

and spirited citizens. Perhaps best known as the owner and publisher of The STAR newspaper, Mr. Woodring led the weekly newspaper for 45 years and was one of the city's most outspoken commentators. He worked tirelessly to inform the people of North Augusta and to remind the community's public officials that their ultimate responsibility was to the citizens who placed them in office. His work the STAR newspaper earned him great respect within the journalism community of South Carolina and he won numerous awards from the South Carolina Press Association, including the prestigious Elijah Parish Lovejoy Award for Courage in Journalism.

However, the significant contributions Mr. Woodring made during his lifetime are not limited to his role with The STAR newspaper. He also served the people of North Augusta as the president of the Chamber of Commerce, and he was a recipient of the Order of the Palmetto, South Carolina's highest civilian honor. In addition, he served his country with honor and courage in the United States Army during World War II.

In conclusion, Sam Woodring was a man of character and integrity who will be greatly missed by a wide circle of friends. He lived a life of accomplishment and made wonderful contributions to the community of North Augusta. He was a true American and a fine South Carolinian, and my heartfelt thoughts and prayers remain with his family during their time of mourning.

TITLE I TARGETING

AMENDMENT NO. 2058

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, I am proud to have joined Senators LANDRIEU, COCHRAN, and DEWINE in offering a truly historic amendment, which will for the first time specifically target new title I funding directly to our nation's poorest communities and schools. In doing so, this amendment will help us move closer to realizing the original promise of title I and, more importantly, help us move closer to realizing the promise we have made to give every child in America a high quality education.

The compromise reached today will provide \$1 billion for the targeted grant formula under title I, which was enacted into law by Congress in 1994 but unfortunately has never actually been funded by appropriators. This agreement ensures that no state, or local school district will lose any funds, but at the same time ensures those school districts with the greatest need and with the greatest challenges will receive a significant boost in resources.

For example in my own State of Connecticut, this would mean our three communities with the greatest poverty and educational needs including Bridgeport, Hartford, and New Haven would receive increases of 25, 35, and 31 percent, respectively, over their cur-

rent funding levels for a combined increase of over \$12.4 million. That is \$12 million more worth of educational services provided and high quality teachers hired to ensure that title I children may achieve academic successes. I would also mean substantial increases in investment for many other communities serving low-income students.

This agreement is by no means perfect. It leaves in place a distribution system that remains badly diluted and seriously inefficient. However, it represents a dramatic change in policy, one that Senator LANDRIEU and I, and the members of the Senate New Democrat Coalition have been fighting for for some time. And we are optimistic that we can build on his breakthrough in the future to really put our education money where our mouth is, and concentrate our resources and our resolve on lifting up our most disadvantaged schools.

Most immediately, this amendment makes a strong statement, acknowledging that title I is just not working as it was intended. The original goal of this critical program was to compensate for local funding inequities within States and help level the playing field for low-income children. But the 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.

As my colleagues know, Federal funds for poor children are currently distributed through two grants, basic and concentration. In order to be eligible for basic grants, which comprise the bulk of current title I funds, local districts only need to have 10 school-age children from low-income families, and these children must constitute only 2 percent of the total school-age population. Under the concentration grants, districts with a child poverty rate of 15 percent are eligible to receive funding. As a result of these low threshold, title I funding has been spread too thin and too wide. In fact, according to a 1999 CRS report, title I grants are provided to approximately 90 percent of all local school districts, and 58 percent of all public schools. Even worse, because title I has not been close to fully funded, these diluted formulas have left little aid available for many of the country's poorest students. CRS found that one fifth of all schools with concentrations of poverty between 50 and 75 percent do not receive a dime of title I funding.

In examining these inequities we also cannot ignore the growing impact that concentration of poverty is having on the academic achievement of our nation's school children, particularly those who live in disadvantaged communities. America's top 150 highest poverty cities have 40 percent of our all title I students. Students in these cities face many challenges, none greater than the pervasive poverty that sur-

rounds them. Studies show that, even after controlling for student's socioeconomic background, concentration of poverty has an important negative effect on student achievement.

For example, a U.S. Department of Education study found that "The relationship between family poverty status and student achievement is not as strong as the relationship between school poverty concentrations and school achievement averages." An Urban Institute study of public-housing students in Albuquerque, NM found that, after controlling for home environment, if a poor child lived in a neighborhood and attended school with 20 percent poverty rather than 80 percent poverty, that child's standardized test scores were likely to improve by 13 percentage points.

Concentration of poverty does create a barrier to educational achievement, but that barrier is not impenetrable. University of Tennessee's William Sanders found that high concentrations of poverty do not on their own preclude or prevent schools from raising student achievement. Low-achieving students are often the first to gain, and experience the greatest gains, from quality instruction. Unfortunately, only a small share of our federal resources are getting to the districts most in need of critical funds, which limits the ability of those districts to hire the most qualified instructors and provide the best services.

The Federal Government alone cannot solve this grave inequity. We can only supplement state and local funding, but cannot supplant those resources, and states and localities must do more to target their own resources. A recent Education Trust analysis of funding inequities reveals that school districts with the greatest numbers of poor children have less money to spend per student than districts with the fewest poor children. And a growing body of research shows, according to the Education Trust report, that additional dollars, if directed at the most critical activities, can significantly raise the achievement of poor and minority students.

But the Federal Government can make a real and consequential contribution, both in terms of leadership and of leverage of national resources, and this amendment aims to do both. As I have noted, it will significantly improve the targeting of Federal dollars. But it also includes a second piece that will help reduce the inequities within states. In addition to funding the targeted formula for the first time, this amendment also funds the State finance and incentive grant formula for the first time, a formula intended to reward states that have made real strides in eliminating funding gaps with their own resources.

The amendment calls for channeling \$500 million through this fourth formula, which is commonly known as the "Effort and Equity" formula. Although I share the concerns raised by many

that the current design of this formula has substantial flaws and should be modified so that truly meets its intended goal, I also share the belief of my colleague from Iowa that we should do more at the federal level to prompt states to better equalize their own funding.

That is why I am committed to seeing improvements made to the effort and equity formula through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act conference that is currently pending. I commend Senator HARKIN for his willingness to reexamine and overhaul this formula so that it better targets funds within states to the districts with the highest concentrations of poverty. And I look forward to working with him and with a common focus to improve the fairness and the performance of title I. In achieving this goal, I believe that we can further work together to see even more funds appropriated to the targeted formula as the appropriations process moves forward.

The compromise we have struck today might not be politically popular or perfect, but it is a great beginning and a way to draw our attention back to the original intent of the ESEA and the primary function of the Federal Government in education. It is a bold step forward, one that I believe that we can only enhance as the appropriations process as well as the ESEA conference moves forward, and I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting it.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred in April 1995 in Seattle, WA. Ian West, 29, was arrested for attacking a gay man. Mr. West was subsequently sentenced to five days in jail, ordered to pay restitution, perform community service, and complete an anger management class.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

DONALD TAYER: IN MEMORIAM

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, on October 26th, I was deeply saddened to learn of the passing of San Francisco Bay Area resident, Donald Tayer.

I have known Don Tayer and his family since the beginning of my career in

public office, when I served as a Marin County supervisor and Don served as councilmember and mayor of the town of Tiburon. He was a multitalented man who cared deeply for his community.

In addition to his work as a local elected official, Don Tayer forged a distinguished legal career as a senior partner in the firm of Beeson, Tayer & Bodine. For 25 years, he served as Executive Secretary in the San Francisco office of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists (AFTRA) and the Screen Actors Guild; he served as counsel to the Actors' Equity Association and the American Guild of Musical Artists; he was the very first recipient of the Annual Bill Hillman Award, in recognition of his service to AFTRA's San Francisco local; and in August of this year he received AFTRA's National George Heller Memorial Gold Card—the highest honor bestowed by the union—for his many and remarkable contributions.

He was an adjunct professor in the School of Urban and Public Affairs at Golden Gate University and former chairman of the Labor and Employment Law Section of the Bar Association of San Francisco.

Don also somehow found the time to enjoy a rich cultural and community life. He was president of the San Francisco Bay Area Chapter of the American Jewish Committee for 5 years, and continued to serve as a member of the Committee's National Board of Governors. He was a recipient of its Distinguished Service Award in 1987.

Don Tayer served on the Marin Arts Council and was both president and a member of the Board of Directors of San Francisco's Center for the Arts at Yerba Buena Gardens—where a memorial tribute will be held on December 1st.

I offer my condolences to Don's wonderful wife Joyce; to his children Lisa and Marc and his four grandchildren.●

TRIBUTE TO KATHRYN KAY AND HER "THANKSGIVING PRAYER"

• Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to a wonderful Utah woman, mother, and nationally published poet, Ms. Kathryn Kay. I also want to relate a remarkable story concerning Ms. Kay and a poem she wrote more than 60 years ago.

The poem, "Thanksgiving Prayer," and the story behind it could have happened today. Its message is timely, its impetus notable.

"Thanksgiving Prayer" was part of a book of poems *If the Shoe Fits*, written by Kathryn Kay. The book was sold out of a little book store in the heart of Hollywood, California, where Ms. Kay was living and working at the time. The book, and its ensuing poem, were read and well-liked by many Hollywood stars, including the wife of the legendary veteran film actor, Hobart Bosworth.

At that time, the Nation was about to embark on a celebration commemo-

rating the sesquicentennial of the ratification of the Bill of Rights. Mrs. Bosworth was serving as the Pacific Coast chairwoman of the celebration, and in that role was able to give the poem, "Thanksgiving Prayer," to President Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt. She framed it in gold and presented it to Eleanor Roosevelt for her work in improving the cultural arts. Kathryn also officially dedicated the poem to her with "sincere appreciation of her example, which causes women of today to build for tomorrow."

Mrs. Bosworth also arranged for this poem to be part of the Southern California Bill of Rights Celebration. She had the poem cast on a large bronze plaque, ready to be placed on Mt. Whitney, and read at the beginning of the official week long celebration of the Bill of Rights, as proclaimed by President Roosevelt. The date for the ceremony was December 7, 1941.

As history so tragically reminds us, no celebrations took place that day; America was attacked, and we were at war.

The bronze plaque was melted down to make bullet casings for the war America was battling. The heartfelt words of gratitude for America would not be immortalized.

Ms. Kay went on to publish many more poems, and two more books of poetry. She returned to Utah, and continued her career in live television and as a columnist for the Salt Lake Tribune. She married Lee Pratt, and raised two wonderful sons.

But her love for poetry never dimmed. Kathryn Kay has been a driving force for many, many years in Utah to promote poetry, from the high school to the professional society level. She helped found the Utah State Poetry Society, and served two terms as its president. In fact, well into her late 80s, she continued to edit the society's yearly publication.

Kathryn is 95 years old, still living in Utah, and still touching the lives of those around her. Perhaps her greatest tribute recently came from her son, Jim. He described his mother this way: "She is a happy breath of sunshine, who appreciates life and makes life better for everyone she meets."

I pay tribute to Kathryn Kay today, and in turn, share with the Nation the words penned by her so many years ago. As we all pause during the next few weeks to celebrate the holiday season in our own way, I hope that the words of this poem written during another time of conflict and war will serve to strengthen us and remind us of the blessings we share as Americans.

The poem follows:

THANKSGIVING PRAYER

God ev'ry year about this time,
according to routine,
I've bowed my head in the accepted way
and offered thanks, like some well syn-
chronized machine.
that prayed because it was the time to pray.
But, God, this year is different, this year I
seem to feel