CONDEMNATION OF CHINESE MISSILE TESTS IN THE TAIWAN STRAITS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, we are currently in the middle of a very tense period in the relationship between the United States, the People's Republic of China, and Taiwan. Military tensions, in particular, are rising. Last week, China began a week-long series of ballistic missile tests and announced it will conduct an additional set of live fire military maneuvers as well. I urge China to cancel these tests and maneuvers. Together they constitute the fourth set of major military exercises the People's Liberation Army has undertaken in the straits since last July. They are provocative, destabilizing, and only damage China's image in the eyes of the world.

There is no reason to disbelieve China's public claim that it is not planning an actual attack on Taiwan at this time. But I do not believe that these are merely routine military maneuvers, as Chinese officials have portrayed them. These tests, and the military exercises that preceded them last year, are clearly meant to intimidate the people of Taiwan in the run-up to the first fully democratic presidential election in the history of Chinese civilization. But the escalation in both scope and nature of this week's exercises raises the risk that conflict could start through miscalculation or accident. It is essential that all parties work to prevent an armed conflict that no one wants.

Chinese Premier Li Peng stated in a speech to the National People's Congress that the Taiwan issue was an internal affair and warned other countries not to interfere. In this regard I support the long-standing United States position that the issue of reunification be handled by the Chinese people on both sides of the straits, but that policy was founded on the understanding that the question of Taiwan would be resolved peacefully. When the leadership in Beijing threatens to use force against Taiwan, it challenges that understanding and Beijing itself creates an international issue. Beijing must understand that the United States does not view Chinese threats toward Taiwan as an internal Chinese affair. The United States has a strong interest in peace and stability in the Taiwan Straits. It has a strong interest in the continued prosperity of the region—Taiwan is the world's 14th largest trading economy and the 7th largest United States trading partner. These exercises are disrupting shipping and continued military maneuvers will inevitably make investors and traders think twice about doing business in the region.

China has repeatedly sought to be considered a responsible member of the world community in a number of international fora. But if it wants the international respect it feels it deserves, it must follow that community's norms of behavior. Threatening Taiwan is not acceptable to that community. Beijing should stop these missile tests and military maneuvers and re-open talks with Taiwan through its own Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Straits and Taiwan's Straits Exchange Foundation. Negotiations between these two entities were successful in resolving a number of issues between Beijing and Taipei before China cut them off last year. China should again use these talks, and not the military, to persuade the people and the Government on Taiwan.

KELLY McCALLA, SOUTH CAROLINA'S 1997 TEACHER OF THE YEAR

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I am delighted to congratulate Kelly McCalla on being named the 1997 Teacher of the Year for the State of South Carolina. For 11 years, Ms. McCalla has dedicated herself to educating the young people of Greenwood in her own inimitable style. She is an inspiration to anyone who aspires to do a job well and win the respect of others.

As a teacher of science at Oakland Elementary School, Kelly McCalla engages students' minds and imaginations. As a member of the community, her contributions are vast. Whether organizing special youth events through her local church or participating in summer Bible School, Ms. McCalla contributes to local children's education outside the classroom as well. She is active in other programs that benefit the community at large such as Meals on Wheels, programs for needy children, and caroling at a local nursing home.

Obviously, she is willing to teach by example the importance of being involved in the community.

The award for South Carolina Teacher of the Year is given to educators who are representative of the many excellent teachers across the State, and it is clear that Ms. McCalla is worthy of this title. Said State Superintendent of Education Barbara S. Neilsen, ''The State selection committee saw the same magic in Kelly McCalla that her students do.''

These days, with everyone worrying about children's education, not just in terms of school but in terms of moral values, it is truly a pleasure to be able to honor someone like Kelly McCalla. She is instilling in her students something more than a knowledge of science, she is showing them how to love learning and to be involved, caring, decent people. And that is something that only a gifted educator can do. I send her my congratulations, my thanks, and my best wishes in the future.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

BALANCED BUDGET DOWNPAYMENT ACT, II

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate, H.R. 3019.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3019) making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 to make a further downpayment toward a balanced budget, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Hatfield modified amendment No. 3466, in the nature of a substitute.

Daschle (for Harkin) amendment No. 3467 (to amendment No. 3466) to restore $3.1 billion funding for education programs to the fiscal year 1995 levels.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

AMENDMENT NO. 3467

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise to speak on behalf of an amendment that a number of us have introduced which adds back $3.1 billion to education programs to restore education funding to fiscal year 1995 levels.

Mr. President, I will summarize. This amendment restores funding for the following programs: Goals 2000, title I, safe and drug-free schools, charter schools, vocational and adult education, educational technology, Head Start, dislocated workers, adult training, school-to-work, summer jobs for youth, and one-stop career centers.

Mr. President, as the minority leader pointed out yesterday, we have offsets for this increased funding. Mr. President, let me, first of all, say to my colleagues, and especially to my very good friend, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, whom—you do not call people heroes unless they truly are, and he is to me, one of the great Senators in the history of the country. I really believe it was a terrible mistake for the House of Representatives to send over a continuing resolution with these very deep cuts in education.

Mr. President, as I think about where we are in the country right now, it seems to me that people in our Nation are saying very clearly that they care about opportunities. They worry about their children, and they want all of God's children to have opportunities. Mr. President, I just think that slamming the door of opportunity for children is a huge mistake. I think that some of the discussion about children of the next generation—absolutely, we

need to pay the interest off on the debt. But you do not save the children of the next generation by savaging the children of this generation.

Mr. President, I think that as we look at where we are in the country and where we need to go together, Democrats, Republicans, independents, you name it, each and every time, I would emphasize a good education as a foundation of it all—for welfare reform, for reducing poverty, for a stable middle class, for economic performance, for a functioning democracy; each and every time, I would say you need to emphasize a good education and a good job.

Mr. President, I have tried to be an education Senator. I spend time, about every 2½ or 3 weeks, at a school in Minnesota teaching. I was a teacher for 20 years. I have to tell you that the shame of all of this is that, for some reason, we have not looked very carefully—or at least the Gingrich-led House has not—at what these cuts will mean in human terms. I will not even give you the statistics, Mr. President. But I will tell you this: If I was to just take the title I program in my State of Minnesota, which is a $13.5 million cut right now in this continuing resolution, the very negative effects this will have on children is absolutely unbelievable.

We want children at a young age to be wide-eyed. We want them to be experiencing all of the unnamed magic in the world before them. We want them to be nurtured. We want them to be encouraged. What do we do with title I money in Minnesota? Talk to the teachers and talk to the parents—the title I parents in Minneapolis-St. Paul. What do we do? We give kids at the elementary school level one-on-one—I know you, Mr. President, are very committed to children—one-on-one instruction.

I met a mother yesterday. She said, ''My son was a slow reader falling behind, not doing well. From title I he received that special attention, one-on-one instruction, through some additional teachers and teacher assistants. He is now a seventh grader in junior high school, and he is a straight-A student. I come here today to tell you that if not for title I, I do not know where he would be.''

Title I money is not just a bureaucratic program. It works. I was at a school, Jackson Elementary School in St. Paul, with a wonderful principal, Louis Mariucci, which is a great hockey name in Minnesota from the Iron Range. He is committed to the inner-city school, and they are doing well. The students have high achievement levels. It is diverse. It is rooted in the neighborhood.

When I was meeting with a class of third graders and then a class of fourth graders, I asked these kids how many languages are spoken at home. In one class there were three different languages spoken in the homes, and in another class there were four different languages. Then I met with the parents later on from the Hmung community and the Laotian community.

Mr. President, we say we want the parents to be involved. Well, there were two young people who are translators. They are proud because they could use their ability. They were bilingual to help other kids that were younger. They had graduated from college. There are jobs for them. The parents could participate. I could understand what they were saying to me as a Senator. The teachers could and do understand what I was saying.

Mr. President, that is funded out of title I money. That school, Jackson Elementary School, which is an outstanding success, does not know where it is going to be next year because of these deep, draconian, mean-spirited cuts in funds which provide opportunity for our children. Mr. President, is this not shortsighted?

Other examples: Meet with some of the teachers that are title I teachers. They will tell you about the ways in which that money is used for literacy training for adults, the parents, so that they can be involved. They talk about ways in which parents are involved in the kids' education. In school after school after school, whether it is Minneapolis-St. Paul, whether it is Rochester, whether it is Fergus Falls, whether it is Bemidji, whether it is Duluth, whether it is the Iron Range, over and over and over again there are success stories where this title I money was used to provide kids from difficult backgrounds, kids who were disadvantaged, with the additional one-on-one support they needed in reading or mathematics so they could do well at the elementary school level and then go on and do well in school. And we are going to cut this program? What kind of distorted priorities are these?

Mr. President, I wish every one of my colleagues was on the floor right now, especially on the other side. Little kids do not understand budgets. Little kids do not know what ''continuing resolution'' means. Little kids do not know what the ''Congressional Budget Office scoring'' means. Little kids in Minnesota, Massachusetts, Oregon, Ohio, and all across this country do not understand why they cannot receive help to be better readers. Do my colleagues have any answers for them? They do not understand the budgets. They do not understand why they do not get any help. They do not know why they are not getting help so they can do better in reading classes. They do not know why they are not getting any help so they can be better in mathematics. They do not know why they are not receiving help.

Mr. President, a definition from an elementary school student on leadership—I say this to my colleague from Massachusetts. I think he fits this definition. An elementary school student's definition of ''leader.'' ''A leader is someone who gets things done to make things better.'' ''A leader is someone who gets things done to make things better.'' Kids know what is right, and I say to my colleagues that they know what is wrong. We should not kid ourselves. To cut title I money from my State of Minnesota, or any other State, to shut off children from the opportunities they need, from the support they need so they can reach their full potential, is not right.

Leaders are Senators who get things done to make things better. This amendment that restores some funding for educational opportunities for children gets things done to make things better.

Cameron Dick, from South Minneapolis, testified last week in a hearing. Cameron Dick had dropped out of school. He is a native American. He was ''going nowhere.'' But the School-to-Work Program saved him. Working with the American Indian Opportunities Center, he now goes to school, has a job, sees the connection between his schooling and a work opportunity, and in his spare time—you will love this—he tutors other children.

I met a young woman yesterday in St. Paul, MN. I am embarrassed; I forget the last name. The first name is Erika. She is a Hispanic woman who came to Minnesota from California. She has lived in some communities with some very difficult circumstances. She had dropped out of school for several years and then went back to school in the School-to-Work Program at Humboldt High School on the west side of St. Paul and found herself an apprenticeship program with a business, began to study accounting, now has a job, is proud of her work, makes a decent income, and is now going to go on and pursue higher education.

These are not the programs we ought to be cutting. I mean, what is the House of Representatives trying to say to people in this country? ''We will not shut the Government down, but the price we exact for not shutting the Government down is to cut Pell grants or to cut Head Start or to cut low-interest Perkins loan programs or cut vocational education or cut title I or cut safe and drug-free schools. These are not the priorities of people in this country.

Mr. President, I believe that this debate on this amendment to restore $3 billion in funding for children for education and for opportunities is one of the most important debates that we are going to have. This is all about who we are as Senators, whom we represent, what values we believe in, and what our priorities are.

I say to some of my colleagues, especially on the House side, that your agenda is too harsh, your agenda is too extreme, and it is a profound mistake for us to begin to divest from children.

It is a profound mistake for this Nation to abandon children. It is a profound mistake for this Nation to move away from providing opportunities for children.

I will conclude. Little kids do not understand budgets. Little kids do not understand why we cannot help them. Little kids who are trying hard do not understand why we cannot help them do better in school. And that is exactly what we ought to be doing because this is the very essence of the American dream.

There is a former teacher from Northfield, Joanne Jorgensen, who is visiting with me today with her husband, Paul, who is an education professor at Carlton College. Much of politics is personal. Our daughter, Marsha, when she was in elementary school at least up through around fifth grade I would say, was put in a lot of the lower classes. No matter what we call those classes, ''blackbirds'' or ''redbirds,'' everybody knows who are the students that are not doing well. Some of the other kids were calling her a ''retard,'' and as parents it was painful to see your own little girl or to see any little girl or any little boy not feel good about himself or herself, but this was our daughter. Then Joanne Jorgenson became the teacher, and Joanne Jorgenson said to Marsha, ''Marsha, you are not stupid. You can draw. You are an artist. Marsha, you are not stupid. You can write poetry. You have rhythm. Marsha, you are a smart little girl. You are not dumb. You can do well.''

Now be a proud Jewish father. By the time Marsha finished high school, she was a great student and she went on to the University of Wisconsin-Madison, top Spanish student and she is a great Spanish teacher at the high school level. She is a public schoolteacher. I do not know whether she would have been able to do that were it not for Joanne Jorgenson. This is the kind of support that we give students. And Marsha did not come from some of the difficult background circumstances that a lot of the students come from that are able to receive the support they need from title I or vocational education or school-to-work Programs or, for God sake, the Head Start Program. The Head Start Program is what we say it is. We have decided as a nation that we are going to give certain kids a head start.

This is a profound mistake. Do not divest from children. Do not divest from education. Do not divest from opportunities for children. Our amendment restores this $3 billion, and we should do so.

Mr. President, my final point. My final two points, and I promise my colleagues only two points. Point No. 1. I do not want to stand out on the floor of the Senate and argue for this amendment just on the basis of reducing violent crime. I can think of a million reasons why we should invest in education for children beyond that. But I will tell you one thing. Investing in children when they are young and making sure they have the educational opportunities beats the heck out of having to spend money on prisons.

There is a judge, Rick Solum—and maybe my colleagues have heard the statistic before. I have only seen one report on this and maybe it is not corroborated. It is a startling statistic. In Hennepin County, he tells me there is a high correlation between high school dropouts and incarceration, winding up in prison, and cigarette smoking and lung cancer. If the statistic is true, and the judge says it is, that tells a very large story.

I also know, Mr. President—and I try not to do this top-down or outside-school-in—I spend time in schools, Jill and I spend time with street kids, with homeless kids, with at-risk youth, with youth workers, and all of them say the same things: Senators, you have to give these kids positive things to do. You have to give them opportunities.

It starts when they are young. We are never going to stop this cycle of violence by just building prisons. We have to make sure our children in this country, all the children in this country, have hope, have a future that they can believe in, have goals, and have the ability to be able to live for their own dreams. That is what these educational programs mean.

This amendment restores the funding. We should have the support for this amendment, and I look forward to the final vote. I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I rise in strong support of our education amendment, to restore the funding for some of the very basic and fundamental education programs to reaffirm this country's commitment to investment in the young people of our country in the limited but important way in which the Federal Government works in partnership with the States and local communities.

We will have an opportunity to vote on this measure, and I should like to underscore a few of the principal reasons why this issue is of such importance and to review very briefly with the Senate why we are where we are at the present time.

We should understand at the very beginning what is in the legislation and what is not in the legislation. And nothing is clearer than to look at the legislation itself in the final general provisions on page 780. Section 4002 says:

> No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be made available for obligation or expenditure nor any authority granted or be effective until the enactment into law of a subsequent act—

I mention that again for emphasis.

> of a subsequent act entitled ''An Act Incorporating an Agreement Between the President and Congress Relative to Federal Expenditures in Fiscal Year 1996 and Future Fiscal Years.''

This title may be cited as, ''The Contingency Appropriations Act of 1996.''

This is the Contingency Appropriations Act. It is important as we start the debate that we listen to many of our very good friends who say, ''Well, we have really restored a great deal of education funding in this program so that parents should not worry, teachers should not worry, school boards should not worry because we have restored the money, perhaps not all of the money that we would have liked to have done, but, Senator, we have a difficult financial situation and education has to take the hit like anything else.''

I would differ with that and say as to the proposal in the budget, the Republican budget, which provides the tax breaks for wealthy individuals ranging from some $240 billion, or the revision down, one of the proposals, to $178 billion, can you not give us $4 billion of the tax break that is going to go to the wealthiest individuals and fund these essential education programs because, my friends, basically what they are saying is that to be effective there is going to have to be a subsequent act, and that act is going to have to pass the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. That is not going to be a reflection of the will and desire of some of our Republican friends who are strongly committed to education. This legislation is very clear in that there is going to have to be action in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States in order for any of the provisions in here to be effective.

That is not satisfactory. Effectively this comes back now to the question of priorities. Are we going to say we will not even seek any restoration of funding for education until we are going to get the tax breaks for the wealthy individuals? That is effectively what this provision says. You will not hear a lot of people talking about it. You will not hear a lot of people saying, ''Well, look, my Republican friends want that big tax break for the wealthy; can't we take $4 billion off there and just put it right in here on education.''

You will not hear a lot of people saying, ''Yes, that is the way to do it.'' That is not the proposal before us. So we have a measure that says, all right, we are going to put in some real money and we are going to put it in now. We are going to put it in education. We are going to support the school boards, the parents, the teachers who are meeting all over this country even while we are in here this morning with their pencil and paper wondering what they are going to be able to do for the children of this country over the next fiscal year.

That is happening in every city and town in my State and in every other State. I will come back to that in just a moment.

Mr. President, are these programs really worthy of support? I think we have to be able to justify the particular programs that are going to be added to.

We have the Goals 2000 Program that had strong bipartisan support in the last Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike basically accepting what

the Governors had agreed to in Charlottesville that said one of the most important elements in education is raising the bar and the challenge to the young people of this country. They will be able to measure up, if we establish some increased academic challenges to the young people.

That is exactly what Goals 2000 is meant to do, not at the State level but at the local school levels. It is meant to get the funding into schools, get parents involved, get the business community involved, teachers involved, and begin to establish the higher standards for the young people.

Those standards are voluntary and have been worked out in some important areas; for example, in math and in science. A number of communities have accepted those particular standards, and do you know what? The latest review shows there is a measurable improvement in the young people who have been challenged by those standards in math and science. It is beginning to move. The challenges are out there. There is an increase in academic achievement and accomplishment.

The bipartisan Democratic and Republican Governors who supported the concept of the Goals 2000 is beginning to work, but not according to this budget. We are cutting back on those Goals 2000 programs so that thousands and thousands of schools will not be able to provide the same opportunities for those children. We are not doing anything about the tax breaks, but we are cutting back on Goals 2000.

We had lengthy debates last year about the effectiveness of the title I program: Should we pull out students to be able to participate in the title I program? If they are not pulled out, are the students missing more than if they stayed in that class? Should we not have perhaps the opportunity to have greater flexibility at the school level?

We had days and days of hearings on that and hours and days of debates in the House and Senate. Many, many good ideas were put forward by parents to try and help and assist those who have some disadvantage in terms of their past educational achievement. In many instances, they were not able to get into the Head Start Program or they need that extra help and assistance in literacy, in confidence-building skills, in the basic elements of decent education.

Do you know what has happened to that? That was cut back initially by almost 1 million children. Now 700,000 will not participate in that program which makes such a difference.

Mr. President, in talking to Mayor Menino in Boston 2 days ago, he said that 14 out of the 78 different programs in the city of Boston are now going to have to be cut out for those schoolchildren.

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program—this is a beauty. By 57 percent, it slashes the drug abuse and violence prevention programs for 40 million youth—40 million youth. It cuts back on the help and assistance to the school systems of our country for safe and drug-free schools.

Maybe many of our Republican friends are going to be able to respond to what I heard from the assistant district attorney, Mr. Gittens who is a deputy DA in Suffolk County in Boston who I heard on Friday afternoon and who also happens to be head of the school committee. He is head of the school committee and a prosecutor, and he asked me a very basic question and one which I would like to address to those who want to cut this program. He said: ''Do you know when the increase in juvenile violence takes place, Senator? Do you know what time? You can almost set a stopwatch by it. When the schools close down.''

We should be surprised by that? In the afternoons is when the principal increase in juvenile crime occurs.

What are these programs? Many of them in the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program go for dispute resolutions. We have a number of schools in my own city of Boston that have enacted that program, and they have seen a dramatic reduction in tension in the schools for a whole range of different reasons.

We have these voluntary programs in the city of Boston for kids who are the most vulnerable children in our communities to get involved, and it is vastly oversubscribed—vastly oversubscribed. There is strong support from the district attorneys.

Meanwhile, in another part of our governmental body, we are cutting off and censuring Colombia to show how tough we are on crime and substance abuse and, at the same time, we are prepared to cut back on programs that reach out into those communities and make a real difference for children. Mr. President, 57 percent of the children.

While I was having meetings out in the community on Friday afternoon, we heard from so many of the ministers in Boston talking about the summer jobs for youth. The 12-, 13-, 14-year-old kids, again, some of the most vulnerable, are talking to their teachers now: ''Is that summer job going to be out there?'' ''Will I be able to have that employment that I had last year?'' ''You know, we want to do something, we want to make something of ourselves.'' And I tell them that this Republican Congress has zeroed their program out.

Mr. President, it makes no sense. If you talk to some who are involved in the program, they say those kids at the end of the summer, if they go the whole summer, may make $900. They say you cannot believe the difference it makes in their attitude when they come back to school after they have been participating in that program. Their whole attitude changes about themselves, about their school, about the importance of schools, about staying out of gangs and staying out of trouble. Well, $867 million is cut out.

What are we going to tell the 1,200 schoolchildren in Boston who otherwise would have been participating in this program, in close collaboration with the private sector that works very closely in the administration of that program, uses that as a principal source for trying to bring young people back into the private sector for training and doing evaluations? It has been a very, very important program, not only in the major cities—in Lawrence, New Bedford, Worcester, Springfield, and many of the other cities.

Also, there has been a $137 million reduction in Head Start. We have been around for years. We saw a significant increase under President Bush in the Head Start Program. Then we had some questions about what was happening to the quality of the Head Start Program. So we revised that with strong bipartisan support. I do not think there were three Members of the U.S. Senate who voted against restructuring of the Head Start Program and the increase in the funding for that program, because it only reaches about 35, 40 percent of the children who are eligible for that program. But nonetheless, they are cutting back that program, a program that helps develop confidence-building skills for young people.

And the work goes on. The Dislocated Workers Assistance Program, there is a 29-percent cut. It excludes 157,000 workers who have lost their jobs from programs that teach them new skills.

At the same time, I was reading in this morning's Washington Post an article by James Glassman which talks about provisions that we have considered in the Judiciary Committee under immigration. Some of us, including myself, do not believe that we ought to fire American workers who are qualified to permit American companies to hire foreigners who have no better skills or equal skills and then drop their cost in wages. So you have American workers who have lost their jobs, the company has lower wages, they compete with American firms, and those firms go out of business. But at the same time, we will have a chance to debate those issues later on.

The point that Mr. Glassman makes is:

> Also, many of the best U.S. jobs go begging, simply because we don't have workers smart enough to fill them. In an extensive new study for Empower America, Stuart Anderson reports that 16 large, high-tech companies alone had 22,000 job openings in January.

That is 22,000 jobs. What do those people need? Some training, so that they are going to be able to be productive, useful members of this society and provide for their families. What does this program do? It cuts out the dislocated worker assistance to be able to give those skills to American workers so that they can get those jobs.

Are we missing something here, Mr. President? Are we going to say to those

workers who are dislocated, with all of the phenomenon that is taking place in terms of the requirements in the job market, without the kind of training that should be provided by the companies and corporations of America—only a handful of them do; they should be commended for doing it, but only a handful of them do—and then on the one hand say, here are thousands and thousands of jobs that are here, and in the same proposal cut back on the dislocated worker assistance?

Mr. President, one of the most important, innovative programs that we passed—again, with strong bipartisan support. We had Republican Governors who have testified in favor of this very exciting program, the former Governor from the State of Maine. Also, we have in the State of Michigan, the School-to-Work Program to try to reach out to the three out of four high school students who do not go on to college but go on into the employment market.

Let us show some consideration for those kids. Let us not just have them every time go on out to McDonald's. Let us try to give them some opportunity of getting on a path that can give them some hope in terms of the future. That is what the School-to-Work Program is about, and it is successful, Mr. President. But we have now a cut in that program that was passed on.

So, Mr. President, we will hear later on about, ''Well, we will be able to deal with some of these issues, perhaps, a little later on.'' We are halfway through or more, certainly, in terms of the planning and programming for the school year.

Let me just mention quickly what is happening out there in the various school boards. I have a deputy superintendent in Worcester, MA, who told me planning next year's budget in the midst of the Federal budget confusion is like reading tea leaves in the middle of an earthquake. Worcester loses $2 million in Federal funding. More than 4,000 students will lose access to support services. Title I will be cut by $1 million. That translates into 700 fewer students. That is $1 million, with 700 fewer students being served, and the layoff of 16 teachers.

In Ayer, MA, they depend on the Federal impact for 23 percent of its budget. The picture is stark. If the Federal funding impasse is not resolved by April 22, they will close the schools 2 months earlier this year.

You have heard about stories in Newport News where they were cutting back on heating for 2 hours in the schools, cutting back heating in a program that we refuse to address. We have the issue of increased tax breaks, and they have cut back heating in the public schools of the country. You wonder why we are putting this legislation out here and why we are demanding that we have a debate and a focus on this.

In Chicago, the chaos caused by the budget impasse will move from the central office to teachers and parents and schools. March 18—next week—the district's budget director has to tell each school the size of their budget for the next year—by the middle of May, local school councils, made up of teachers, parents, community members, and the principals, must submit it for approval—next week. But they will have the assurances of the Contingency Appropriations Act of 1996 to help them out. What does that mean?

The uncertainty about Federal support for education will cause Chicago to waste valuable time deciding how to allocate a lump sum that could change at any time. They will be forced to assume the worst. Chicago schools will lose nearly 20 percent of their budget, or $40 million. That means laying off 600 teachers. The district will have to deny extra help in math and reading to 43,000 students.

Mr. President, this would be bad under any circumstance, but it is particularly bad now. Why? Because of the demographics of this country, we have increased the total number of students anywhere from 3 to 5 million in our schools. Just to keep even with 1995 figures in support, we would need 50,000 additional teachers—50,000 additional teachers—just to keep the pupil-teacher ratio, we would have to add those. We would have to increase the funding.

We are not even asking to increase it. We are just trying to get back to 1995. So you are starting off with 50,000 less teachers than you would need if you are going to be where you should be in 1995. And with the loss of funding of the other program, you lose another 50,000.

Mr. President, that is a matter, I think, of national urgency. I think it is a matter of national crisis. It is a reflection of national priorities, whether we are really serious. If we cannot find the way and the means to try to at least make sure that we are going to do what we did in 1995, let alone try to meet responsibilities in the areas of new technologies to help and assist students, which we should be doing, if we are, as an institution, so bound by procedures that in a $1.7 trillion budget we are not able to find those funds, it is a fierce indictment.

Mr. President, the list goes on. I just want to say, Mr. President, that I do not believe, and I think most Americans do not believe, that education is a contingency as a priority for this country. School boards cannot write their school budgets with contingency moneys. They cannot hire teachers with contingency money. They cannot buy books and pencils and computers for their students with contingency money. They need real numbers now to write their budgets for the coming year. This bill leaves school districts stranded in confusion and uncertainty once again. That is the reason why this amendment which we offer to restore the education funding is so necessary.

Education is not a contingency for the American people. It is not a contingency for the millions of schoolchildren today who will enter the work force in the 21st century. If our commitment to education is real, we should fund it with real money. I urge my colleagues to support the education amendment in the pending appropriation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to 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. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will just take a couple minutes, I say to my colleague from Pennsylvania. If he is getting ready to speak, I will just take probably 2 or 3 minutes. If not, I will take a little more time. Might I ask my colleague if he is ready to speak now? I had an opportunity to speak. I will be very brief.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank my colleague from Minnesota for his inquiry. I am ready to speak, but I have no objection to his taking 2 or 3 minutes. I will be here all day.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thought I would supplement earlier remarks that I made on the floor when proposing our amendment, along with the Senator from Massachusetts.

I'd like to take a closer look at these education cuts. Look at this chart for a moment—Goals 2000 is cut by $82 million; that is a 22-percent cut. This slashes school improvement efforts in over 2,000 schools, serving over 1 million children. Title I, $679 million; denies 700,000 disadvantaged children crucial reading and math assistance.

I tried, Mr. President, to give examples, many examples from my State, about what an important program this is. I will repeat what I said earlier: Little kids do not understand all this budget language and do not understand why we cannot help them be better readers and help them do better in school. I also want to provide information that has been given to me by Ms. Susie Kay, an outstanding teacher at the H.D. Woodson Senior High School in the District of Columbia. Mr. President, for examples of what education cuts mean to students, we need go no further outside this Chamber than a couple of miles away, to Ms. Kay's classroom. She writes:

> Our students are not born criminals; they are not lazy or stupid. They just want, and so deserve, the same chances that this country is supposed to guarantee all its citizens. The last thing that they need is to be set back by further budget cuts in education, cuts which would only serve to discourage students and the teachers committed to helping them beat the odds. H.D. Woodson literally survives from the assistance that the Title I Program provides. To cut any further into our resources would be nothing short of criminal. We should be doing everything we can to help them. Too many people ask me why I continue to teach. * * * I respond * * * how can you not?

I ask that Ms. Kay's eloquent and impassioned statement be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WELLSTONE. The Safe and Drug Free Schools Program is cut by this omnibus appropriations bill a total of $266 million. That is a 57-percent cut. This omnibus bill slashes drug abuse and violence prevention programs for over 40 million young people. Mr. President, you have certainly taken a real leadership role in this area. The only thing I say is that I am immensely impressed not based upon debate on the floor of the Senate, not based on abstraction, but visits to schools at the mentoring programs, at the counseling programs, and really the success of the Safe and Drug Free School Program in doing everything we can to try and address what I think is apparent, the huge problem of substance abuse.

Head Start Program, $137 million cut; denies 50,000 children services that help them become ready to learn. Now, Mr. President, again I remind my colleagues that the Head Start Program, which has overwhelming support in the country, does just what the title says it does. That is, gives children who come from families in very difficult circumstances, very tough backgrounds, a head start. I have taught Head Start mothers; I have taught and worked with Head Start families. There are two things that are very important about the Head Start Program: First, we better invest in children when they are young. That is what you have to do. That is what this program is about. The second thing is the involvement of the parents, and the education of their children. What are we doing cutting the Head Start Program? Does anybody think that is what people voted for in 1994?

Summer jobs for youth, cut $867 million—I did not talk about that before—100 percent they want to eliminate it, preventing 673,000 high school students from gaining valuable work experience.

Mr. President, I will just tell you right now that those publicly elected officials that are more down in the trenches—the commissioners, the school board members, the city council people, the mayors, and I do not mean just in our large cities but I mean in greater Minnesota as well—they will tell you that they have a tremendous amount of fear, I think is the right word, about this extreme House effort, this extremist agenda, of eliminating summer jobs programs for youth. What we want to do is get our young people involved with work. We want them to feel good about themselves. We want them to have these opportunities. This is a critically important program. What are we doing eliminating it?

Mr. President, $362 million for dislocated workers assistance, a 29-percent cut, excluding 150,000 workers who have lost their jobs, in programs that teach new job skills.

Mr. President, every day we are reading about downsizing and restructuring—which is euphemism for some of the large companies in this country—large multinational corporations just firing people. What are we doing cutting a program that provides people who maybe are middle aged who have been working hard all their lives who thought if they did work hard all their lives they would have secure employment, what are we doing cutting a program that provides the dislocated workers with some assistance to make a transition back into the workplace? Did anybody hear a hue and cry from people in 1994 that the kind of change they were voting for was to cut dislocated workers assistance or summer jobs for youth? Finally, Mr. President I talked about this earlier, school to work is cut $55 million—a 22-percent cut, curtailing efforts of 27 States, including Minnesota, to provide students the skills they need to get a good job. Mr. President, I heard the other day in a hearing from the business community that supports it, from labor that supports it, from youth workers that support it, from teachers that support it, and maybe most important of all, from young people, for whom this has made all of the difference in the world.

Mr. President, the definition for family security in Minnesota is to focus on a good education for our children and our grandchildren and to focus on educational opportunities and job opportunities. Mr. President, good family values is to invest in children. Good family values is to invest in educational opportunities. Good family values is to make sure that children can have dreams and can fulfill their dreams. Good family values is to give children hope. Good family values is to give kids a lending hand when they need it. Good family values is to give children the careful consideration and nurturing and support they deserve to do better in reading, to do better mathematics. Good family values is to make kids feel good about themselves. Good family values, Mr. President, is to understand that education and educational opportunities are the essence of the American dream.

This is one of the most important amendments, I think, that has been proposed on the floor of the Senate in my 5 years in office. I am very proud to be a Senator that brings this amendment to the floor, and I hope we will restore this funding. I have said it 10 times on the floor of the Senate. I will say it an 11th time and then be done. Now that I have grandchildren, I see these little children—they surprise me because our children are all 30, 26 and 23; I hope I have that right. Now three grandchildren. I see these kids. It is incredible. Every 15 seconds they are interested in something new. They can be in the same room and they can come back weekend after weekend and they always find something new. Those children are experiencing all the unnamed magic of the world. You take that spark of learning and you ignite it and it takes a child from any background to a life of creativity and accomplishment; you throw cold water on that spark of learning and that is the cruelest thing you can do as a Senator, as a government, as a country, as a society.

By trying to enact the deepest cuts we have ever had in education as the price for not shutting the Government down—that is precisely what the Speaker and other Members of the House who support this have sent over to the U.S. Senate—an effort to pour cold water on this spark of learning is unconscionable, unacceptable, and Senators should vote for our amendment to restore this funding. I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

My name is Susie Kay and I have been a 12th-grade American government teacher at H.D. Woodson Senior High School for the past five years. I am one of four non-minority teachers at Woodson, which has a 100% African American student population. H.D. Woodson is a D.C. Public High School, located in the inner city, east of the Anacostia River.

Teaching at Woodson has been a powerful experience, and, while often disheartening, my days are filled with constant inspiration and small miracles. The noted education writer Jonathan Kozol has put my Woodson experiences in chilling perspective. He writes in *Amazing Grace*, ''No viable human society condemns its children to death. Yet, through public policy and private indifference, we have guaranteed that our poor inner city children will lead lives stunted by heartbreak, violence and disease.'' He continues, ''. . . that each casualty, part of the beauty of the world is extinguished, because these are children of intelligence and humor, of poetic insight and luminous faith.''

The story of the inner city and its youth is all this and infinitely more. It is a tale of survival, not only from a culture of economic despair and hopelessness, where too often nothing seems to change, but survival against the temptations of ''easy money'' in an area where there are virtually no available jobs or means of ''legal employment.'' It is a tale of survival amidst drug dealings and drive-by shootings and too often its innocent casualties . . . ''dreams deferred.'' Mostly, it is a story of the survival and triumph of the human spirit through resilience and finding hope in even the darkest corners. Our students want to survive, and they want to succeed, despite the multitude of odds against them. My friends hear all of my stories day after day; it is a world so foreign to most of them, in fact to most people in this country, and one which too many people don't want to be bothered with. It can be symbolized in the paradox of Washington, D.C., this glorious, powerful city, where blocks separate these two worlds. My students do not feel the same reverence and respect for our government that I was taught growing up, but rather an alienation, abandonment, and disillusionment of it. I must say that it is often difficult to blame them for this.

From what I have witnessed, those students that make it have truly survived against the odds. Many of their obstacles are so seemingly insurmountable, that there is an unwritten creed that making it to graduation day alive is, in itself, a victory. Death

is a culture in the inner city, and one that is prevalent. One of the most incredible aspects of these children's lives is the amount of death that they must constantly deal with, and the accompanying complacency and acceptance of it. Every Monday brings with it a new list of immediate family members and close friends who have either been killed or died because of the critical lack of available medical attention. This year alone, I have attended the funerals of three of my graduating 1995 seniors. They were all bright and beautiful young people, rich with intelligence and talent. This is not a sane way to grow up, nor is it conducive to a clear mind ready to begin the school day. Too many of our students come to school weary from sleepless nights spent worrying about things that citizens of this country, the richest country in the world, should not have to worry about. Will I have a place to live this week-end? Will that next stray bullet come through my bedroom window? Where will my next meal come from? As if teachers don't have enough to worry about, feeding, clothing, and sheltering our students with our own money has become routine. It is just part of the job. For the past three weeks one of our students has been homeless. A few teachers and myself have spent a great deal of time feeding, sheltering and locating suitable housing for this young man. It has been frustrating, but as always, we have been inspired by his determination to get through this. And once the students do beat the odds and arrive at school safely, what awaits them? Too often they face deplorable physical conditions and severe lack of supplies and resources (yes this does include text books). They face no heat in the winter and no air conditioning in the sweltering warmer months of May and June. School should be a haven and a refuge from the ills of the outside world; instead it is a place where even the presence of metal detectors and too few security guards can only do so much to keep our children safe.

We read daily about the lack of supplies, money and resources in the District of Columbia Public Schools. I am sure this is a story that is repeated in inner city school districts throughout the country, but these stories only scratch the surface. The reality is much worse, in fact tragic. Many classes did not have books until November of this year. Until recently, there was only one copying machine for use by the entire faculty, and now budget cuts have eliminated the repair of that machine. We were often relegated to using a hand-crank, 1950's style ditto machine located in the women's bathroom or expending our own funds to purchase copies of materials at Kinkos or Staples. Most teachers spend an average of $500–700 per year on supplies that are taken for granted in suburban schools through this country. Even the most basic supplies are now elusive . . . pencils, paper . . . what's left? It is impossible to teach effectively without spending our own money.

We are often inundated with news about teachers who have given up . . . burned out . . . who are apathetic . . . who simply do not care. This is not a fitting description of so many of my colleagues at H.D. Woodson. Certainly it does not bespeak the endless hours of work done by teachers who increasingly are being called upon to fill so many abdicated roles in their students lives. It is not an accurate description of Barbara Birchette, the lead teacher of the accelerated charter school at D.H. Woodson, the Academy of Finance and Business. She daily and tirelessly performs the job of an army battalion. Nor does it describe Kenneth Friedman, the English teacher to whom students know they can go to be fed and so much more . . . nor Coach Bruce D. Bradford, the swimming coach who continuously teaches his students invaluable life lessons. The names and stories of dedicated teachers are endless. We daily confront multiple obstacles and see them as challenges to be surmounted, while fighting off the temptation to give up. Our reward is our students . . . it certainly is not monetary.

The H.D. Woodson Swim Team placed 2nd in the DCIAA Championship over the past week-end . . . an amazing feat considering that we had no water in the swimming pool this entire season. Due to budget cuts, the necessary pool repairs have not been made. I guess there is nothing like dry land workouts for a swim team. Congress could learn a lot from our Woodson swimmers . . . how to do more with less. The Woodson Warriorsharks epitomize how success in these circumstances is still possible. So many of these students are the most creative, determined and loving people that I have ever met in my life. In spite of the odds, they desperately want to make it, and many miraculously do. In spite of the constant reinforcement of messages, both subliminal and blatant, our society, our government, our country is saying to these children that they are not valued as much, or deserving as much, as our (other) children. It is a race issue. It is a social class issue, and, if not quickly addressed, we will all suffer in the end. For those who think that this is not their problem, I say to you, you can run, but you cannot hide.

For many of my 17-year-old seniors, I am one of the few white people with whom they have had a daily relationship. Their experience with my race has often been either nonexistent, negative or at the very least, confusing. I am constantly faced with the challenge of answering logical questions that have no reasonable answers—at least ones which I find satisfactory as I face into the eyes of these children. Why do white people cross the street and hold their purses close and follow us around stores as if we are all criminals? Why do white people look at us with such anger and fear? Why does our government seem not to care about us? These are good kids growing up in a cruel world. Yet I'll say it again. The story is in the miracle . . . the thirst for knowledge and the will to survive.

I have made a point of exposing my students to my friends and to their jobs as lobbyists, hill-staffers and lawyers in the hopes that stereotypes will be dispelled on both sides . . . they always are. One of the largest voids in these students' lives are contacts and positive exposure to people beyond their immediate community. We all know it's who you know, and by no fault of their own, those connections are just not there. It does not take a congressional study to understand this simple philosophy of how so many of these kids are sent off into the world to complete with those who have been economically and academically advantaged, equipped to succeed. Our students are not born criminals; they are not lazy or stupid. They just want, and so deserve, the same chances that this country is supposed to guarantee all of its citizens. The last thing that they need is to be set back by further budget cuts in education, cuts which would only serve to discourage students and the teachers committed to helping them beat the odds. H.D. Woodson literally survives from the assistance that the Title I Program provides. To cut any further into our resources would be nothing short of criminal. We should be doing everything we can do help them. Too many people ask me why I continue to reach and care about these kids. I respond . . . how can you not?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am a proud cosponsor of the pending amendment because I feel that education is so critical to this country's future. The worst thing we can do, the worst thing we can do when we look at budget priorities, is to make the kind of cuts in education programs that are proposed to be made for next fall and for the fiscal year that we are debating. These are the largest cuts in education programs in this Nation's history.

By the way, the same day that we made a $3 billion cut in education programs on an annualized basis, the cuts which were contained in the interim funding bill that we are now operating, $7 billion was added to the defense budget for items not requested by the Pentagon.

Within 2 hours we had two votes in this body. One of the votes passed a continuing resolution, interim funding, with cuts in education programs, cuts in title I programs that provide teachers, for math and science, for most of our school districts, cuts in Head Start programs, cuts in loan programs for colleges, cuts in the School-to-Work Program, which is a new form of vocational training education and is working so beautifully in our high schools; a 17-percent cut we had in the title I program; and a 22-percent cut in school-to-work.

Within 2 hours of that vote, which cut $3 billion in education, which represents the future of this Nation, we adopted a defense authorization bill that added $7 billion for items that the Pentagon did not ask us to add—ships and planes, mainly—and which the President did not request. Those are not the priorities that the people of this Nation want.

The cuts in education are proposed at a time when a recent NBC News/Wall Street Journal public opinion poll says that 92 percent of all Americans believe that the Federal Government should spend the same or more on education; 92 percent of our people do not want us to cut education.

The continuing resolution and the appropriation bill before us now makes historic cuts in education. These are cuts in programs that are working. We are not talking about cuts in programs that are not working. These are cuts in programs that are having a positive impact on the lives of people, according to, I think, all the authorities that I can talk to.

I have traveled around my home State of Michigan for the last month talking to parents, educators, and students. I asked them to talk to me about school-to-work, and to tell me what difference the School-to-Work Program means in their lives. And I am told what that program means in the lives of students.

We finally have a School-to-Work Program where the business community is involved in education. The business community is designing the curricula in the high schools that will provide students with schools that the business community can use.

Finally, we have a true marriage between business and education to provide real-world skills with real-world technologies. What do we do? There is a proposed cut in the School-to-Work Program of 22 percent. This is a program that is working. This is not a program that is floundering, a program that is wasteful.

When you travel around our States—and I can only speak for my State, but I go to school after school after school, from one part of my State to another, just on the School-to-Work Program. Another group of visits was on the title I program. These are programs where the Federal Government is making a positive difference. These are not wasteful programs. This is not where there is waste, fraud, and abuse, where we ought to be active. These are programs where we are making a positive contribution to the lives of students and to the future of this Nation, and it is proposed that we cut these programs by a historic amount of $3 billion, and where the American people have told us in public opinion polls, in our mail, phone calls, and in our visits, that education is a very big priority for them. They believe these programs are making a difference.

These college loan programs are making a difference. Head Start, we know, makes a difference in the lives of students. Only half of the students now eligible for Head Start get Head Start. Only half. That is all the funding that is available. So instead of increasing Head Start, we have an appropriation bill before us which reduces Head Start.

Now, in addition to the huge cuts that this bill would make in education and that our amendment would restore, that the Harkin amendment would restore, we have another problem, which is that the appropriation proposal before us causes local school districts tremendous uncertainty because the proposal before us says that there is a contingency fund, and if that contingency fund is funded, then they are going to get one level of funding, and if it is not funded through some budget agreement between the Congress and the President, then it is not going to be funded.

How do we expect school districts to be budgeting for next fall when we have, as part of their funding level, a contingency fund which nobody has any idea whether or not it is going to be funded? These are administrators of schools. They have responsibilities to people—to our children, in the case of high schools and elementary and intermediate schools, and colleges, in the case of college students. They have responsibilities to plan a budget.

The appropriation bill before us says, well, some of these cuts you are talking about maybe will be restored. If the President and the Congress get together on a budget deal, then there is going to be a higher level of funding, and those $3 billion in cuts you are talking about will not happen. They cannot budget that way. It is not a responsible way to budget. So right now, as they are budgeting for the fall, trying to figure out whether they have to lay off title I teachers, and they are trying to figure out whether they will have to terminate school-to-work programs, this new form of vocational education training, which, as I said before, finally marries the business community with our schools in the most creative kind of partnership, that I have seen in education. We have business people in our schools working together on a curriculum that will provide skills for students that are needed by business.

Mr. President, I have been in room after room with business people and students together in my State of Michigan, where the business people tell me that when these kids complete this course, this School-to-Work Program, when they learn these skills and when their attendance record is what it has to be under this program, and when they do all the things required of them, they will have a job with me. When you look at a room full of kids and when they are told by business people, ''When you complete this course in this high school, when you graduate this School-to-Work Program, you have a good-paying job with my company,'' that is real, and that is happening in the school-to-work world. That is what is proposed for a cut, unless, of course, there is a contingency fund that is funded.

But school districts cannot budget on that basis. They have to figure out now whether or not next fall they are going to have to reduce their School-to-Work Program, or whether they are going to have to lay off title I teachers. These are real budget decisions, and they should not be left up in the air the way this proposal does.

The bill includes significant funding cuts in some of the most proven education programs that we have. As I said, school-to-work initiatives are cut by 22 percent. We ought to be increasing school-to-work. It is a tremendous success. Goals 2000 is reduced by 22 percent; Perkins low-interest college loans is cut 37 percent; State student incentive grants is cut 50 percent; the title I skills program is cut by 10 percent; Head Start is cut by 4 percent; funding is eliminated altogether for the summer jobs program. This program has a direct affect on thousands of young people who otherwise are going to be without work and in the streets. It affects their education because many of these jobs are directly connected to whether or not they are in school or not.

As I have said, Mr. President, my reaction to these cuts is not just based on some philosophical belief that I hold deeply that education is the key to our future. It is based on personal experiences and traveling around my home State of Michigan.

(Mr. KYL assumed the chair.)

Mr. LEVIN. Let me give some examples of some of the comments of the various educators and people relative to these cuts.

Larry Campbell, the superintendent of the St. Joseph County intermediate school district said this:

> It is difficult for me to fathom proposed cuts in Federal education funds for title I, Goals 2000, school-to-work, and safe and drug-free schools. I am deeply distressed at the prospect of losing $265,600 in title I Federal funding for schools in St. Joseph County. This will have a profound affect on our ability to educate children, especially those with the greatest need.

Mrs. Jean Sawaski, the vice president of the Wakefield Township school board of education says:

> I am deeply distressed at the prospect of losing $93,300 in title I Federal funding for schools in Gogebic County. Please consider the impact of these cuts to education.

David Defields, the superintendent, and Mary Stessard, the director of programs and instruction of the Coloma community schools, in a February 15 letter, said to me:

> In Berrien County we are projected to lose $1.1 million in title I funds alone, at a time when teachers have begun to accept the research on how children learn, have invested much time in professional development and are excited about new teaming efforts to get it right the first time. You folks are asking us to cut back and curtail the momentum. It is all very discouraging for educators. Many at-risk students will lose services. We are willing to tighten our belts. However, we hear that on the same day that a budget cut of $3 billion from education funding is proposed, an increase for the defense budget of $7 billion is proposed. Is providing contracts for the defense manufacturers more important than the education of our children?

Mr. Richard van Haaften, superintendent of the North Branch Area School, said:

> I am very concerned about possibly losing $350,000 in title I Federal funding for schools in Lapeer County. A loss of revenue of this magnitude will have a significant impact on our ability to educate children with the greatest need.

Marilyn phillips, Principal of Beetle Lake Elementary School in Battle Creek, talks about real children where title I has made a difference in their lives. She says:

> I wish you could see how title I funds have helped so many students in our school. We have an excellent early intervention program for our kindergarten, first- and second-grade students which will have to be curtailed if you reduce funding for next year. For instance, Caitlin, a first-grader who was not succeeding in kindergarten, is now a fluent reader in the first grade because of the extra help given her through title I funding. Adam, Travis, and Mark, and so many others have been helped, too. Won't you please think about the importance of good education for this generation of children?
>
> Won't you please think about the importance of a good education for this generation of children?

Superintendent of the Detroit Public Schools, Dave Snead, told me:

> The elimination of the Summer Youth Program is short-sighted and sacrifices our ability to teach skills related to the work ethic, economic independence, and self-sufficiency. Reduction of funding for Head Start, Title I, School-To-Work, and Safe and Drug-Free

Schools shortchanges students most in need of assistance. The proposed cuts must not stand.

Well, if these cuts do become law—and, if we do not correct them through the pending amendment—our Nation is going to face the largest cut in education funding in our history. Over $3 billion will have been taken from America's schoolchildren, and the loss of the investment in their futures will have harmed us all.

So, Mr. President, President Clinton has said he will not sign this bill in its present form. And he should not. But it should not get to him in its present form. The Senate should adopt the pending amendment which should restore educational funding to at least last year's level, and we should not rob our children of their future, which is what we do when we cut education programs which are working.

I want to close with that thought because a lot of us in this body have gone after programs which do not work. We spend a lot of time trying to reduce programs which should either be eliminated or be reduced. That is true of many programs. And that is the responsibility which we have, and which some of us have tried to carry out. But these programs work, and we have to make a distinction between programs which work and programs which do not. When we have a title I program which is working, when we have school-to-work, and vocational education programs that are working, Head Start programs that are working, we should be finding ways to increase the availability of these programs.

We should be making college more available to students—not less. We are in the midst—and have been for about 20 years—of a real economic crunch on the average American family. It is something which we have been concerned about and have tried to turn around for a long time. We know that there is a direct relationship between how much education you have and what your lifetime earnings are going to be. It may not be true in every case. But it is true in most cases. The more education that you have the greater the likelihood is that you are going to have a better income for your whole life. We know it statistically. And what we also know is that the relationship is closer than it has ever been. To put it another way, the gap in income between those that have education and those that do not is growing.

When we are in a situation—I think it is a deeply troubling situation—when that average American family has seen stagnation in its income, when that average American family is working longer hours, because they are, or more hours put in per family to earn either the same amount, or less, in real terms after inflation and after taxes, it seems to me that we have to look for ways that we can turn that around where we can again see real growth in family incomes.

One of the ways to do that—and there are many—but one of the ways to do it is a proven way of increasing educational opportunities for the breadwinners of those families. We know it as certain as we are standing here; that, if we can increase educational opportunities for people, there is a strong likelihood—not a 100 percent likelihood but a strong likelihood—that they will be better off economically through their lifetime. Knowing that, why in Heaven's name we would be proposing historic cuts in education programs is beyond me. When we are struggling to find ways to improve family income to finally get it back into a growth mode, under this a appropriations bill—unless it is amended—we would be making reductions in one of the ways that we can be enhancing family income.

Our families are not only working longer hours, they are more productive than they have ever been. Our productivity as a people has gone up dramatically.

So the families of America are working more hours, are more productive than ever, and yet family income is stagnant. Median family income in America has actually gone down over the last 20 years. It is a situation which has troubling—indeed, tragic—overtones. And what we must do is continue to seek ways that we can reverse that situation. We must look for ways to improve the standard of living of average American families. And the worst thing we can do—the last thing we ought to do—is to be cutting the education programs which can help families, and help future families earn more.

So I hope that we will be adopting the amendment before us. I hope that we will restore not just in a contingent way, or in a hypothetical or possibly a theoretical way but that we will actually restore funds which have been cut from some very vital education programs.

I again am proud to be a cosponsor of the pending amendment and hope that it passes with an overwhelming vote of the Senate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, in my capacity as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, I have been struggling to meet the requirements of these three important departments in a way to present on the floor of the Senate a bill which can pass and will be signed by the President. There is an open question as to whether there can be passage of a bill by the Senate on a 51 majority vote on the declaration of an emergency without having offsets so that we reach the objective of a balanced budget, which is the objective articulated by the Congress as well as the President.

It has been this search for offsets which has occupied me for many weeks up to this instant. This morning I was on the phone trying to reach Chief of Staff Leon Panetta, with whom I have talked about these offsets again and again and again. We are still struggling to find those offsets, because if we do not find those offsets there is a real threat that there will be a stalemate again between the Congress and the President which will lead to a closing of the Government, which I think has been cataclysmic and would be even more so if it happened again.

That is not something I am saying for the first time in this Chamber, on March 12, today. I said that back on November 14, on the second day of the first closing of the Government because of my view that if we are going to have political gridlock, we ought to find a way to carry forward and crystallize the issue for the November elections and then take it to the American people as to whether they prefer the approach of the Congress or prefer the approach of the administration.

So as we have had these continuing resolutions late last year and again early this year, I have been talking to the administration's chief negotiator, Mr. Panetta, to try to find out the offsets. I wrote to Mr. Panetta back on February 20 of this year. I will read the first paragraph.

DEAR LEON: I called again this morning to try to find out from you the possible offsets to add approximately $3.3 billion for appropriations for my subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education. As you know, when we talked the week before last you expected to be able to identify those offsets by last Tuesday. When I caught up with you on Friday, you thought the offsets could at least be identified by today.

We had scheduled a hearing for the three Secretaries for February 21, which was deferred in the absence of those offsets, and we finally had those hearings trying to get the priorities from those top administration officials a week ago today, on March 5. I had actually gone to Wilkes-Barre, PA, on February 16 in the hope that I would see Mr. Panetta. I could not reach him on the phone. He was traveling with the President. I got to Wilkes-Barre, PA, when the President was scheduled to inspect flood damage with a number of Pennsylvania officials from the Pennsylvania congressional delegation and the Governor. I found Mr. Panetta was not there, so I had a chance to talk to the President about this issue.

President Clinton said to me that he had discussed this offset question with Mr. Panetta and that offsets had been identified. I asked the President what they were, and he did not have the specifics at that time. But we are still in search of those offsets.

The bill which passed the Appropriations Committee provided an additional $3.3 billion for these three departments. The amendment which has been offered by Senator DASCHLE reduces that figure and calls for additions of $3,098,637,000. In working with Senator HARKIN, who is the ranking Democrat on this subcommittee, in what was virtually an all-night session—Bettilou Taylor nods in the affirmative—we have been able to come

up with offsets of $2,634,239,000. And in my efforts to reach Mr. Panetta again this morning, talking to Miss Barbara Chow of his office, talking about offsets perhaps from extending current fees of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, there is a question as to whether that fits into this year or not.

When my colleagues from the other side of the aisle have been talking about the importance of education, I will not take a back seat on education funding to anybody in this Chamber or anybody in this Congress or anybody in this country. The education issue was very heavily stressed in the Specter family when I was growing up because my parents had so little of it. Both immigrants, my mother only went to school through to the eighth grade; my father had no formal education; but my brother, my two sisters and I have been able to share in the American dream because of educational opportunity. And I am determined to see that for America today and for America tomorrow.

There is another public policy consideration. Equality is in the eye of the beholder in how we get there. And that is the commitment which the Congress has made to a balanced budget, which the President has agreed to. That is why we are searching for these offsets. When comments are made about grandchildren, I concur totally on educational opportunity. But I am also concerned about not paying our bills that we run up on a credit card today, as we have for so many, many years with a national debt which exceeds $5 trillion and annual deficits which exceed $200 billion. So that is what we are struggling to do.

Comments were made about summer jobs. One of the Senators on the other side of the aisle said that he talked with the assistant district attorney in Boston who pointed out that crime increased when school closed. I do not know why you have to talk to anybody special to find that out. I was an assistant district attorney many years ago. The city of Philadelphia has a lot of similarities to Boston. And I saw that when school was out crime went up, and I did not have to find that out that particular summer. It was the summer of 1960 when I saw that.

I have been as concerned as my colleagues on both sides of the aisle about summer jobs, and the add-backs which are in the committee report provide for $635 million for summer youth jobs, which is what President Clinton had asked for in the add-back request.

When there is talk about the importance of school-to-work by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I agree with that, too, and we have added back in the bill currently pending from the committee $182 million for school-to-work programs, which is the President's request.

When you talk about the vital factor of title I compensatory education, again we have met the President's request on the add-backs putting in $1,278,887,000 billion.

So that we are struggling to find enough money in offsets which will enable us to proceed, to maintain the objective of a balanced budget by having offsets. It is something which Leon Panetta is committed to do, searching for offsets. I repeat the quotation of the President when I talked to him in Wilkes-Barre on February 16 that there were offsets and we are still trying to identify them. And this business about an emergency, if that is sufficient to avoid a 61-vote determination, that all anybody has to do in any amendment which is offered by any Senator is to say it is an emergency situation.

The logic is that if it is determined to be an emergency by the President and by the Congress, then that is an emergency and it is an exception to the Budget Act. But the question remains as to what kind of a vote it is which determines whether there is such an emergency.

There are extensive parliamentary considerations as to the ruling of the Chair and overturning the ruling of the Chair by a majority vote, and I would like to see us not engage in that kind of parliamentary maneuvering. I would also not like to see us engage in jeopardizing portions of this bill which provide for emergency relief for the terrible floods which ravaged my State of Pennsylvania and many, many other States.

That is why I am hopeful that we can come to terms and find the necessary offsets so that we maintain the commitments which I think, realistically stated, remain on both sides of the aisle to balance the budget and not to undercut that, but where we do add to education and summer jobs and school-to-work programs, programs that I totally subscribe to, that we do so in a way which comports with our responsibility on a balanced budget and meets that with offsets.

At this point, I am going to continue my work on the offsets. That concludes the essence of what I have to say. I know of no other Senator seeking recognition, Mr. President, so 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. KOHL. 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. KOHL. Mr. President, I come here as an original cosponsor of the Daschle-Harkin education amendment. With this amendment, we have the opportunity to answer a daunting question for school administrators, teachers and parents across the country: How much does this Congress value education?

With this amendment, we can make the right choice. By passing it, we can prove to our children and their teachers that Congress will back up its words extolling the virtues of a good education with actions that will provide a good education.

This amendment does not represent empty promises. It brings education funding back to last year's level and is paid for with real spending cuts, not with the fund contingent on some uncertain future event.

Last week, the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education heard from the Secretaries of these agencies. As a member of that subcommittee, I was stunned by the extent that education and job training programs have been hampered by the sharp cuts in the current continuing resolution and by disruptive Government shutdowns.

Despite these warnings, the Appropriations Committee reported a new continuing resolution containing over $3 billion in cuts to education and job training resources. My own State of Wisconsin will be hit with a $20 million cut in education, including almost $1.5 million less for Goals 2000, $2 million in vocational education cuts, $4.5 million in cuts to the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program, and a debilitating $12 million cut in title I, which is the money that goes to our most disadvantaged young students.

Supporters of this continuing resolution will argue that there is over $3 billion in education money provided, contingent upon Congress passing entitlement reform. Mr. President, school administrators cannot bank on some unknown budget breakthrough that may happen in 2 or 3 weeks or perhaps not even at all. I hope we do get a breakthrough on a budget deal, but these school officials need to make budget decisions for the coming school year right now.

Let us present our school officials, our parents and their children with real solutions and not illusions. Our amendment takes the education priorities identified under the contingency account and pays for them right now. Real offsets are provided for real restorations in the title I program, school to work, drug-free schools, Goals 2000, higher education and Head Start.

Mr. President, no one believes that balancing the budget is easy, but people do question the priorities of the 104th Congress. People do question why the Pentagon was given $7 billion in spending it did not even ask for or need when, in fact, education is slated for huge cuts. People do question why we would shortchange education when noncontroversial offsets exist to pay for continuing funding at last year's level.

I am a strong advocate of balancing the budget. To get to that goal, I know we have to consider cuts in programs that we all support, and I am willing to do so in every area, except in core education programs.

Reducing our spending on education is perhaps the most unbalanced and unfair act that this Congress can take. We have already saddled our children

with Government debt topping $5 trillion. It is unconscionable at the same time to take away the tools that will allow them to earn money to pay off that debt.

When I ran my own business, Mr. President, the people I hired were the best people with the best education. What was true for our chain of stores at that time is true in the national and international marketplaces as well. Study after study has shown that the wages and quality of life of workers are directly related to their educational achievement. In the international economic arena, the country with the best educated work force will inevitably get the high-paying, high-technology jobs in the future.

To leave the next generation with huge debts is disgraceful. To leave them with an education deficit as well, I believe, is criminal. Skimping on education funding runs counter to almost every stated goal of this Congress. How can we reach a sustained balanced budget without giving the next generation the tools that they need to grow the economy? How can we reform welfare into a work program without giving our young people the skills they need to get and hold good jobs? How can we address the income disparity in our country if we deny students the quality education that will allow them to improve their standard of living?

I believe that our choice today is stark. We want to give our children the education they need to keep this country's economy healthy and to keep their standard of living decent. I hope that the Senate will make the right choice—to choose the future and pass the Harkin education amendment. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, while the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is on the floor, I would appreciate it if he would be willing to have an exchange of views and respond to a question or two on some of the statements which he just made.

Mr. KOHL. Go right ahead.

Mr. SPECTER. At the outset, I express my admiration for the work that the Senator has done. We have worked very closely together on a number of committees, including the Terrorism Subcommittee. I note his comments and concern, which I have heard before, about the balanced budget.

When the Senator says that there are offsets, it is my analysis, backed by staff, that the amendment offered by Senator DASCHLE does not have offsets for the full amount of $3,098,637,000. In the efforts which Senator HARKIN and I have made to try to find offsets, we have come to a figure of $2,634,239,000.

There is, in Senator DASCHLE's amendment, a provision for a declaration of emergency which seeks to take this amendment out of the provisions of the Budget Act requiring 60 votes. A concern that I have is that we will structure a bill here which will not be acceptable to both the Congress and the President.

We will have another closure of the Government if we send to the House of Representatives a bill which is based on the emergency determination without offsets. I think it is not highly probable—it is virtually certain it will be rejected and we are not going to have this issue resolved. I very much lament the fact that we are here on March 12, looking at a March 15 deadline.

I have spoken earlier, before the Senator came to the floor, about the efforts I had made with Mr. Panetta in trying to get this matter resolved earlier, and calls going back over several months, and referencing a letter I had written him about that. So that, if faced between the choice on finding hard budget offsets which come to, say, roughly $2.63 billion, what would the Senator's response to that be, contrasted with the pending amendment?

Mr. KOHL. Yes. It is my understanding that the offsets for the education amendment are not controversial and they were agreed upon during previous budget negotiations and have been scored by the CBO. What I have is $1,359,000,000 from the privatization of the uranium enrichment offset, $1,320,000,000 from extending the NRC commission fees, and $292 million from the sale of the strategic petroleum reserve.

So those are the offsets that have been agreed upon and have been scored. So I am satisfied and comfortable that we are not only adding back, as you point out, over $3 billion in education funding, but we are also providing an equivalent amount of cuts.

Mr. SPECTER. The facts that I have differ to some extent of significance. What we have come to in offsets of $2,634,000,000 is $1.3 billion, where I agree, as to the sale of the Uranium Enrichment Corporation. Then there is $292 million from the sale of oil from the strategic petroleum account and $526 million from the FAA rescission, $159 million of unobligated balances from Pell grants, and $166 million from unused budget authority in the committee allocation, $200 million in year-round youth training, which is back to the fiscal year 1995 level, and $25 million from the unemployed trust fund.

I think it is useful to talk about these in specifics so that our colleagues who may be watching will have some of the specifics. But with respect to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, I had thought when I called Mr. Panetta this morning and finally talked to Ms. Barbara Chow—and she brought up the subject—that would be more than enough, $1.3 billion. But there are no savings from that account until 1999. I think that is why Senator DASCHLE has inserted in this amendment the emergency provision, which he hopes will take his amendment out of the limitations of the Budget Act.

So, I guess my question would be, or the point of discussion really, not so much a question, but debate as a dialog on where we are heading here, that if those offsets do not exceed $2.634 billion, you do not really get the $3.09 billion that Senator DASCHLE wants. And we look to send a bill to the House of Representatives which will be tough enough to get if there are hard offsets.

What would Senator KOHL's response be?

Mr. KOHL. Well, I think that we are debating whether or not the offsets that I have offered are legitimate. I think for the most part they are. They are legitimate, I think, to the extent that we are missing, perhaps, just a relatively small portion to get to $3.1 billion. I think we need to work a little harder to get there, because it is a question of priorities.

If we do not feel the priority, then we will not find it. You never do. You have to feel the priority, or those of us who feel strongly about it feel strongly enough so that we feel we have to fund those offsets so that we can in fact make this priority one of educational needs a reality and not find a way to not accomplish it.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I agree totally——

Mr. KOHL. I did offer, as I say, something like $3 billion, very close to $3 billion, in cuts that have been debated and agreed upon. This Uranium Enrichment Corporation cut from extending the Nuclear Regulatory Commission fees, and the $292 billion from the sale of the strategic petroleum reserve, this totals up to $3 billion, very close to the $3.1 billion we are talking about in terms of education.

Mr. SPECTER. The problem is the $1.3 billion from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is not realizable until the year 1999. But I agree with what Senator KOHL said about working hard to try to find them. But if we do not find them, I do not believe it is realistic to send to the House legislation which is based upon anything but hard cuts which come within the timeframe that we are talking about here.

I thank my colleague for engaging in this discussion.

Mr. KOHL. I thank my colleague.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, if I could just pick up where the colloquy between the Senator from Wisconsin and Pennsylvania left off, I would like to emphasize what I think is the most important point, which is that over the 7-year period there is a sufficient offset. The Senator from Pennsylvania is correct that you do not get it every single year and you do not have it necessarily in the up front, but we are talking about a 7-year budget, and over that 7-year budget there is a sufficient offset.

Now, if there is not, assume for the purposes of argument there is not, my question to the Republicans is: Are we going to offer that as a show stopper, or are they prepared to put the money where their rhetoric is and, in fact, fund education to the level that it ought to be in this country?

Now, if there are not sufficient offsets, are we being told by the Republicans that out of a $1.5 trillion budget,

$1.3 trillion or so of which is actually revenue funded, we cannot find a sufficient amount of money to guarantee that the disadvantaged school communities in this country will get funded? That Head Start will be funded? That school to work is going to be funded? That summer jobs are going to be funded?

Look, this is a statement about priorities. There has been no trouble funding the B–2 bomber in the year 1996; there has been no trouble funding the freedom-to-farm bill, which finds an extraordinary amount of money being given away to the mining interests in this country, extraordinary amount of money being given away to the timber industry, extraordinary amount of money being given away to people to not grow crops. So we are going to pay people in America not to grow a crop, but we are not going to pay people in America to grow a child? Unbelievable choice of priorities. Unbelievable choice of priorities. Pay people not to grow something out of the ground, but do not pay for this kid that is already alive that needs Head Start, hot lunches, or decent education? That is the choice on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee, Senator THOMPSON, the Senator from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN, Senator FEINGOLD, and I were able to identify 60 billion dollars' worth of cuts that we thought were pretty reasonable that we could come to. Now everybody here will agree they are reasonable, but it certainly is fairly indicative of something, that the Senator from Arizona, a Republican, the Senator from Tennessee, a Republican, two divergent areas of the country for Democrats, the State of Wisconsin and Massachusetts, could all agree on 60 billion dollars' worth of cuts.

What kind of things did we find? We found the closing of the Uniformed Services of the University of Health Sciences, increasing the burdening sharing of the Republic of Korea, terminating the advanced neutron project, consolidating and downsizing overseas broadcasting by capping our funding to Radio Free Europe to perhaps only $75 million per year, putting other fiscal restraints on it, eliminating certain travel authorizations, reducing some of our export enhancement program for corporations that make millions of dollars.

We have people in the U.S. Senate who a few weeks ago voted to continue to fund extraordinary amounts of money to multimillion-dollar corporations making a profit, to help them sell their products overseas. How do you balance the equities of funding a profitmaking American corporation to sell its product overseas but not fund a nonprofitmaking entity that is trying to raise our kids for the future here in this country? I think the choice is very, very clear.

I said yesterday in my comments on the floor and I repeat again, obviously money is not the whole solution. We all understand that. Clearly, we need reform in our school systems. We need testing. We need to know when a student gets a diploma they can actually find the Capital of the United States on a map or recite the basics of American history, or do basic math. Regrettably, we have people in America who are content to pass kids on from one grade to the other without even an assurance that they can do that. That is disgraceful. That ought to change. A large part of that is a matter of personal accountability within the school system. But there is not any one of us who has not traveled to school systems in our States where they do not have computers, where they are not wired to the network, where they do not have state-of-the-art laboratories for science, where they do not have language laboratories, where they do not have modern reference books for their libraries, where their libraries do not even stay open, where the whole school shuts at 2:30 in the afternoon.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if we are going to talk about values in the United States of America we ought to start living them here on the floor of the U.S. Senate in our votes. This is a value-oriented vote.

What is extraordinary to me in this measure is that children in the United States are being held hostage to the whole budget process. This is a game that is being played; one more political game. What is the game? The game is that all of this money that is being talked about as an add-back is not an add-back at all. It is a contingency. It is going to be there if something else happens. It is not going to be there because we think our kids need it. It is not going to be there because it absolutely ought to be there, and schools ought to be able to plan on what they will spend next year. It will be part of the great political game in Washington because the section in the bill that does the add-backs, section 4002, says none of this money can be spent, even if we pass this today, unless there is a future agreement that is passed between the President and the Congress regarding all of the fiscal years of the budget agreement.

In other words, we could pass this today and some people can go home and say, ''Aren't I terrific, because we just added back money to education,'' but it will not be added back at all unless Medicare is cut, Medicaid is cut, taxes are cut to the level that the House of Representatives is currently holding everybody hostage to. That is not serious legislating, Mr. President.

What we have done is offer an amendment that is real, that offers real money, that brings us back not to the level that many of us in the U.S. Senate think we ought to be back to with respect to spending on education, but at least gets us back to hold us harmless from last year.

It is a tragedy that in the United States of America, recognizing what is happening to our workers, recognizing what is happening to the whole workplace where people's ability to be able to get ahead is tied to their ability to get an education, where countless numbers of our workers now are the victims of the downsizing and of this new information age that we live in, where people are working harder and harder and harder just to pay the bills and to make ends meet, here we are debating add-backs that do not even get us to last year's level of commitment to education. It is astonishing, absolutely astonishing.

There is not an educator in America who will not document the need to have sufficient basic skills to be able to move into the information world. All of us are on the floor constantly talking about the virtues of technology. You look at the entire history of this country from World War II, 75-plus percent of the productivity increases in America since World War II have come from advances in technology. Every one of us understands that in order to continue to compete to advance our productivity we will continue to diminish the labor of human hands in the workplace.

Now, if we are going to increase that labor with respect to services or with respect to the new technologies, people have to have the skill level. Mr. President, they are not getting it in our school system in America today sufficiently. They could. Let me share quickly an experience from a school in Boston. This came to me from the principal of the school, Thomas Gardner School. He wrote and said,

> The staff and the parents of the Thomas Gardner School were devastated to learn recently that the title I funding for 1996/1997 school year will be taken away as a result of Federal funding cuts. After working so diligently in implementing an Inclusion Program at the school and receiving the Boston School Improvement Award in the Fall of 1995 for being the second most improved school in the city, it is a rude and sad awakening to all of us that with the loss of our Title I Grant, our efforts to establish a superior educational environment may have been in vain.
>
> Without the $213,000 that we received this year from Title I, two full-time and one part-time teachers will not be with us next year. The loss of these teachers will result in our having to relinquish the Inclusion Program which has been so successful and return to the traditional classroom setting. This will seriously disturb our school climate, ultimately reducing our students' self-esteem which we at the Gardner School have worked so hard to increase. This will also gravely affect the students in our Bilingual Program because we are losing both a literacy and an English as a Second Language teacher. Not only will the students suffer with the loss of the program but this will also cause low morale amongst the staff. Since my announcement of this tremendous loss of money, I can already see that there is an air of dismay and anxiety in the building because a number of staff members are wondering if they are going to be displaced. This affects teaching and learning because it breaks the spirit of the school community—the teachers, the parents and the students.
>
> Our new computer system, which was funded by Title I money, helped us accomplish a

very difficult task during the 1994/1995 school year. During that year there was a significant rise in the Metropolitan Achievement Reading/Math Percentile test scores. With this success, we planned to move forward with Title I money so that every classroom at the Gardner School would have Computer Assisted Instruction next year.

The teachers and parents of the Gardner School and the other 22 Boston schools which stand to lose a total of 3.5 million dollars in Title I funding next year, strongly protest the insensitive and unjustifiable cuts in Title I funding proposed by Congress.

Mr. President, that is one example. I know that can be replicated in schools all across this country. But what really leaps out at me here, above all, is this contradiction: ''During that year, there was a significant rise in the Metropolitan Achievement Reading/Math Percentile test scores.''

That is what we are trying to achieve, what we are talking about, what we are struggling about. They had planned to put it in every classroom. That is what we are talking about. Every classroom in America ought to have this. We ought to want to do that before we build the next bomber, before we put out the next set of missile systems, or whatever it is. We ought to want every classroom in this country—and we ought to make a commitment—to have that computer capacity. We know it is more than just computers. It is guidance counselors, books, the whole atmosphere of the school, its safety, its drug-free schools. Why are we cutting drug-free safe schools by 57 percent? That was the original effort. Now the Senator will come back and say we are going to add back that money. As I pointed out, it is not a real add-back, unless we get all the other cuts that will come with the rest of the budget agreement. So we are holding children and the education goals of this country hostage to the politics of Washington. They do not come first; the politics are coming first.

Let me share another quick letter. This is from the mayor of the city of Boston:

I am writing to alert you to an urgent situation facing economically disadvantaged youth next summer—the elimination of the Federally-funded summer jobs program for 1996.

As you may know, funding for the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program was eliminated in both the Senate and House appropriations bills for 1996—

Why would we eliminate them? What is it that sets a priority in the first place to eliminate this? Why is our time being consumed to come back here and have to struggle to put back into a bill money for summer jobs for youth? What U.S. Senator believes that kids are better off wandering around the streets of our country in the dead of night in the summer because they have not had a constructive day? Who believes that? Why was it taken out in the first place? Why are we struggling to do that here at the last moment?

Well, maybe it ties everybody up and it ties up the energy of the Senate. But it is surely not a great statement about the priorities of this country. The mayor writes:

In Boston, as across the nation, the JTPA IIB program provides constructive activities for young people and keeps them from idling in the streets during the hot summer months. Through the program, thousands of young people gain work experience, build academic and employment skills, and earn money through service at neighborhood-based community organizations and downtown government agencies.

The program also includes specialized units emphasizing life skills, academics and the arts, and tailored efforts for young people with special needs, including employment for deaf/hard of hearing youth; English as a Second Language instruction for refugee/immigrant youth; and counseling for court-involved youth.

Mr. President, we have a provision in our Tax Code that encourages companies to take a deferral and reduce their taxes for moving their jobs overseas. Here we are fighting to put back money at the expense of that program so kids right here at home can have a job during the summer. That is a pretty fundamental choice.

Let me share one last example of what is at stake here. This information comes to me from New Bedford, MA, one of the highest unemployment sectors of Massachusetts, perennially, which has been hard-hit now by the loss of industrial jobs and jobs in the fishing industry.

There is a program there that started, a Head Start program in New Bedford. It has been about a year going on. It actually has a two-part program called People Acting in Community Endeavors. In 1994, because of the capacity to do this inexpensively and keep the administrative costs down and run a whole program, they bought a building, in order to create a second outreach program of Head Start for kids who need it. And 294 children are participating in the New Bedford Head Start program as of a year and a half ago. That program provides nutrition and educational services to a multicultural community. Now we learn, according to the budget cuts that have been proposed here, that there will be a 50-percent reduction in that funding, which adds to their now $6.5 million debt and to other cuts in the CDBG title I. So you are not only going to wind up laying off teachers, you are going to wind up cutting the program.

Mr. President, it just does not make sense. I know there are colleagues of mine on the other side of the aisle, like the Senator from Vermont, Senator JEFFORDS, and others, like the Senator from New Hampshire in the chair, who care enormously about education, who are committed to this. I do not think that the U.S. Senate should have that hard a time finding a way, out of this $1.5 trillion budget, to guarantee that we provide what is needed, not what we sort of want to find to provide, but what the country desperately needs in order to be able to provide structure for these kids. We cannot just come to the floor of the U.S. Senate and be bombastic about illegitimacy, births out of wedlock, and run around saying how the values of the country are imploding and then forget that the three great teachers of values are the schools, parents, and religion.

There are too many kids today who grow up without contact with any one of those. It is no wonder that we have sociopaths raised in this country who are prepared to shoot another human being just to wear their Levi jacket or their Reebok sneakers. If we are going to be real in our talk about how you inculcate values into young human beings, let us recognize the lessons of what taught all of us.

Let us affirm some structure in those children's lives. Let us somehow find a way in the Senate to guarantee that the 36 percent of all the kids in America who are born out of wedlock are going to somehow find some teacher in their life, a mentor, one-on-one, some outreach, some affirmation that will give them an opportunity to believe that they too can make it in this country because, if we do not do that, it is an absolute certainty that we will continue to fill our jails, our substance abuse programs, our shelters, and we will continue to bemoan the loss of the country that all of us care about and want to have.

That is what is at stake in this debate. That is what this amendment is about. And I hope we can find it in ourselves to strip away the politics, to strip away the sort of the scorecard, if you will, of who wins and loses. We all win. We all win. Most importantly, the children of America will win, if we can find a way to sufficiently guarantee the resources for our education system are adequate. I hope we are going to do that today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two letters I used be printed in the RECORD.

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

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
THOMAS GARDNER SCHOOL,
Allston, MA, March 12, 1996.

The staff and the parents of the Thomas Gardner School were devastated to learn recently that the Title 1 funding for the 1996/1997 school year will be taken away as a result of federal funding cuts. After working so diligently in implementing an Inclusion Program at the school and receiving the Boston School Improvement Award in the Fall of 1995 for being the second most improved school in the city, it is a rude and sad awakening to all of us that with the loss of our Title I Grant, our efforts to establish a superior educational environment may have been in vain.

Without the $213,000 that we received this year from Title I, two full-time and one part-time teachers will not be with us next year. The loss of these teachers will result in our having to relinquish the Inclusion Program which has been so successful and return to the traditional classroom setting. This will seriously disturb our school climate, ultimately reducing our students self-esteem which we at the Gardner School have worked so hard to increase. This will also gravely affect the students in our Bilingual Program

because we are losing both a literacy and an English as a Second Language teacher. Not only will the students suffer with the loss of the program but this will also cause low morale amongst the staff. Since my announcement of this tremendous loss of money, I can already see that there is an air of dismay and anxiety in the building because a number of staff members are wondering if they are going to be displaced. This affects teaching and learning because it breaks the spirit of the school community—the teachers, the parents and the students.

Our new computer system, which was funded by Title I money, helped us accomplish a very difficult task during the 1994/1995 school year. During that year there was a significant rise in the Metropolitan Achievement Reading/Math Percentile test scores. With this success, we planned to move forward with Title I money so that every classroom at the Gardner School would have Computer Assisted Instruction next year.

The teachers and parents of the Gardner School and the other 22 Boston schools which stand to lose a total of 3.5 million dollars in Title 1 funding next year, strongly protest the insensitive and unjustifiable cuts in Title I funding proposed by Congress. We urge everyone who agrees that funding for education is the most valuable investment we can make today to join our protest.

CATALINA B. MONTES, Ed. D.,
Principal.

BOSTON CITY HALL,
Boston, MA, December 14, 1995.

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

DEAR SENATOR KERRY: I am writing to alert you to an urgent situation facing economically disadvantaged youth next summer—the elimination of the federally-funded summer jobs program for 1996.

As you may know, funding for the Summer Youth Employment & Training Program (JTPA-IIB) was eliminated in both the Senate and House Appropriations Bills for 1996, while the new workforce development legislation will go into effect at the earliest on June 1st, 1997. This situation leaves the summer program unfunded in 1996.

Your strong support has helped counter efforts to reduce and eliminate the summer youth program in the past, and again your help is needed to preserve this important opportunity for young people.

In Boston, as across the nation, the JTPA IIB program provides constructive activities for young people and keeps them from idling in the streets during the hot summer months. Through the program, thousands of young people gain work experience, build academic and employment skills, and earn money through service at neighborhood-based community organizations and downtown government agencies.

The program also includes specialized units emphasizing life skills, academics and the arts, and tailored efforts for young people with special needs, including employment for deaf/hard of hearing youth; English as A Second Language instruction for refugee-immigrant youth; and counseling for court-involved youth.

Operated by Action for Boston Community Development, Inc. over the past three decades, the program has provided thousands of low-income youth with their first work experiences and has strengthened hundreds of community-based organizations throughout our neighborhoods. Over the past few years, the integration of education into the program has reinforced the connection between school and work that has been missing from the academic experience of so many of our young people.

As the budget reconciliation process goes forward, please support the restoration of the summer jobs program for 1996. Thank you for your efforts on behalf of the young people in our communities who need and deserve a chance to work and learn during the summer.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. MENINO,
Mayor of Boston.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of this amendment to increase real education funding for our Nation's children.

Over the past year, this Congress has eliminated billions of dollars for educating America's young people. And this CR would continue that process by slashing $3 billion from vital education programs. This moves us toward the single largest cut in education spending in our Nation's history.

And, there are real children behind these cuts: $137 million would be slashed from Head Start, affecting more than 20,000 3- and 4-year-olds; $679 million would be cut from math and reading programs, affecting 700,000 children; $266 million cut from the Safe and Drug-Free School Program; affecting 23 million kids.

And all funding for summer youth jobs would be cut, leaving half a million American teenagers with nothing to do this summer.

In my State of Connecticut, $9 million in Federal education funding will be lost. And most of those cuts come in the title I program, which provides remedial education for thousands of Connecticut's poorest and most disadvantaged children.

These cuts make it near impossible for schools and colleges across this country to plan ahead.

School districts do not know how many new teachers or new aides to hire. Educators are faced with appalling choices—which programs and what children will receive meager Federal benefits.

And all this comes at a time when public schools are making real progress in solving the myriad problems that face them; at a time when a good education is more essential than ever to guarantee our children the ability to compete in the global economy.

But instead of increasing funding, or at the least, maintaining current levels, this Congress is intent on pulling the rug out from underneath America's children.

This CR would wreak severe havoc on America's schools, on America's education programs, and most of all on America's children.

This is no way to run the Government and this is no way to balance the budget.

CUTS ARE NOT BACKED UP WITH REAL MONEY

To add insult to injury, while the majority party claims they are adding back funds for education, there is little real money in these appropriations.

These add backs are conditional on the Congress and the President agreeing on future cuts in Medicare and Medicaid and other essential programs; the same cuts that we haven't been able to agree upon over the past year.

So the only way we could increase money for education is by taking desperately needed funds away from America's most vulnerable citizens, the elderly and children. It is like robbing Peter to pay Paul and it is unacceptable.

This is the ultimate example of smoke and mirrors. The Republicans go to the voters and say ''We're serious about education,'' when in fact they provide hardly any real money to fund Federal education programs.

The Democratic amendment proposes real offsets and real spending cuts that would allow Congress to maintain its commitment to education.

This is the real way to balance a budget, by matching spending increases with real spending cuts.

THE GOP BALANCED BUDGET STRATEGY

To be honest, I have given up trying to understand the rationale of the majority party's budget cutting strategy.

First, they shut the Government down, costing the taxpayers over a billion dollars.

Then they continue this dangerous and chaotic policy of haphazardly passing CR after CR, all of which cut desperately needed funds for education, technology and crime programs, the environment, and the list goes on and on.

Now, realizing the folly of their ways, realizing that the American people don't want these draconian spending cuts, realizing that they cannot blackmail President Clinton into accepting their demands, the majority party proposes to restore a fraction of education funding—that is conditional on cutting money for essential programs that serve America's youngest and oldest citizens.

This is a foolhardy and dangerous approach, particularly in the face of earlier budget agreements, passed in a bipartisan manner, to protect education as a national priority.

All Americans can agree on the enormous importance of education for the future of our children, our families, and our country.

In fact, a recent Gallup Poll showed 75 percent of Americans support expanding Federal aid for education.

We must draw a line against these cuts in education and give our children the educational opportunity they need to succeed.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I rise as a cosponsor of the Daschle-Harkin amendment. This amendment adds back $3.1 billion for vital education programs such as title I, Head Start, School-to-Work, and Education Technology.

I have often said that children will do as we do and not as we say. If we want our children to value learning and discovery, we just value them as well and demonstrate by our actions here in the Senate that we are willing to invest in their education and their futures by providing the money necessary to ensure a quality learning experience for all our children.

Recent polls show that education is a national priority among all Americans. These polls reflect what I have been hearing from Nebraskans—that Americans want their tax dollars to go to a strong education system—a system that will work for all its citizens. They are willing to spend more if they get more for their money. We must be willing to invest in education and spearhead a national commitment to achieve results in every school, rich and poor.

As I examine the programs that will receive additional funding under this amendment, I am struck by the fact that these dollars will be providing opportunities for our young people to do exactly what we all as parents admonish them to do—prepare themselves to live meaningful and productive lives. Under this amendment, we add back money to Head Start to enable our youngest citizens to enter school prepared to learn; to title I to allow our economically disadvantaged youth the opportunities afforded more affluent students; to vocational, school-to-work and summer jobs for youth programs to train, and educate our young people for the future workplace; and to technology programs such as STAR schools to provide exciting resources for all our students regardless of geographical limitations.

All of these programs are vital to my State of Nebraska, as they are in States throughout our country. I hear daily from Nebraskans who are concerned about the cuts to education being considered by Congress. They understand the serious budget considerations with which we are faced. However, they urge us to set our priorities in much the same way they prioritize their own budgets, and to secure our future by investing in our youth.

To those who argue that money will not solve our schools' problems, I will counter that we should put real money on the line here, not just spare change. It is past time for us to stop wishing our schools get better and start doing something about it. We are losing too many of our young people of all economic backgrounds to drugs, despair, and underachievement. We must be willing to invest in education just as we have been willing to invest in our national defense when our Nation's security has been at stake, because in a very real sense, our national security is at stake here.

Mr. President, as is so often the case when we are fighting for increased funding for discretionary programs such as these, it is becoming more and more difficult to secure the dollars necessary to make a difference. I am convinced that unless we are willing to commit to reforming our entitlement system, we will be unable to adequately fund vital education programs such as these.

I urge my colleagues to support the Daschle-Harkin amendment. By doing so, we will demonstrate our commitment to our children and their future.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I have listened very carefully to the very eloquent statements of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle with respect to education. There is nothing that I disagree with.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to remember that the first vote this afternoon will move us from the macro responsibilities we have with respect to education to the micro responsibility we have for the District of Columbia. I hope when the fourth cloture vote comes up, on the D.C. appropriations bill, that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will remember their responsibilities to the education of the children of Washington, DC, and will express that same compassion and vote for cloture so that we can move that conference report, which will do so much for the children of Washington, DC, on to the President.

I want to remind everyone that we are coming to a crisis point. First of all with respect to the budget of the District of Columbia as they are fast approaching the point of bankruptcy, and will reach it very quickly, if we do not pass that bill. That bill is locked up because we are arguing about a small provision included in the conference agreement that deals with education on a very controversial issue. But one which has been worked out between the House and Senate conferees which allows the District of Columbia, if they so desire, to have a very small voucher program for the purposes of allowing kids to have an option of the school that they will attend. It is done in a way that is only a local decision. It is not anything which has been characterized on the other side as shoving it down the throats of the people of DC.

So I urge you to keep in mind that we have this responsibility and that we are now over halfway through the school year. If we do not do something quickly, we will lose the whole school year. In fact, we will be into the next school year as far as planning goes and the inability to really enact anything which will help those kids.

So I urge you to use compassion and express it today in the vote for the District of Columbia in order for those young people to get the tremendous advantages that will occur by virtue of the reform which is contained in that package. Do not deny the city the opportunity to start its education reform over one issue which has become a national symbol, for what reason I do not know because it has nothing to do with what would be a federally-imposed voucher system on a community, or a State, or the country.

I urge you, please, when that vote comes up, vote for cloture today. Otherwise, we are going to find ourselves embroiled in even a greater conflict over the same DC appropriations bill in the large omnibus appropriations bill we are considering. The simple way to get out of the mess is to vote for cloture, and to get the DC bill out so we do not have to have the fight within the comprehensive package which is facing us today.

So, Mr. President, I again urge all of my colleagues to support the cloture motion which we will be voting on as soon as we come out of our weekly Tuesday luncheons.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. 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. GREGG. 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. GREGG. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly—about 10 minutes—about where we are on this piece of legislation, and then later in the day I will be offering an amendment relative to the amendment offered by the Democratic leader.

We have heard a great deal of discussion from the other side of the aisle. We have heard from both Senators from Massachusetts, from the Senator from Minnesota, and I believe the Senator from Michigan. There must be something about States that start with the letter M. But we have heard a great deal from the other side of the aisle about how, if we do not proceed on this course, if we do not add in this additional $3 billion-plus into—I guess it may be more than that—education, that all sorts of disaster and plague will occur with the educational system of the United States.

One must ask the question, how can that sort of representation be made in light of the history of the educational experience over the last 15 to 20 years? We know, I think, as a country because we have seen—and we have had enough experience with it now over the last 15 to 20 years—that putting more into education is not necessarily the way to resolve the underlying problem in education. Yet, there is no question that more money in some instances significantly improves education. Take, for example, title 94–142, the IDA accounts for handicapped disability education. Yes, there is no question, to put more money into those accounts would certainly assist us in helping those individuals to be educated. It would take the pressure off our local school systems. Later in the day maybe I will even offer an amendment that will try to address that.

But the concept generally of putting more dollars into education will improve education is, I think, one that has been fundamentally disproved. There is study after study. In fact, the University of Rochester reviewed something like over 400 different studies and concluded after looking at those 400 different studies that there is very little correlation between the significant

increase in dollars spent on education and the improvement in education.

If we look at the academic performance of our students over the last 10 to 15 years, where we have seen a significant decline in our students' ability to score well in internationally evaluated exams, especially in the math-science area, while at the same time we have seen a significant increase in dollars in education, I think we must conclude that there is very little direct correlation between the amount of money you spend and the type of education you get. Yes, there is a correlation, but it is not a formula that says 1 equals 1—for every new dollar you spend in education you get an equal increase in quality. In fact, the formula for increasing and improving education is much more complex than that, and it involves, I think, primarily maintaining individual and parental involvement in education, maintaining local control over education, especially at the principal level and at the teacher level, with parent input, and allowing the school systems to have an activist approach from the community rather than have them told how to educate their children by either the State government or the Federal Government.

Buried within this amendment is the funding, of course, for Goals 2000, which takes us in exactly the opposite direction from local control, the basic theory of Goals 2000 being that there should be a national agenda, a national curriculum in fact designed to control the manner in which local education is delivered and which as a practical matter would probably be the most single debilitating event in the panoply of debilitating events that have impacted our education system were it carried to its true goals and fruition, which is basically to have a nationalization of the education curriculum in this country. So not only do we not necessarily get better education by spending more dollars in some instances, but in this instance by spending more dollars we get worse education because what we are going to get is more Federal control over education and the loss of local control which is, I happen to think, the essence of good education.

But the real core problem here is not the application of these dollars. It is the illogic of putting forward the increase in these dollars while at the same time being unwilling to face up to the underlying threat to our students which far exceeds anything else that they may be threatened by relative to their future which is the deficit of this country and the fact that we are passing on to the next generation of Americans who are today in school a Nation which is fiscally bankrupt.

We hear from the other side that, well, if we will just put more money into that program and more money, and give me another program and put more money into that program, and give me another program and put more money into that program, we will correct all the ills of our society and manage this country in a much more efficient way, which begs the fundamental question of, who is going to pay for all this that is being spent? Who is going to pay for all these additional dollars that are being spent?

I would be willing to consider the amendment brought forward by the Senator from South Dakota, the Democratic leader, if he and his party and his President at the same time had the responsibility to come forward and say, well, we are going to pay for this by controlling those discretionary accounts in the Federal Government which are driving us into these tight fiscal times. I would be willing to consider it under those terms. But we hear nothing from the other side. In fact, we have heard a rejection from the other side of any attempt to try to bring under control those functions of the Federal Government, specifically the entitlement programs, which are forcing us to contract our ability to spend moneys in the area of education that we might otherwise wish to spend. In fact, the irresponsibility of the other side is so excessive now that you have the President of the United States, having once agreed to welfare reform, which is one of the core entitlements which we should be getting under control, now rejecting a plan which was passed out of this Congress, this House of the Congress by 87 votes in favor of it. While the President at the same time has claimed that this was going to be the essence of his Presidency, or an essence of his Presidency, that he would reform welfare as we know it, change it fundamentally, now he has rejected a plan which once he accepted and which the Senate accepted by an 87-vote majority.

Then we have the same administration and the leadership on the other side of the aisle rejecting a plan brought forward by the Governors of the States, all 50 Governors in unison, saying let us use this as a way to bring under control this entitlement program, welfare. They are rejecting that program. And then when the Governors came forward as a unified body, all 50 Governors, Democrats and Republicans, and said let us correct the entitlement program, Medicaid, once again we hear from the other side of the aisle, no, we cannot do that because we will be giving up control here in Washington; we will be giving it back to the Governors; we cannot afford to do that so we are not going to correct that.

When you have the trustees of the Medicare trust fund coming forward and saying, if you continue to spend money the way you are spending money today, the Medicare trust fund is going to go bankrupt in the year 2002—now it is going to be bankrupt in the year 2001—trustees who were appointed by the President of the United States who serve in his Cabinet, you have the President of the United States and the other side of the body walking away from that issue as if it does not exist, either turning a blind eye to that problem and not being willing to address that problem or wishing to use the politics of fear and scare tactics against senior citizens in alleging that any proposal to address fundamentally the improvement in Medicare is a proposal to undermine the quality of Medicare. It is totally inappropriate for the administration and the other side of the aisle to say that.

So where are the proposals from the other side which would bring under control that function of the Federal Government which is going up at such a rate that it is leading the Nation into bankruptcy and is forcing us to have to limit our capacity to put funds into those accounts which many of us feel we might like to do such as special education in the area of IDA, 94–142, or chapter 1, which is also a good program. Where is the other side in coming forward with proposals on the entitlement accounts, because until they come forward with proposals on the entitlement accounts, they have no credibility on this issue.

When they bring forward an amendment which simply says spend the money and uses some fallacious offsets, when they bring forward such an amendment and at the same time fail consistently to address the underlying problem which is driving the fact that we do not have the resources necessary to address accounts which we think are appropriate in the discretionary side of the budget because of the rate of growth of entitlements, then they have no credibility.

That is what I find disingenuous in the arguments from the Senators from Massachusetts, Minnesota, and Michigan because there appears to be no program that they are not willing to spend more money on, but there appears to be no proposals to bring under control those programs which are bankrupting this Government and our children's future, which is what it comes down to as the bottom line, of course. Passing on to our children a finer education is something we all wish to do. There are ways to improve our educational system, and money does not happen to be the only way to do that. But there are things we could do here at the Federal Government level that would obviously improve our children's educational system. But passing on to our children a better education system is going to do very little good for them if at the same time we pass on to them a Nation that is bankrupt, where their opportunities for prosperity are dramatically limited because their Government was irresponsible and unwilling to address the core problems of expenditures growing so fast that they were outstripping the country's capacity to fund them, such as the entitlement programs of Medicare, welfare, and Medicaid.

So when the other side comes forward with these proposals, I think you have to take them with a grain of salt. You have to recognize that this is an election year; that they are going to continue to propose ideas to spend

money without being accountable until they feel that they have identified all constituencies necessary to build the voting majority. But I hope the American people will be a little more sophisticated; that they will understand this issue is about how you make the Federal Government responsible, how you pass on to our children not only excellent education but a chance for a prosperous and fulfilling lifestyle, and that that second part of the exercise involves addressing the issues of how this Government spends its money in the entitlement accounts, something about which, unfortunately, the other side of the aisle has decided to bury its head in the sand and the President of the United States has decided to join them.

I thank the Chair for his courtesy. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold that suggestion?

Mr. GREGG. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. GREGG. I withdraw my suggestion.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, the Senate will now stand in recess until 2:15 p.m. today.

Thereupon, at 12:29 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. COATS).

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996—CONFERENCE REPORT

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2546, the DC appropriations bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2546, the D.C. Appropriations bill:

Bob Dole, Trent Lott, Jesse Helms, Phil Gramm, Judd Gregg, Dirk Kempthorne, Strom Thurmond, Olympia Snow, Bob Smith, Dan Coats, Larry E. Craig, John Ashcroft, Thad Cochran, Jon Kyl, Mark Hatfield, Robert F. Bennett.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2546 be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are ordered under rule XXII, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 25 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Abraham	Faircloth	Lugar
Ashcroft	Frist	Mack
Bennett	Gorton	McCain
Bond	Gramm	McConnell
Bradley	Grams	Murkowski
Breaux	Grassley	Nickles
Brown	Gregg	Pressler
Burns	Hatch	Roth
Byrd	Hatfield	Santorum
Campbell	Helms	Shelby
Coats	Hutchison	Simpson
Cochran	Inhofe	Smith
Cohen	Jeffords	Snowe
Coverdell	Johnston	Stevens
Craig	Kassebaum	Thomas
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thompson
DeWine	Kyl	Thurmond
Dole	Lieberman	Warner
Domenici	Lott	

NAYS—44

Akaka	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Glenn	Moynihan
Biden	Graham	Murray
Bingaman	Harkin	Nunn
Boxer	Heflin	Pell
Bryan	Hollings	Pryor
Bumpers	Inouye	Reid
Chafee	Kennedy	Robb
Conrad	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kohl	Simon
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Specter
Exon	Leahy	Wellstone
Feingold	Levin	Wyden
Feinstein	Mikulski	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 44. Three-fifths of the Senators not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

WHITEWATER DEVELOPMENT CORP. AND RELATED MATTERS—MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under rule XXII, the clerk will now report the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to Senate Resolution 227.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Senate Resolution 227, regarding the Whitewater extension:

Alfonse D'Amato, Trent Lott, Jesse Helms, Phil Gramm, Judd Gregg, Dirk Kempthorne, Strom Thurmond, Jim Jeffords, Olympia Snowe, Bob Smith, Dan Coats, Larry E. Craig, John Ashcroft, Thad Cochran, Jon Kyl, R. F. Bennett.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate be brought to a close? The yeas and nays were ordered under rule XXII.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 26 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Abraham	Bennett	Brown
Ashcroft	Bond	Burns
Campbell	Grassley	Murkowski
Chafee	Gregg	Nickles
Coats	Hatch	Pressler
Cochran	Hatfield	Roth
Cohen	Helms	Santorum
Coverdell	Hutchison	Shelby
Craig	Inhofe	Simpson
D'Amato	Jeffords	Smith
DeWine	Kassebaum	Snowe
Dole	Kempthorne	Specter
Domenici	Kyl	Stevens
Faircloth	Lott	Thomas
Frist	Lugar	Thompson
Gorton	Mack	Thurmond
Gramm	McCain	Warner
Grams	McConnell	

NAYS—47

Akaka	Feinstein	Lieberman
Baucus	Ford	Mikulski
Biden	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Bradley	Heflin	Nunn
Breaux	Hollings	Pell
Bryan	Inouye	Pryor
Bumpers	Johnston	Reid
Byrd	Kennedy	Robb
Conrad	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kohl	Simon
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Exon	Leahy	Wyden
Feingold	Levin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53 and the nays are 47. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. D'AMATO addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes.

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

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, today we have seen what is the first of probably a number of votes to attempt to curtail the filibuster against moving forward with the Whitewater investigation.

Let us be clear and set the record straight. I have offered publicly, and I offer again on the Senate floor, an opportunity to answer the question of whether or not the committee is looking to continue the investigation into the political season and to do so by incorporating an indefinite time agreement. I can state, we are willing to limit—not that I am happy about it—since the setting of arbitrary time limits, as stated by the former Democratic majority leader, Senator Mitchell, is a mistake. Senator Mitchell came to this conclusion to prevent the possibility of lawyers from stalling and keeping matters from coming forth. However, recognizing that we are in a unique situation, this Senator has indicated before and I indicate publicly now that we would be willing to terminate the committee's work, even if it is not finished, within 4 months. It will take us, I believe, at least that period of time since there is a trial which is taking place right now in Little Rock, AR. There are witnesses who are unavailable to us who are testifying there. I believe that their presence, at least the opportunity to attempt to bring them forward, is important.

Mr. President, let me quote something. Let me read it to you.