA at the 40 percent level that Congress had promised in 1975, we would have allocated $15.6 billion in fiscal year 2000 rather than $4.9 billion.

In essence, a $10.7 billion unfunded mandate was passed along to our State and local governments for IDEA. And that is on top of the 60 percent—or $23.3 billion—for which they are already responsible. So, for a federally created program, our State and local governments' ''share'' in this fiscal year will amount to $34 billion out of a total of $38.9 billion.

Indeed, Mr. R. Kirk Hamilton from Southwestern City School, Grove City, OH has written to me, stating that IDEA is:

> an enormous, unfunded mandate which is so expensive and so cumbersome that the funds are not available to deliver needed services to children.

Mr. President, that is just wrong.

For all programs under IDEA, the President of the United States assumes an expenditure of $6.3 billion in fiscal year 2001. That is only a $332 million increase from the $6 billion level of funding in fiscal year 2000.

However, the President's fiscal year 2001 budget contained a whopping $40.1 billion in discretionary education spending. That is almost double the $21.1 billion in discretionary education spending allocated by the Federal Government just 10 years ago in fiscal year 1991, and nearly 5 times the $8.2 billion spent on discretionary education spending 25 years ago in 1976. Where is that money going? Think of that. Where is it going?

It is important to understand that the White House and some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are very good at reading polls. They see that education is of high interest to the American people.

Even though the Federal Government only provides 7 percent of the funds for education in this country, the White House and these same colleagues consider themselves, sometimes, I think, to be members of a national school board.

They have other, new priorities that they believe Washington should fund instead of providing additional funding for the federally created IDEA—programs like school construction, after-school programs, hiring more teachers, improving technology and training in schools, and creating community learning centers. They are all great ideas.

They are important initiatives, but they are the responsibility of our States and local communities. Of course, the politically expedient thing to do is to support funding for all these programs at the federal level; it makes us look as if we are ''for'' education. They are high in the polls. Nevertheless, I believe in the delineation of Federal and State responsibility, and increased funding for IDEA is a Federal responsibility.

It is one that we mandated on the school districts. It is part of our responsibility. We said we would pay for 40 percent of it. It is about time we paid for 40 percent of it, rather than going off on a lot of new initiatives.

During our debate on the fiscal year 2001 budget resolution, I offered, and this body adopted, by a vote of 53–47, an amendment stating that before we fund new education programs, we should make funds available for IDEA.

The amendment that I am offering today makes good on the commitment we made in the budget resolution.

Specifically, my amendment would give local education agencies the flexibility to take $2.7 billion of Federal money under title VI of this appropriations bill and spend it on IDEA, if they choose. In other words, we are saying that school districts, if they choose, can use new money for IDEA.

If the Federal Government was fully funding IDEA, most of the education initiatives my colleagues are proposing—school construction, after-school programs—could be and likely would be taken care of at the State and local level. That is how our State and local education leaders want it.

In February, with the help of the Ohio School Board Association and the Buckeye Association of School Administrators, I contacted Ohio teachers, superintendents, and educational leaders from urban, suburban, and rural districts in every part of Ohio to ask what they would prefer: a full Federal commitment to IDEA or new Federal funding initiatives.

More than 90 percent of the responses I received so far have shown that Ohio's education community leaders prefer a full commitment to IDEA over new programs. I am confident this same poll conducted in other States would produce a similar result.

Let me read a few responses I received. Mr. Philip Warner, Superintendent of Ravenna City School wrote:

> I believe school districts would benefit the most if Congress met its obligations under IDEA, therefore allowing school districts to fund programs that would be specific in each school district.

David VanLeer, Director of Pupil Services, Euclid City Schools, right across the street from where I live:

> Congress should honor that pledge to provide 40 percent of the cost of IDEA before any new programs are funded.

Doreen Binnie, speech language pathologist at Colombia local School District responded, ''Absolutely,'' to the

question of whether Congress should fund IDEA before new programs.

We must stop acting as if we are the Nation's school board, trying to fund every education program possible. The truth is, many of the programs that Members of Congress and the President want to enact should be funded at the State and local level. In my view, those programs would have a better chance of being funded if State and local governments didn't have to divert such a large percentage of their funds to pay for IDEA. The Federal Government has a commitment to IDEA and that commitment should be fully honored. I believe our State and local leaders should be given the flexibility they need to spend new Federal education dollars that are allocated under this bill to honor the commitment of IDEA. I appreciate the fact that the appropriations committee provided increased money for IDEA in this budget.

The fact is, we should say to our local school districts that with the $2.7 billion which is allocated in title VI one of the options we should give them is to fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Chair. Under the unanimous consent agreement, I have the right to offer my amendment at this time.

Mr. REID. Not until we finish the Voinovich amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Voinovich amendment must be disposed of.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, we have been consulting on the complexities of the bill. If I understand the amendment by the Senator from Ohio, it is that the title XI block grant of $2.7 billion, which is divided for class size and construction, may be used for other purposes at the discretion of the local boards. If they choose not to use it for construction or class size, it could be used at their discretion. He wants to be sure those funds can be used for special education.

Mr. VOINOVICH. That is correct.

Mr. SPECTER. That would be acceptable. It is our purpose that the local boards, having decided they do not want it for the other purposes—construction or reduction in class size—may use it as they decide. We are prepared to accept the Voinovich amendment. We are also anxious to proceed with the bill.

Mr. VOINOVICH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the minority has reviewed the amendment. I have spoken with Senator HARKIN. We have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3641) was agreed to.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. COVERDELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SPECTER. May we have a time agreement on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana?

Ms. LANDRIEU. I would need about 20 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. May we have a time agreement of 30 minutes, 20 minutes for the proponents of the measure and 10 minutes for the opponents, if there are opponents?

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

The Senator from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 3645

(Purpose: To provide funding for targeted grants under section 1125 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes)

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I am hoping there will not be opponents because we think this amendment makes a lot of sense. We are happy to agree to a time limit because we are interested in moving this debate along.

I agree with our distinguished colleague from Ohio. I think his is a good amendment. I commend him for coming to the floor and bringing to the Senate an issue that is very important to Louisiana, to our educators, teachers, superintendents, and parents who are very interested in funding. I thank the Senator for continuing to advocate for us to fulfill our commitment and meet our promises to our special education students. I hope the leadership would consider accepting this amendment, which I offer in good faith, because it does not add money to the budget. It simply provides greater flexibility.

I send my amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Ms. LANDRIEU] proposes an amendment numbered 3645.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 55, strike line 21 and all that follows through page 56, line 8, and insert the following: ''Higher Education Act of 1965, $9,586,800,000, of which $2,912,222,521 shall become available on July 1, 2001, and shall remain available through September 30, 2002, and of which $6,674,577,479 shall become available on October 1, 2001, and shall remain available through September 30, 2002, for academic year 2000–2001: *Provided,* That $6,985,399,000 shall be available for basic grants under section 1124: *Provided further,* That up to $3,500,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary on October 1, 2000, to obtain updated local educational agency level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census: *Provided further,* That $1,200,400,000 shall be available for concentration grants under section 1124A: *Provided further,* That $750,000,000 shall be available for targeted grants under section 1125 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965: *Provided further,* That grant awards under sec-''.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, this amendment will not require 60 votes because it does not seek to waive the Budget Act.

I am somewhat in agreement with what Senator GRAMM said and our ranking member, Senator HARKIN, about the fact that we do need to be concerned with the amount of spending. We need to be concerned about the amount of spending for education, for health, for our military. We want to make sure we are making smart and wise investments. We want to make sure we are not getting back into the era of big Government or irresponsible Government with irresponsible tax breaks. I am much inclined to support many of the comments that were made.

This amendment fits that debate exactly. I am hoping the leadership on both sides will see it that way.

Let me begin by telling my colleagues again what this amendment does not do. It does not ask to waive the Budget Act. It does not add any money to this budget. It does not reduce one penny of title I money to any State in the Nation.

It simply attempts to redistribute the moneys within this budget to reflect a value about which we all speak on both sides of the aisle each day; that is, the value of trying to target the money in this budget to those children, families, and communities that need the most help.

Many communities in Louisiana, California, New York, Michigan, and Mississippi are struggling to meet their obligations to provide a quality education for all children, regardless of their race, religion, or what side of the track they were born on, or whether they have a lot of money in their household or little money.

We believe that in America every child deserves a quality education. We say that on this floor over and over and over again. We speak these words. We say this. But when it comes to writing our budget, which we are doing today, we don't do it. We don't do it. We have the power to do it. Fifty votes, right now, could do this. But, unfortunately, I don't think we may get more than maybe one or two or three or four because we are very good at talking about equality, fairness and justice, but when it comes to writing a budget, we don't do it.

As a Democrat, it is hard for me to say, but I have to be honest and say I am not sure the President's budget reflects that value as closely as it should. I have to say the Republican budget doesn't reflect that value, and some of my own colleagues were not reflecting that value.

This amendment, with all due respect to the committee and to everybody who tried to work on this, attempts to say that with some portion of this increase, we should increase title I because it is the only title that attempts

to send money out in a way to this Nation where the poor children, the neediest children, get the help and attention, giving complete flexibility to the local government to decide whether it is additional teachers, additional resources. Title I has great flexibility. There are few limitations, but it says let's help the poorest children, whether it is in Louisiana or Arkansas or Mississippi or California, and there are many States that would benefit from this change.

All of the increases Senator GRAMM talked about, whether it is a 20-percent increase or an 8-percent increase, for the purpose of my amendment, are not really the issue because of all of the increase—whether 20 percent or 8 percent—a small amount, a few tiny pennies, have been devoted to title I. The poorest children in this Nation, who have no lobbyists, no big and powerful agencies to represent them up here, have literally been left out. In addition, the accountability money that was placed in this budget in past years to make sure the money was going to the poor districts, the middle-income districts, and the wealthy districts has been totally taken out.

So this bill we are debating, that has either a 20-percent or 8-percent increase, literally underfunds the poor children of the Nation, the moderate-income families, the lower income families, who are struggling to make the American dream possible for themselves. Yet we all come here every day and talk about widening the circle of opportunity, how we want to share the great wealth of this Nation. But when it comes to funding education for the kids who need it the most, so they can have a chance, we say no, no, and no. That ''no'' is being said on the Democratic side, the Republican side and, frankly, from the White House.

This is one Senator who thinks it is wrong. If I am the only vote on the bill, let it be so. I think there will be a few others. I don't think this amendment will pass. I am sure it will be second degreed because when we can't agree, we offer a commission—I am sure someone is going to do that—to study the issue because we have to keep studying the issue of how poor children are affected when their education is at a disadvantage.

I will vote against a study. I am going to vote for this amendment because it will simply move within the confines of this bill $750 million, which is still a reasonable amount of money, from one title into the title I.

I ask unanimous consent that this document be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE ALLOCATIONS AT $738 MILLION (THROUGH BASIC, CONCEN. AND TARGETED)

State	Landrieu Amendment	Appropriations Committee
Alabama	144,564	134,762+10 million
Alaska	21,513	20,225+1 million
Arizona	140,669	130,766+10 million
Arkansas	89,736	84,016+5 million
California	1,155,500	1,075,015+80 million
Colorado	76,628	72,531+4 million
Connecticut	83,202	77,575+6 million
Delaware	23,653	22,429+1 million
DC	31,071	28,611+3 million
Florida	430,617	403,006+27 million
Georgia	249,983	234,458+15 million
Hawaii	23,306	21,956+2 million
Idaho	26,254	24,716+2 million
Illinois	362,951	332,172+30 million
Indiana	129,110	122,037+7 million
Iowa	57,129	54,715+3 million
Kansas	62,627	59,452+3 million
Kentucky	141,777	131,270+10 million
Louisiana	209,188	191,242+18 million
Maine	35,358	33,785+2 million
Maryland	116,722	109,446+7 million
Massachusetts	170,733	161,058+9 million
Michigan	380,257	353,215+27 million
Minnesota	94,030	89,526+5 million
Mississippi	134,957	124,813+10 million
Missouri	154,238	144,421+10 million
Montana	29,986	28,346+1 million
Nebraska	34,320	32,636+2 million
Nevada	27,397	25,713+2 million
New Hampshire	22,034	20,919+2 million
New Jersey	202,046	189,679+13 million
New Mexico	78,176	72,541+6 million
New York	874,009	803,360+71 million
North Carolina	174,860	167,151+7 million
North Dakota	22,389	20,984+2 million
Ohio	326,933	305,597+21 million
Oklahoma	111,448	104,642+7 million
Oregon	75,647	72,354+3 million
Pennsylvania	376,332	351,631+25 million
Puerto Rico	299,038	282,528+17 million
Rhode Island	28,262	26,427+2 million
South Carolina	116,887	110,255+6 million
South Dakota	22,223	20,672+2 million
Tennessee	147,499	138,396+9 million
Texas	782,711	726,154+56 million
Utah	37,139	35,293+2 million
Vermont	19,834	18,659+1 million
Virginia	136,709	128,802+8 million
Washington	118,831	113,362+5 million
West Virginia	80,579	74,627+6 million
Wisconsin	136,280	126,519+10 million
Wyoming	19,942	18,798+1 million

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, this shows clearly that every State in the Union will benefit. The poor children in every State will benefit significantly by this amendment. I will read specifically into the RECORD the poorest States that will greatly benefit, and those States are: Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, California, District of Columbia, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, New Mexico, New York, Texas, and West Virginia.

Just to read out a few pretty startling numbers, let's take California. This amendment, without adding one penny to the budget, will give California $80 million more because they have in certain areas a concentration of very poor children who need additional help. Louisiana will get an $18 million increase. Without this amendment, Senator BREAUX and I will basically go home empty-handed to a State where a headline in one of our major newspapers this week was: Louisiana's Children Suffer.

The Kids Count Data Book just came out. It clearly demonstrates which States need the help and which States could use the help. I don't believe in just throwing around new money. I am arguing for flexibility and accountability. But I am also arguing that we have an obligation to target our Federal resources better than we do. I am hoping my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will see the wisdom in this amendment.

I am going to yield a few minutes of my time to my colleague from Arkansas, Senator LINCOLN, who has waited patiently to speak. I thank her for her support, her passion, and her interest in helping us make our point. At this point, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Arkansas, and then I respectfully request the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I, too, join my colleague, Senator LANDRIEU, in applauding what our colleague from Ohio, Senator VOINOVICH, was doing previously in bringing up the importance of not only the program of IDEA but also the importance for us to be able to make good on commitments we have made, things we have asked our States and our localities to do and yet have not provided them the resources to do them.

This is just one of those requests. When we look at the targeted grants for the title I dollars, it is a program that was authorized over 6 years ago and never has been funded. That is all the Senator from Louisiana is asking—that we make good on our obligation that came about several years ago to target those dollars to the neediest of children across this Nation.

And to our colleague, Senator GRAMM from Texas, who mentioned that one of the most important things we need to do in this debate is to set priorities, I say: Exactly. Let's set the priorities of educating our children and understanding that we are only as strong as our weakest link, and that devoting the resources we have obligated long ago to the neediest of children should be done.

So I rise in support of the amendment offered by my good friend from Louisiana, Senator LANDRIEU, which would provide a modest increase in title I funding and target those additional resources to the neediest public schools. As I have said on many occasions, I believe strongly that we need to increase the Federal investment in public education to ensure that all students have access to quality education. But spending more money to help educators meet higher standards is only one part of that solution. We also have to ensure that Federal dollars are spent responsibly and that we allocate those resources where we can make a real difference.

Right now, in those title I funds, there are three categories. These targeted grants don't receive any of that funding. Eighty-five percent goes to basic grants and 15 percent goes to concentration grants. Statistics consistently demonstrate that, on average, children who attend schools with a high concentration of low-income students lag behind students from more affluent areas. This is certainly true in Arkansas, where students in the delta region score lower on academic achievement tests than students in our more prosperous regions of the State.

To me, these statistics are a clear indication that title I, which again was created to aid the education of disadvantaged children, isn't working as well as it should. We have diluted our title I program funds to so many different areas, until they have become less effective in the areas where they are supposed to be directed—to the disadvantaged.

Congress recognized that problem back in 1994 when it created those targeted grants for title I dollars. In the most recent ESEA Reauthorization Act, unlike basic and concentrated grants, targeted grants are designed so that school districts with a high percentage of low-income students receive a greater share of title I funding.

I think we were on to something, but unbelievably these targeted grants have never been funded.

This is unfortunate because these are the kids who need the Federal assistance the most, and it is where we could do the most good. Income status alone doesn't determine student achievement. It is the concentration of economically disadvantaged students in a school that makes the most difference.

After visiting dozens of schools and talking with hundreds of parents in my home State, I am convinced that we have to change our approach if we want to maintain public confidence and support for a strong role in education at the Federal level. In addition to more targeted funding, we need tough accountability standards to ensure students are learning core academic subjects, and more flexibility at the local level to allow school districts to meet their most pressing needs. Ultimately, we have to account for the money we spend in Washington and show our constituents results to sustain their support.

I also call on my colleagues to support an amendment Senator LIEBERMAN will be offering later which will address this issue. It calls for a comprehensive GAO study of targeting under title I. At the very least, I believe we have a responsibility to take a good, hard look at the current system because the status quo isn't good enough.

This amendment is an important step in the right direction. I applaud my colleague from Louisiana for the courage to stand up for what is right. Maybe it is not the most popular, but it is right.

I urge support for this proposal. This may not be a political issue, and this certainly may not be the most popular issue with those in this body who want to keep the status quo, but it is the right issue. It is the right decision to make, and it is the right amendment to support. If nothing else, this body should support this amendment on behalf of the neediest children in this Nation.

I applaud my colleague's courage, and I appreciate her leadership in this effort.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I yield 4 of those minutes. But I ask for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator.

I yield 5 of those minutes to my colleague from Connecticut, and I would like 5 minutes to close.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair. I thank my friend and colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I commend my friend and colleague from Louisiana, Senator LANDRIEU, and express my strong support for her amendment to better target our Federal education funding to the schools and children who need it most. I know from our collaboration on our comprehensive new Democrat education reform plan, the Three R's legislation, that Senator LANDRIEU's commitment to rescuing failing schools and providing every child with a quality education is unsurpassed in this body.

I also want to thank my friend and colleague from Arkansas for her devotion to this cause, and for her very eloquent statement on behalf of this amendment.

As Senator LANDRIEU and many others have rightly pointed out, we are facing an educational crisis in our poorest urban and rural communities, where learning too often is languishing, where dysfunction is too often the norm, and where as a result too many children are being denied the promise of equal opportunity. It is just not right or acceptable that 35 years after the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, that the average 17-year-old black and Latino student reads and performs math at the same level as the average 13-year-old Caucasian American student. We must begin to respond to this emergency with a greater sense of urgency, and that is exactly what the Landrieu amendment aims to do, infusing $1 billion in new funding for FY 2001 into the Title I program for disadvantaged students and allocating those resources to the districts with the highest concentrations of poverty.

We are currently spending $8 billion a year on Title I. No one in this body questions the value or mission of Title I, which was enacted in 1965 to compensate for local funding inequities and help level the playing field for low-income students. But the unpleasant truth is that this well-intentioned program is not nearly as focused on serving poor communities as it is perceived to be, leaving many poor children without any aid or hope whatsoever.

According to the Department of Education, 58 percent of all schools received at least some Title I funding, including many suburban schools with small pockets of low-income students. Of the 42 percent that don't receive any Title I support, a disturbing number have high concentrations of poor students. In fact, one out of every five schools with poverty rates between 50 percent and 75 percent do not get a dime from Title I. Let me repeat that startling statistic, because the first time I heard it I did not believe it—one of every five schools that have half to three quarters of its children living in poverty receives no Title I funding. None.

How does this happen? The formulas we are using to allocate these funds purposely spreads the money thin and wide. Any school district with at least 2 percent of its students living below the poverty level qualifies for funding under Title I's Basic Grants formula, through which 85 percent of all Title I funding is distributed. The rest of the money is channeled through the Concentration Grant formula, which is only marginally more targeted than the Basic formula, providing aid to districts with as few as 15 percent of their students at the poverty level. As a result, almost every school district in the country—9 out of every 10—receives some aid from this critical aid pool.

In fairness, Congress did make an effort to correct this imbalance in 1994 through the last reauthorization of the ESA. We approved the creation of a new Targeted formula, which puts a much heavier weight on poverty and therefore would direct a much higher percentage of funds to schools with higher concentrations of poor children. The key word there, of course, is would. Congress has unfortunately never appropriated funding through the Target formula. Not a penny, Instead, we have perpetuated a system that promises one thing and delivers another, that succeeds in letting us bring home funding to each of our districts but fails to meet its fundamental goal of helping those most in need.

That is exactly what this amendment introduced by the junior Senator from Louisiana will do. Once again, I congratulate her on her leadership. This is an amendment which would put our money where the needs generally are. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I will try to be brief as I conclude my remarks on this important amendment.

I thank my colleague from Connecticut for his extraordinary leadership in the area of education. It is particularly wonderful and refreshing to note that there are some Members of this body who will take their time and give their energy to speak on an amendment on the principles because States benefit from this—and Connecticut most certainly benefits from this. Connecticut is not one of the

poorer States in the Union. I thank my colleague for his extraordinary leadership and commitment, even though he doesn't come from a State where the per capita income is low. It is quite high. It makes his leadership on this issue all the more inspiring. I thank him for his help.

Connecticut will do well under this formula, as will many other States. But it is the States that have poorer rural students and poorer urban students that will do the best because that is what the Federal Government should be doing with a portion of our education money, helping to level the playing field.

We talk a lot about opportunities, and then we don't fund them.

We talk a lot about fairness, but we don't fund it. We talk a lot about equality, but we don't fund it.

Mr. President, talk is cheap. Whether it comes from this side, that side, or down Pennsylvania Avenue, that is what this amendment is about. That is why I am insisting on a vote. That is why, while a study may be helpful, what really would be helpful is a vote for the poor kids of this Nation.

One of the great Presidents of one of our distinguished universities said: If you think education is expensive, try ignorance.

I offer to this body that there is not any way in this world, not with any tax cut, not with any fancy new technology, not with any new program that anybody in this Chamber can think of, we can help sustain this economic miracle of growth if we don't fund a quality education for every child in this Nation.

Mr. President, this budget doesn't do it.

This amendment helps to target some money to the kids who need it the most. We need to put back our accountability money, put our money where we say our values are.

I yield the floor, and I ask for a vote on my amendment.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: I believe Senator REID was going to offer a second-degree amendment on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). A second degree amendment would not be in order until the time has been used.

Mr. LOTT. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 10 minutes and the Senator from Louisiana has 2 minutes.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I renew the unanimous consent request with respect to the limit of first-degree amendments to the pending bill and send the list of amendments to the desk.

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

The list of amendments is as follows:

Ashcroft, Medicare; Baucus, Medicare; Baucus, Impact aid; Bayh, State children's health program, No. 3614; Bingaman, Energy, No. 3652; Bingaman, Drop out; Bingaman, Tribal colleges; Bingaman, Relevant.

Bingaman, Relevant; Bingaman, Relevant; Bingaman, Relevant; Bingaman, Relevant; Boxer, Relevant; Boxer, Relevant; Boxer, Relevant; Breaux, Point of order.

Brownback, Disease treatment, No. 3640; Brownback, Family research, No. 3646; Byrd, Relevant; Byrd, Relevant; Collins, Defibrillator, No. 3657; Collins, Defibrillator, No. 3643; Collins, Drug treatment for homeless, No. 3642; Collins, Rural education.

Conrad, Relevant; Conrad, Relevant; Coverdell, Contracts with criminals, No. 3647; Coverdell, Needles, No. 3648; Daschle, Discrimination; Daschle, Relevant; Daschle, Relevant to any on list; Daschle, Relevant to any on list.

Daschle, Relevant to any on list; DeWine, Troops to teachers, No. 3591; DeWine, Poison control, No. 3592; Dodd, After school program; Dodd, Restraints; Dodd, Relevant; Domenici, Telcom training center, No. 3651; Domenici, Telecom training center, No. 3662.

Dorgan, Relevant; Dorgan, Relevant; Dorgan, Institutional Development Award Program, No. 3611; Durbin, Asthma, No. 3606; Durbin, Asthma, No. 3607; Durbin, Immunization, No. 3608; Durbin, Immunization, No. 3609; Edwards, Relevant.

Edwards, Plan to eliminate syphilis, No. 3613; Enzi, OSHA (ERGO), No. 3660; Feingold, Defibrillations; Feingold, Relevant; Feingold, Campaign finance; Feingold, Campaign finance; Feinstein, Master teachers; Frist, Education research, No. 3654.

Graham, Social services, No. 3595; Graham, Healthcare providers, No. 3597; Graham, Health; Graham, Health; Graham, Relevant; Gramm, Budget limit, No. 3667; Gramm, Relevant; Harkin, School construction.

Harkin, Discrimination; Harkin, Relevant; Harkin, Relevant; Helms, School facilities; Hollings, Amendment; Hollings, Amendment; Hollings, Amendment; Hutchinson, NLRB, No. 3627.

Hutchinson, Medicaid waivers; Jeffords, IDEA, No. 3655; Jeffords, Medicine management, No. 3656; Jeffords, Public Health Service Act, No. 3677; Jeffords, High school, No. 3676; Kennedy, Mental health services; Kennedy, Health professionals; Kennedy, Job training.

Kennedy, Relevant; Kennedy, Relevant; Kennedy, Health care; Kennedy, Health care; Kerrey, Web-based education, No. 3605; Kerry, Technology literacy, No. 3636; Kerry, Technology, No. 3659; Landrieu, Adoption services, No. 3668.

Lautenberg, Health spending; Lautenberg, Relevant; Leahy, Office of Civil Rights; Levin, Relevant; Levin, Relevant; Lieberman, GAO study on Title I funds; Lieberman, Targeted education, No. 3650; Lott, Relevant.

Lott, Relevant to any on list; Lott, Relevant to any on list; Lott, Relevant to any on list; Lott, Energy, No. 3615; Murray, Class size; Nickles, Relevant to any on list; Nickles, Relevant to any on list; Nickles, Relevant to any on list.

Nickles, Relevant to any on list; Nickles, Relevant to any on list; Nickles, Health care; Reed, Gear-Up, Nos. 3637, 3638, 3639; Reed, Immunization; Reed, Summer job; Reed, Youth violence-drug and gun free schools; Reed, Relevant.

Reid, National Institute of Child Health, No. 3599; Reid, Relevant; Reid, Relevant; Robb, School Construction; Schumer, Vocational rehab; Schumer, Cancer funding; Schumer, Relevant; Smith, (NH) CHIMPS, No 3603.

Smith (NH), CHIMPS, No. 3670; Smith (NH), Invasive medical tests in schools; Smith (NH), Davis-Bacon; Smith (NH), Davis-Bacon; Smith (NH), Relevant; Smith (NH), Relevant; Specter, Managers amendment; Stevens, Relevant.

Stevens, Relevant; Torricelli, Fire sprinklers; Torricelli, HCFA regulation; Torricelli, Lead poisoning; Torricelli, Lead poisoning; Torricelli, Lead poisoning; Torricelli, Cost effective emergency transportation, No. 3612.

Wellstone, Perkins Loan cancellations; Wellstone, Stafford Loan forgiveness; Wellstone, NIH grants and drug pricing; Wellstone, Child care, No. 3644; Wellstone, Social services, No. 3596; Wellstone, Suicide prevention; Wellstone, 1.1 billion advance LIHEAP; Wellstone, Relevant; Wellstone, Relevant; Wyden, NIH.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has 2 minutes remaining. Does she wish to use that time or reserve it?

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the distinguished leader. I have made my closing arguments. If there is no one else to speak, I am happy to receive a motion on the amendment so we can call for a vote.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have a very short statement to make.

I applaud the Senator from Louisiana for this amendment. I do believe it is a very good idea to target funds for disadvantaged children under title I. The difficulty is that the $600 million will be taken from title VI, where we have already allocated the principal sum of those funds to meet the President's requirements for new school construction and for class size on the condition that local boards may use it for other purposes if they decide they do not need classroom construction or additional teachers.

When the Senator from Louisiana concludes, I will move to table the amendment.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask the Senator, is it not true that there is a $1.5 billion increase in title VI; yet there is a very small percentage or a $400 million increase for title I? If we are going to build schools or reduce class size, and this is a question, does the Senator think we should try to do it for the poorer communities first and then we can do it for everyone else? That is what my amendment attempts to do. I ask the Senator that.

Is that in the interest of the Nation, to do it for the poor schools first and then worry about everyone else?

Mr. SPECTER. If I may respond, my preference would be to move for the poor schools first.

In constructing this bill, there were many objections as to how the money was going to be allocated. The only way we could work through the complications was to put it in title VI. That was not my first choice, nor are the programs my first choice.

Working through a great many considerations, we ended up in title VI leaving the options to school districts, if they choose not to have construction, or if they choose not to have reduction in class size. That is an accommodation to very many disparate views.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator for his honesty, and I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, and this has been cleared on the other side, that the vote

on the Landrieu amendment be set at 7:45.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could amend that request to ask consent that votes occur on the pending amendments at 7:45 in the order which they were debated, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes, and that there be 2 minutes for explanation prior to each vote.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, there will be a motion to table on the Landrieu amendment. There will be a motion to table on the Jeffords amendment. We would not want a right taken away, in case a motion to table fails, to second degree.

Mr. LOTT. That is not limited by this.

I further ask consent that the time between now and 7:45 be equally divided on the Jeffords amendment.

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

The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 3655

(Purpose: To increase the appropriations for carrying out the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, with an offset)

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I now send amendment No. 3655 to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], for himself, Mr. GREGG, Mr. FRIST, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. VOINOVICH, proposes an amendment numbered 3655.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 58, line 15, strike ''$4,672,534,000'' and insert ''$3,372,534,000''.

On page 58, line 17, strike ''$2,915,000,000'' and insert ''$1,615,000,000''.

On page 58, line 22, strike ''$3,100,000,000'' and insert ''$1,800,000,000''.

On page 58, line 26, strike ''$2,700,000,000'' and insert ''$1,400,000,000''.

On page 60, line 16, strike ''$7,352,341,000'' and insert ''$8,652,341,000''.

On page 60, line 19, strike ''$4,624,000,000'' and insert ''$5,924,000,000''.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators COVERDELL and CHAFEE be added to the other cosponsors of the amendment.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I begin by commending my colleague from Pennsylvania for his leadership as chairman of the Labor, HHS, Education, and related agencies subcommittee. His efforts to increase funding for education and health care often receive too little attention. I offer him my thanks on behalf of all Members who share our dedication to education.

He has had a challenging job crafting appropriations bills that balance the many real and competing needs of the Nation. He has been a strong advocate for education funding and an even stronger advocate for the funding of IDEA. He has been an equally strong advocate for more funding for the National Institutes of Health. This year he has once again taken up the challenge of balancing competing needs. The appropriations bill he brought to the Senate is a product of difficult negotiations between competing viewpoints.

Because of my respect for my friend from Pennsylvania, I come to the floor with an amendment only because of my conviction that there is an unmet Federal obligation that must now be met in full. Almost all the Members of this body have gone on record in support of fully funding our commitment to our local schools. We should fully fund IDEA for special education.

I also commend my good friend from Iowa, Senator HARKIN, who has been a tireless champion of education funding and health care funding.

I anticipate that the opponents of my amendment may argue that this amendment should be defeated because it takes funds from one education program and provides it to another. I, too, support increased funding for education, and have voted repeatedly over the past several days to waive the Budget Act in order to secure additional funds for education. It is clear, however, that this does not reflect the will of the Senate.

Because it is very clear that there is not sufficient support for an amendment which would exceed the budget caps, we must make difficult choices regarding which programs should be given priority. I have been a longtime advocate for funding for the title VI block grant program. This appropriations bill provides this program with a $2.7 billion increase, while providing a $1.3 billion increase for IDEA. I believe, and this belief is held by every school board in Vermont, that IDEA should be our very first priority.

In 1974 we made a commitment to fully fund IDEA. If 25 years later we cannot meet this commitment in an era of unprecedented economic prosperity and budgetary surpluses, when do we plan to keep this pledge?

When I first arrived in Congress, one of the very first bills that I had the privilege of working on was the Education of All Handicapped Act of 1975.

As a freshman Member of Congress, I was proud to sponsor that legislation and to be name as a member of the House and Senate conference committee along with my chairman Johns Brademus and then Vermont Senator Bob Stafford.

At that time, despite a clear Constitutional obligation to educate all children, regardless of disability, thousands of disabled students were denied access to a free and appropriate public education. Passage of the Education of All Handicapped Act offered financial incentives to states to fulfill this existing obligation.

Recognizing that the costs associated with educating these children was more than many school districts could bear alone, we pledged to pay 40 percent of these costs of educating students.

I know that there is some disagreement about whether or not a commitment was made. I want to tell you as someone that was there at the time that we made a pledge to fully fund this program.

I have in my hands a petition from every school board in my State. I urge all of my colleagues to come by my desk and look at these petitions. They know we made that commitment. Passing this amendment will do more to help our school districts meet their obligation to improve education in this country than nearly anything else we can do.

In 1997 Congress once again took up this landmark legislation. This a complex bill that has profound impact on classrooms across the Nation. With the strong leadership of Senator LOTT, Senator FRIST, Senator GREGG, Senator KENNEDY, Senator DODD, Senator HARKIN, and many others, we passed the first reauthorization of IDEA in 22 years. It is an accomplishment that many of us are very proud of.

At that time, we reaffirmed our commitment to pay 40 percent of the costs of educating children. We made this pledge to families, to school boards and to the Governors of our States. Over the past 3 years, we have made some progress.

But as my good friend from New Hampshire has pointed out several times over the past year, we are only supporting 13 percent of these costs. In 1975, we made a pledge which we did not keep. In 1997 we made that same pledge once again when we reauthorized IDEA.

In the 105th Congress we felt it important to reaffirm our commitment to full funding for IDEA. We added language to the fiscal year 1999 Budget that stated that IDEA should be fully funded as soon as feasible. And it is feasible now. We know that. This language was adopted unanimously by the Senate. At that time, we still faced budget deficits and it was argued that full funding was not feasible.

In the 106th Congress we continued to press for full funding for IDEA. The fiscal year 2000 appropriations provided a $600 million increase in funding for IDEA. During the debate over the 2001 Budget Resolution the Senate adopted language that I advocated calling for full funding of IDEA as soon as feasible.

The appropriations bill that is before us raises funding for IDEA by $1.3 billion in fiscal year 2001. I commend Senator SPECTER and Senator HARKIN for providing for this historic increase in funding for IDEA. Nonetheless, this increase does not put us on the path toward fully funding this program.

Our amendment is simple. It doubles the increase that is provided in the bill

and provides IDEA with an increase that is comparable to the increase that Senators SPECTER and HARKIN have provided for the National Institutes of Health.

It provides a path by which we will achieve full funding for IDEA by fiscal year 2005. It sends a clear message to the Nation that we, as a body, make good on the commitment we make.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

Good Lord, if we can't do it now with budget surpluses and the economy we have, if not now, when will we do it? I do not believe anyone can rationally argue this is not the time to fulfill that promise. I intend to do all I can to make sure we do.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa controls 14 minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend from Vermont. I want to make it clear I am not rising in opposition to his goal. Senator JEFFORDS' goal is the same goal I have. We both want to do everything we can to fully fund, on the Federal level, our stated goal of paying 40% of the costs of special education. We should do it. So I agree with the Senator on that. Senator JEFFORDS has been a stalwart supporter of that goal. I believe I have been, too. So I do not rise in opposition to what my friend from Vermont is trying to do Just like me, he wants to educate kids with disabilities and ensure the Federal Government meets its authorized funding goal that was stated in the bill, in IDEA, when it was passed 25 years ago.

I do, however, feel compelled to clarify once again, as I have every year that this issue has come up, usually presented by the Senator from New Hampshire, the terms of the 40 percent. The stated assumption that the Federal Government is to fund 40 percent of the cost of educating children with disabilities is not correct. You must look at the legislation. The authorizing legislation of 25 years ago authorized the maximum award per State as being the number of children served times 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure. It was not 40 percent of the cost of educating kids with disabilities.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I did not say it was. I carefully deleted that and said it is the cost of educating a child.

Mr HARKIN. A child? Then the Senator is correct. Usually it is stated the other way around. The Senator correctly stated the law.

But back to the point I wanted to make. Should we reach that 40-percent goal? Absolutely. We should have reached it a long time ago. I agree the Federal Government has fallen down on its effort to reach that goal.

What I rise in opposition to is how my friend from Vermont does this. What my friend is doing is he is taking money out of title VI, which was put in there for school construction and modernization—$1.3 billion.

He is taking that money and saying it should be used to help meet our goals on IDEA.

Again, it is a classic case of robbing Peter to pay Paul. Do we have a need for the Federal Government to educate kids with disabilities and meet its goals to our States? Yes. We ought to fully fund IDEA.

Do we also have a responsibility to help States and our local school districts rebuild our dilapidated and crumbling schools? I believe the answer to that is yes. The average school in America now is over 40 years old. They are crumbling. They need to be modernized. They need to be updated.

I say to my friend from Vermont—and he is my friend and he is a great supporter of education, I know that—but I ask my friend to consider this: When we modernize schools and rebuild schools, one of the biggest beneficiaries is a kid with a disability. I want the Senator to consider that because when many of our old schools were built, they were not accessible. The doors are too narrow, the bathrooms are not accessible, and even the drinking fountains are not accessible, especially for someone who uses a wheelchair.

When we talk about school construction and modernization, we talk about $1.3 billion, which is a mere pittance of what is required. What the Senator from Vermont is actually doing by taking that money and putting it into IDEA, is penalizing kids with disabilities who need these schools modernized and upgraded. But then the Senator proposes that he is putting the money in IDEA to help kids with disabilities. Please, someone make some sense out of that for me.

As I said, the Senator's intentions are very good and laudable to increase funding for IDEA. If he were to do this in an open way and say we ought to increase money for IDEA, I would be on his side, but not at the expense of school modernization and construction because it is kids with disabilities, maybe above all others, who need to have some of these schools modernized, I say to my friend from Vermont.

Second, we just adopted an amendment offered by Senator Voinovich from Ohio. I said: Yes, we will accept it. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio says the schools can use title VI money, an allowable expense, to meet the requirements of IDEA. I submit to my friend from Vermont that the acceptance of the Voinovich amendment takes care of that. It leaves the money in there for school modernization and construction. However, out of the total pot of title VI money, the VOINOVICH amendment says that one of the allowable uses would be to use it to meet the requirements of IDEA.

I hope that will satisfy the Senator from Vermont. It still leaves the money in there for construction and modernization. I want to make that clear. Because this is where I differ with my friend from Vermont. Under his amendment we will have zero dollars for school construction and modernization. Zero. At least with the Voinovich amendment, they will be able to decide what they want to do. They will have money in there for school modernization and construction.

I hope the Senator from Vermont will perhaps reconsider this amendment. I know the goal is laudable. Heck, I support that. We ought to fund IDEA, but not take it out of school construction and modernization.

I hope we can move beyond this and meet our obligations to all our children in this country in education and not penalize one group to help another group. In this case, we penalize kids with disabilities to help kids with disabilities. That does not seem to make much sense to this Senator. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Iowa, perhaps we can add a phrase to this amendment that says the communities should make it a high priority to fix any problems with access. Would he then support this amendment?

Mr. HARKIN. The Senator asks me a legitimate question. As I understand it, under the Voinovich amendment, IDEA is an allowable use under title VI. I believe that is well covered in the Voinovich amendment.

Again, the Senator wants to restrict the use of the construction and modernization money. A lot of it will be used for accessibility. Some may not be. Some may be used to repair a ceiling. A ceiling is leaking, and they need to repair it. It might not just help kids with disabilities, it would help all kids. I would not want to narrow it this way.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Again, I want to point out that the people's understanding of our responsibilities are pretty clear in this case. If there is a statutory obligation and a commitment to fully fund a program—as there is in IDEA—this should be our highest priority. And again, I remind my colleague that this body has gone on record in vote after vote that we should fully fund IDEA. To suggest that fully funding IDEA should not be given higher priority than our desire to create a new construction program, is to abandon our original commitment. Certainly, if you owe money to a bank, that is a first priority over putting money in your savings account.

We made these pledges. The people back home know that the best way to improve education using Federal money is to have financial relief from the pressures of IDEA. It should be obvious what our conscience is telling us. We should fully fund the obligations we made back in 1975. That should be our primary priority. We said it over and over again and now we are turning our

back on our commitment. We say: No, we are going to use it for other things, and we are going to use it for things for which we have not already made a commitment, and that is to help with the construction of schools. School construction has always been a state and local responsibility. Fully funding IDEA will allow local communities to fund their own priorities, including construction.

I urge my friends to recognize our commitment to fulfill the promise we made and to use these funds to fund IDEA.

Look at these petitions from every single school board in my state. Every school district in the state says that the first thing we should do is fulfill our promise to fully fund IDEA.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has 4 minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. I just heard my friend from Vermont say some magical words with which I totally agree. I wrote them down as he said them: ''Take budget surpluses and meet our commitments.'' I agree with that.

Do you know what? Just this week we now found out we are going to have $1.9 trillion over the next 10 years we didn't know we were going to have in surplus.

If my friend from Vermont wants to offer an amendment to fully fund IDEA, and to take it out of the surpluses, I am with him 100 percent of the way because he would be right on. The Senator just said that: ''Let's take our budget surpluses.'' I agree with that.

That is not what my friend is doing. He is taking it out of school modernization and construction.

I say to my friend from Vermont, if you want to rewrite the amendment and take it out of surpluses in the future, I am with you.

Mr. JEFFORDS. If I may respond.

Mr. HARKIN. Sure.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I say to the Senator, as you know, I have voted that way. In fact, I offered the amendment to the budget resolution that would have done that. My amendment would have made mandatory money available for IDEA. But it was rejected. I agree with my friend from Iowa that we should dedicate more of the surplus to fully funding IDEA. It is the right route, but we were turned down by three votes. It failed.

Now I am trying to use a different route. I am interested in offering an amendment that I hope will be supported by a simple majority of this body. An amendment which funds education using the surplus is in violation of the budget resolution and must be approved by a sixty vote majority. The Senate has repeatedly voted to reject similar amendments.

This amendment is the one that has a chance to succeed in spite of the limitations imposed by the budget resolution. We can take the money from a brand new program, which we are doing, and shift it over to IDEA where I believe it ought to be our first priority. That is something we can do on this bill. We can't tap the surplus now, as I tried during the budget resolution. That was turned down.

Mr. HARKIN. As the Senator knows, I supported that when he offered it.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Right.

Mr. HARKIN. That was on the budget. This is on appropriations.

I say to my friend, offer an amendment. The Senator can offer an amendment right now to fully fund IDEA and take it out of budget surpluses. I will support him on it right now.

Mr. JEFFORDS. It will take 60 votes and fail.

Mr. HARKIN. Who knows if it will fail? Wouldn't it be nice to try?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Sure. If I fail, you can try. All right?

Mr. HARKIN. We should not be taking it out of school construction and modernization—not at all. Our local school districts need this money. Go out and talk to your school districts. The people who are paying our property taxes are getting hit pretty darn hard. Ceilings are falling down. They are leaking. They need this help from the Federal Government. We have the wherewithal to do it. And that is what we ought to stick with.

If the Senator wants to offer an amendment to fully fund IDEA, take it out of the $1.9 trillion budget surplus—''take it out of the budget surpluses,'' as my friend said, I am in lockstep with him because that is what we ought to be doing with that surplus. We ought to be meeting this basic goal of our Federal Government.

Of course, while I believe some of the surplus should be invested in quality education, we don't need to touch the surplus to meet the goal of fully funding IDEA. There are many savings we could achieve that could more than pay for the investment.

For example, look at Medicare fraud, waste and abuse. While we've cut it over the last few years, the HHS IG testified before our Subcommittee this March that last year Medicare made $13.5 billion in inappropriate payments. Eliminating that waste alone would more than pay for IDEA. Yet, the House passed Labor-HHS bill actually cuts funding for auditors and investigators. That means we would lose hundreds of millions more to fraud and abuse.

In addition, I've introduced The Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1999 to promote greater fiscal responsibility in the Federal government by eliminating special interest tax loopholes, reducing corporate welfare, eliminating unnecessary programs, reducing wasteful spending, enhancing government efficiency and requiring greater accountability. This bill would result in savings of approximately $20 billion this year and up to $140 billion over five years.

For example, by enhancing the government's ability to collect defaulted student loans, the bill would save $1 billion over five years. By ending tax deductions for tobacco promotions that entice our children to smoke, we'd save $10 billion. And by limiting the foreign tax credit that allows big oil and gas companies to escape paying their fair share of royalties, we'd save about $3.1 billion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 1 minute.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Good.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has 1 minute.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I am willing to yield back my 1 minute.

Mr. HARKIN. The Senator from Pennsylvania may want a minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield back his minute?

Mr. HARKIN. I want to see if the chairman wants to say anything.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Vermont believes very deeply about the importance of the IDEA program and the necessity and desirability of the Federal Government to fund it.

The difficulty is—and we wish we had more funds in the education budget, although this budget has $4.5 billion more than last year, and $100 million more than the President's figure—but when it comes out of the construction account, or any other account, they are very carefully calibrated to provide the appropriate balance.

The construction account is one of the President's priorities. We have met that, as with class size, subject to the discretion of the local school boards. If they make a finding they do not need additional buildings or additional teachers, they may use it for what they choose. It may be that they could use it for the purposes articulated by the distinguished Senator from Vermont. So it is with reluctance that we are opposing his amendment. And I move to table.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3645

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes for debate prior to the vote on the Landrieu amendment.

Who yields time?

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, we would ask the proponent of the amendment to step forward to debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I move to table the Landrieu amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to table has already been made on the Landrieu amendment.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: I just moved to table the Landrieu amendment, and the Chair advised me a motion had already been made to table. And I might ask, by whom was that made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania, prior to the quorum call, made a motion to table.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania, I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania was moving to table the Jeffords amendment and not the Landrieu amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 7:45, the Landrieu amendment was pending. The motion to table was made.

Mr. HARKIN. I believe the hour of 7:45 had not arrived at that point, and that Senator Jeffords had made his remarks. I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania was moving to table the Jeffords amendment.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, if I moved to table, I withdraw the motion and yield to the Senator from Iowa to make a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, now I understand the Senator from Louisiana is here, and she wants a minute. I will make my motion to table after her minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I was under the impression that perhaps the other amendment would go first on the vote, but I thank my colleagues for giving me a moment to get here.

I want to object, of course, to the tabling of this amendment. As I described earlier, I believe very strongly, as do some others, that this money should be better targeted. That is what this amendment does. It does not add new money to this bill. It simply says, of the money that we are going to spend—whether it is a 20-percent increase that Senator GRAMM earlier spoke about, or an 8-percent increase—whatever the increase, if we are going to increase funding in this bill, the money should go to help the poorer children first, the communities around this Nation that need the most help, whether they be in rural areas or urban areas.

Every State will gain. Every State will leave with additional money for title I. The States that need the most help will get that help. That is simply what this amendment does. I object to the tabling.

I thank the Senators for granting the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 1 minute has expired.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table Landrieu amendment No. 3645. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 158 Leg.]

YEAS—75

Abraham	Feingold	Murray
Akaka	Fitzgerald	Nickles
Allard	Frist	Reed
Ashcroft	Gorton	Reid
Baucus	Gramm	Robb
Bennett	Grams	Roberts
Bingaman	Grassley	Rockefeller
Bond	Hagel	Roth
Boxer	Harkin	Santorum
Brownback	Hatch	Sarbanes
Burns	Hollings	Schumer
Byrd	Hutchinson	Sessions
Campbell	Hutchison	Shelby
Chafee, L.	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith (OR)
Collins	Johnson	Snowe
Conrad	Kennedy	Specter
Coverdell	Kerry	Stevens
Craig	Lautenberg	Thomas
Crapo	Levin	Thompson
Daschle	Lott	Thurmond
Dodd	Lugar	Voinovich
Domenici	Mack	Warner
Dorgan	Mikulski	Wellstone
Enzi	Murkowski	Wyden

NAYS—23

Bayh	Edwards	Leahy
Biden	Feinstein	Lieberman
Breaux	Graham	Lincoln
Bryan	Helms	McCain
Bunning	Kerrey	McConnell
Cleland	Kohl	Moynihan
DeWine	Kyl	Torricelli
Durbin	Landrieu	

NOT VOTING—2

Gregg	Inouye

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. COVERDELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3655

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 2 minutes for debate on the Jeffords amendment.

The Senator from Iowa requested order in the Chamber. We need order in the Chamber. We will withhold business until there is order in the Chamber.

Who seeks recognition?

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, this is the Jeffords amendment relating to title VI of the bill. It takes money which is dedicated to school construction and puts it into IDEA and special education.

We have over and over again pledged to fully fund up to 40 percent of the cost of educating children in special education. We have not done that. All of you committed to doing that. We have no comparable historical obligation to contribute money for school construction. That is an option under title VI and will remain an option even if my amendment is approved. We believe we should fund and pay for our current Federal obligations first before we take on new and open ended obligations. It is a promise we have all made. It is a promise we should keep.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I agree with my distinguished colleague from Vermont that it would be desirable to put more money into the program for individuals with disabilities. But in constructing this bill, we have tried to fashion it in a way that it will be signed by the President. We have put the money into construction to meet requests with the proviso that if the local boards do not need it for construction, or want it, they can use it as they choose. If we had additional funds, I would be delighted to acknowledge Senator JEFFORDS' request. But in its present form, we cannot take those funds without increasing the chance of a veto.

This carefully constructed bill ought to stand. Therefore, I move to table the Jeffords amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 3655. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 159 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Baucus	Feinstein	Moynihan
Bayh	Gorton	Murray
Bennett	Graham	Reed
Biden	Harkin	Reid
Bingaman	Hatch	Robb
Boxer	Hollings	Rockefeller
Breaux	Johnson	Roth
Bryan	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Byrd	Kerrey	Schumer
Cleland	Kerry	Specter
Conrad	Kohl	Stevens
Daschle	Landrieu	Thompson
Dodd	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dorgan	Levin	Warner
Durbin	Lieberman	Wellstone
Edwards	Lincoln	Wyden

NAYS—47

Abraham	Enzi	Mack
Allard	Fitzgerald	McCain
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Brownback	Grams	Nickles
Bunning	Grassley	Roberts
Burns	Hagel	Santorum
Campbell	Helms	Sessions
Chafee, L.	Hutchinson	Shelby
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith (NH)
Collins	Inhofe	Smith (OR)
Coverdell	Jeffords	Snowe
Craig	Kyl	Thomas
Crapo	Leahy	Thurmond
DeWine	Lott	Voinovich
Domenici	Lugar	

NOT VOTING—2

Gregg	Inouye

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HARKIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 4762

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives from the House the campaign disclosure bill, it be immediately placed on the calendar. I further ask unanimous consent that it become the pending business after the final vote this evening—just concluded—and that it be considered under the following agreement: 30 minutes for total debate on the bill to be equally divided in the usual form; that no amendments be in order; that following the disposition of the time, the bill be automatically advanced to third reading and passage occur, all without any intervening action or debate, with the vote occurring on passage at 9:40 a.m. on Thursday, with 7 minutes for closing remarks prior to the vote, with 5 of those minutes under the control of Senator MCCAIN. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that following the passage of the bill, the action on the McCain amendment No. 3214 be vitiated and the amendment then be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WARNER. Reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I first say to my distinguished colleague and friend of almost a quarter of a century, JOHN MCCAIN, I judge this action will enable the defense bill then to no longer have this amendment, and at what point will that occur?

Mr. COVERDELL. That needs to be addressed to the Parliamentarian.

Mr. MCCAIN. Immediately following the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be withdrawn following passage of the bill tomorrow.

Mr. WARNER. I want to make certain I hear. The Chair and the distinguished Senator from Arizona were speaking at the same time. Can it be repeated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Following final passage of the bill tomorrow, the amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. WARNER. And that bill being?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H.R. 4762.

Mr. WARNER. That clarifies it. I thank the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WARNER. If I might just continue, I have consulted with the majority leader, and it is hoped at a subsequent time we can clarify when the Department of Defense bill can be brought up because I know the distinguished Democratic whip, who has helped tremendously on this bill, as have others, is anxious to see this Defense authorization bill move forward; am I not correct, I say to Senator REID?

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from Virginia, I have spoken with the comanager of the bill, Senator LEVIN, and we are anxious to get to this bill. We have a defined number of amendments. We have spoken to proponents of the amendments. I think it is something we can dispose of within a few hours.

Mr. WARNER. Good. That is interesting. I see my distinguished ranking member.

Mr. REID. I did not see Senator LEVIN. I am very sorry.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator will yield, I agree with our whip. It is our intention to, No. 1, limit amendments to relevant amendments, if we can, and, No. 2, begin to work through those amendments and eliminate as many as possible that do not need to be offered, modifying some, agreeing to some, and, if necessary, obviously voting on some. We will be working very hard with our good friend, the chairman of our committee, to proceed through the bill as soon as it is before the Senate, and the moment it is, we think we can make some real progress.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleagues. I hope germaneness will prevail as to the amendments that come up on this bill.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been requested. Is there objection?

Mr. WARNER. There is no objection.

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

THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 2001—Continued

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending motion to waive be laid aside and Senator FRIST be recognized to offer his amendment regarding education and that no second-degree amendments be in order prior to the vote in relation to the amendment. I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the Frist amendment immediately following the debate on H.R. 4762, and the vote occur in a stacked sequence beginning at 9:40 a.m. under the same terms as outlined for H.R. 4762.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HARKIN. Reserving the right to object, we have not seen a copy of the Frist amendment yet. I want to have it described or see a copy so we know to what we are agreeing. I do not think that is an unreasonable request.

Mr. COVERDELL. I am sorry, I thought the conference on this side was over the Frist amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. I heard conflicting things about it, and I want to see how it is written.

Mr. COVERDELL. Do we have a copy at the desk?

Mr. HARKIN. Just let us see it. I have no objection.

Mr. COVERDELL. I propound the unanimous consent I just read.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I ask the unanimous consent request be amended so that after the disposition of the Frist amendment, Senator DASCHLE be allowed to offer an amendment; following the disposition of that, the Republicans will offer an amendment; and following that, Senator DORGAN will offer an amendment.

Mr. COVERDELL. I amend it so that the Republican amendment will be the Ashcroft amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HARKIN. Inquiry: We are asking unanimous consent that following the Frist amendment, Senator DASCHLE be recognized for an amendment, Senator ASHCROFT be recognized for an amendment, and then Senator DORGAN be recognized for an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Following disposition of the Frist amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986 AMENDMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4762) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require 527 organizations to disclose their political activities.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased we have reached an agreement to consider and almost certainly pass H.R. 4762, which passed the House last night by an overwhelming vote of 385–39. Tomorrow will be a historic day. For the first time since 1979,