

The President has proposed that we make needed investments in reducing class size and modernizing our schools. He is making that speech against a background of a GAO report that schools have \$112 billion in repair and modernization needs that they cannot address.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask for an additional minute and a half.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. We ought to be doing all we can to repair and modernize the nation's public schools.

What kind of message are we sending to every child in America who goes to a school with leaking pipes, exposed wiring, broken windows, faulty heating systems, and no air conditioning? The message we are sending to every child is, they don't make a difference, they don't count.

We believe, and the President believes, that the children count, and it is important to provide them with safe, modern schools. We are here in these final days, to make sure that, unlike the Republican judgment that was made in the House of Representatives in June of this past year, any budget that is going to bear the President's signature or have our vote is going to make these needed investments in education that are essential for every working family in this country.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator agree with me that with this emphasis on the global economy, if we don't educate our children to the fullest measure of their capacity, we are not going to be able to compete internationally? It has assumed a dimension now that we have never confronted before in terms of our economic survival in the world economy.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is absolutely correct. By every kind of indicator of which countries are going to continue to survive and prosper in a world economy, education is the linchpin for these initiatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

EDUCATION

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, it has been interesting to listen to the Senator from Massachusetts beating so industriously upon a dead horse. But the issue before the Congress, I suspect, in these last few days is not going to be on the level of support that the Congress and our appropriations bill provides for the education of our children in all 50 States across the country.

The debate now between the President and the leadership who are work-

ing on this budget is over who gets to spend it. The President believes, and the Senator from Massachusetts has outlined in his remarks a whole series of categorical aid programs—money for this specific program, money for that specific program—each of which carries with it its own bureaucracy here in Washington, DC, and, generally speaking, a bureaucracy of the State and always administrators in each school district to fill out all of the forms and to make all of the applications for assistance from the Federal Government. To that extent, an individual school district is lucky if 60 cents or 70 cents out of every dollar supposedly devoted by the Federal Government to education, in fact, ever gets to the classroom and to the students.

No, the battle in these last few days is not going to be over whether or not we shouldn't supply perhaps another billion dollars or more than a billion dollars above what we are already appropriating for the education of our children. It is going to be over whether or not we trust the teachers, the parents, the principals, the superintendents, the elected school board members and thousands of school districts across the United States to determine how that money can be most effectively spent on their students.

Mr. CRAIG. Will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. GORTON. He will.

Mr. CRAIG. About a year ago, the Senator from Washington came to the floor and offered an amendment that would dramatically change the way money flows out of Washington back to local schools, local units of education. And as I remember, there was a resounding vote here on the floor in favor of that.

Mr. GORTON. The Senator from Idaho exaggerates a little bit. It was a winning vote; it wasn't quite resounding.

Mr. CRAIG. It was a dramatic vote in the sense that Senators were voting their conscience about where the public wanted the educational dollar to go, not to get bound up in the Federal bureaucracy and have a lot of it spun off here, as the President apparently would want, but for that money to move right back to local units of education. Is that not true, and was that not the goal of this Congress?

Mr. GORTON. This Senate voted for just such a program last year. This Senate voted for just such a program this year. This Senate did so, I am convinced, because while the Federal Government, in spite of all of the speeches on the floor of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, comes up with only about 7 or 8 percent of the money that is spent in our schools that are, of course, primarily locally and State-operated, it comes up with 50 or 60 percent of the rules and regulations that must be met by our school districts, by hiring administrators, not teachers, people to fill out forms and read Federal regulations rather than li-

brarians and new equipment for our students.

It was our attempt last year, and has been our attempt this year, and I hope and trust will be our policy when we finish an appropriations bill in a few days, that we trust the people in the States and in our communities and in our schools to come up with better judgments about the varying priorities of their students than can President Clinton or a Department of Education bureaucracy here in Washington, DC.

The thrust of the point that I have been attempting to make for a couple of years now is just exactly that: Where should this money be spent? Are we the experts here in this body on how each of 14,000 school districts should go about educating its children? Or is the true expertise in those school districts themselves?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Kentucky is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me just 2 minutes?

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I would like to give everybody some time, but I don't have but 15 minutes myself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might have 20 minutes so I can yield to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Is there objection?

Mr. CRAIG. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Will the Senator restate his unanimous consent request?

Mr. FORD. I say to my friend from Idaho, I have 15 minutes. The Senator from Maryland would like to have a couple of minutes. I ask my time be extended so I can give him up to 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAIG. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. FORD. I yield 5 minutes to my friend from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

A PARTNERSHIP IN EDUCATION

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I want to say in view of the comments that were just made, the Eisenhower Program, I ask the Senator from Massachusetts, that dealt with math and science as I understand it?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SARBANES. That was a program that we put into place during the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SARBANES. As I recall, it was done on an overwhelming bipartisan basis.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct again.

Mr. SARBANES. It was designed to improve the quality of math and science teachers in the classroom. Now we are being told we are trying to direct where the funds should go. The first point I want to make is that this has a long pedigree coming right from the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SARBANES. Yes, I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. DURBIN. I think it is very interesting. The comments made by the Senator from the State of Washington suggested an enormous percentage of the funds which were being appropriated at the Federal level were spent on administration. I have in my hand an April 1998 report by the Secretary of Education that was requested by appropriators from Congress that is based on data from States, the Coopers & Lybrand financial analysis model, and GAO reports, completed this summer, which I think should be part of the RECORD on this debate, and it says:

One-half of 1 percent of the Federal funding for elementary and secondary education programs is spent on Federal administration.

One-half of 1 percent.

States retain on average an additional 2 percent. The remaining 97.5 percent goes to local school districts.

End of quote from the report. To suggest that it is 50 to 60 percent cost of administration really doesn't square with the facts given us in this report.

Across more than 20 major State formula programs, States, in fiscal year 1995, retained an average of only 4 percent of the money at the State level; they distributed the remaining 96 percent to school districts and other recipients, such as colleges and universities. For the program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the percent retained at the State level was even lower—about 2 percent. For Title I, the largest Federal elementary and secondary program, States retain only about 1 percent of the funds. . .

The Department uses a very small portion of our appropriation for Federal administration. In fiscal year 1999, we will expend only about \$87 million to administer some \$20 billion in elementary and secondary programs; these funds come from a separate Program Administration budget account, not from funds appropriated for grants to States or school districts. Even with the addition of related research, leadership, and operations costs, the Department spends only the equivalent of about 0.5 percent of elementary and secondary funds for Federal administration.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the Senator for his intervention. That is a very important point. Because the critics stand up and say it is all going to administration. Now we learn 2.5 percent of it, Federal and State, as I understand it from the Senator, is going to administration. I think we need to underscore that.

I want to come back to this notion that we are trying to direct where the money should go and somehow that is a departure from past practice or hasn't in the past, at least, had strong bipartisan support.

It is clear that math and science is one of the critical areas. I earlier asked

the Senator, wasn't this whole education emphasis important to the U.S. competitive role in the world economy. We can look at what other countries are doing, and we know the kind of investments they are making in math and science. We started with the Eisenhower administration, and that, I think, was at the time of Sputnik that that program was energized to try to improve the quality of math and science. We had some successes, but there has been a relapse, there has been a lapse back, and one of the programs that was cut, as I understand it from the Senator from Massachusetts, and which he is emphasizing we need to restore, is this program to improve the quality of the math and science teachers in the schools all across our country. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, absolutely correct.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, it seems to me—and the other program, I take it, is we have a deterioration in the physical quality of many of our public schools in the Nation. Young children are going to school in circumstances that no one would tolerate. In fact, I understand some of these schools do not meet ordinary building standards. And there are serious problems in that regard.

Once again, we are trying to emphasize a program. Of course, another aspect of what the President is pushing for is more teachers in the classrooms so we can have smaller class sizes, which most people agree is extremely important in the lower grades where we are trying to teach reading and we first introduce young people into their education.

In fact, I ask the Senator, what is the situation with respect to overcrowded classrooms across the country?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is quite correct in his general summation of the approach of the President. And that is: One, to have smaller class sizes; two, to upgrade and modernize schools; three, to have an effective after-school program; four, to enhance the quality of teaching in the classroom; five, to ensure that we are going to have access to the new technology and that that is going to be available in the public schools so these children are going to be able to move ahead; six, to raise academic standards for all children; and then seven, to try to get the encouragement to those students to go on to higher education.

That is all part of the partnership, among the local community, the States, and the Federal Government. This is not just a singular effort; this is a partnership. And when you eliminate the Federal assistance in that partnership, you undermine critical support for improving education that is so important to families and their children.

Mr. SARBANES. If I recall the chart that the Senator earlier displayed on juvenile crime, it peaks in the hours I think between about 3 and 8 p.m., which makes the after-school programs extremely important.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Maryland has expired.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has 15 minutes.

Mr. FORD. I yield the floor, Mr. President, and will take my time later because some here need to go ahead. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has up to 30 minutes under the previous order.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, in the last 15 years America has been invaded by what has been known as information technology. Like the body snatchers of "Alien" that penetrated deep into the human body, computers and communication technologies have penetrated deep into our lives. Unfortunately, the "Alien" metaphor may not be apt since for the most part we have invited this force into our homes.

We invited these technologies into our homes and our businesses because they allowed us to do things faster, to do things better and to do things cheaper. Among other things these technologies have reduced the cost of running a home, made our businesses more competitive, opened new markets by bringing buyers and sellers closer together, and expanded the horizons of our students not to mention adding entertainment value to our lives.

The good news of computer and associated communication technology have been offset by our growing dependence. To see how much we are dependent one need only look at the high level of concern surrounding the Y2K problem. Computer software is written so that at a second after midnight on January 1, 2000, while hundreds of millions of humans will be celebrating the end of an old millennium and the beginning of a new, our computers will act as if it is January 1, 1900. To the machines this will be the equivalent of day light saving century.

To some this is the beginning of a humorous and good news story: No income tax, a chance to correct the terrible mistakes of the past 100 years, and so forth. However, for those who operate our banking, emergency response, air traffic control, and power systems this will be nothing to laugh at. So dire are the predictions of some who understand how dependent on computers and software we have become that they talk as though they are storing up food and medical supplies just in case.

None of this would have happened if the century had ended 20 years earlier because computers, chips, and microprocessors were not yet running things. Twenty years ago I was hearing people tell me about how computers were