be used by local school districts to hire staff to recruit at the top liberal arts, education, and technical colleges (districts would be encouraged to establish a central regional recruiting office to pool their resources). One percent of the total funds would be used by the Secretary of Education to create a national hotline for potential teachers to receive information on a career in teaching.

TITLE VI—TEACHER QUALITY ENHANCEMENT GRANTS

We need to provide on-going education in teaching skills and academic content knowledge, establish or expand alternative routes to state certification, and establish or expand mentoring programs for prospective teachers by veteran teachers (according to the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, beginning teachers who have had the continuous support of a skilled mentor are more likely to stay in the profession).

Establish Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants, a competitive grant awarded to states to improve teaching. The grants would have a matching requirement and must be used to institute state-level reforms to ensure that current and future teachers possess the necessary teaching skills and academic content knowledge in the subject areas they are assigned to teach. In addition, establish Teacher Training Partnership Grants, designed to encourage reform at the local level to improve teacher training. One of the uses of these funds would be for states to establish, expand, or improve alternative routes to state certification for highly qualified individuals from other occupations such as business executives and recent college graduates with records of academic distinction. Another use would be to mentor prospective teachers by veteran teachers. Provide $100 million per year for these new teacher training programs so that states can improve teacher quality, establish or expand alternative routes to state certification for new teachers, and mentor new teachers by veteran teachers.

TITLE VII—INVEST IN COMMUNITY-BASED SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

As many as five million children are home alone after school each week. Most juvenile involvement in crime—either committing crime or becoming victims themselves—occurs between 3 p.m. and 8 p.m. Children who attend quality after-school programs, however, tend to do better in school, get along better with their peers, and are less likely to engage in delinquent behavior. Expansion of both school-based and community-based after-school programs will provide safe, developmentally appropriate environments for children and help communities reduce the incidents of juvenile delinquency and crime. In addition, many states and localities such as Maryland and the Chicago public school system require high school students to perform community service to receive a high school diploma. The real world experience helps prepare students for work and instills a sense of civic duty.

Expand the 21st Century Learning Centers Act by providing $400 million each fiscal year to help communities provide after-school care. Grantees will be required to offer expanded learning opportunities for children and youth in the community. Funds could be used by school districts to provide: literacy programs; integrated education, health, social service, recreational or cultural programs; summer and weekend school programs; nutrition and health programs; expanded library services, telecommunications and technology education programs; services for individuals with disabilities; job skills assistance; mentoring; academic assistance; and drug, alcohol and gang prevention activities.

Provide $10 million in grants to states that have established or chose to establish a state-wide or a district-wide program that requires high school students to perform community service to receive a high school diploma. States would determine what constitutes community service, the number of hours required, and whether to exempt some low-income students who hold full-time jobs while attending school full-time. The grants would be matched dollar for dollar with half of the match coming from the state and local education agencies and half coming from the private sector.

TITLE VIII—EXPAND THE NATIONAL BOARD CERTIFICATION PROGRAM FOR TEACHERS

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, which is headed by Gov. Jim Hunt, established rigorous standards and assessments for certifyuing accomplished teaching. To pass the exam and be certified, teachers must demonstrate their knowledge and skills through a series of performance-based assessments which include teaching portfolios, student work samples, videotapes and rigorous analyses of their classroom teaching and student learning. Additionally, teachers must take written tests of their subject-matter knowledge and their understanding of how to teach those subjects to their students. The National Board certification is offered to teachers on a voluntary basis and complements but does not replace state licensing. The National Commission on Teaching for America's Future called for a goal of 105,000 board certified teachers by the year 2006 (since the exam began recently, only about 2,000 teachers are currently board certified). Since the exam costs $2,000, many teachers are currently unable to afford it.

Provide $189 million over five years so that states have enough money to provide a 90% subsidy for the National Board certification of 105,000 teachers across the country.

TITLE IX—HELP COMMUNITIES TO MODERNIZE AMERICA'S SCHOOLS

More than 14 million children in America attend schools in need of extensive repair or replacement. According to a comprehensive survey by the General Accounting Office (GAO) requested by Senator Moseley-Braun, Sentor Kerry and others, the repair backlog totals $112 billion. Researchers at Georgetown University found that the performance of students assigned to schools in poor condition fall by 10.9 percentage points below those in buildings in excellent condition.

To help rebuild modernize, and build over 5,000 public schools, provide federal tax credits to school districts to pay interest on nearly $22 billion in bonds at a cost of $5 billion over five years.

TITLE X—ENCOURAGE PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE

Many public schools have implemented public school choice programs where students may enroll at any public school in the public school system. In contrast to vouchers for private schools, public school choice increases options for students but does not use public funds to finance private schools which remain entirely unaccountable to taxpayers.

Provide $20 million annually in grants to states that choose to implement public school choice programs. School districts could spend the funds on transportation and other services to implement a successful public school choice program. Up to 10 percent of the funds may be spent by a school district to improve low performing school districts that lose students due to the public school choice program.●

CAMBODIA: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

● Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the latest developments in Cambodia and my thoughts on how the United States should respond to these developments.

Over the past decade the United States has contributed hundreds of millions of dollars towards peace in Cambodia. What benefit has been achieved as a result of this assistance? Is Cambodia better off now than it was 10 years ago? I would argue that recent political developments have undercut most gains this assistance may have provided—and worse, our own policies have contributed to the most recent deterioration considerably.

On July 26 of this year, the Cambodian people turned out in overwhelming numbers to vote in parliamentary elections. The ruling government pointed to this impressive turnout and claimed it was representative of a free and fair process. In fact, the election was termed by one American observer as the ''Miracle on the Mekong.'' With all due respect, I question how any informed observer could make that evaluation. For one to believe this appraisal, one must completely ignore the events dating from the 1997 coup.

In truth, the events which lead up to the July 26 balloting made the prospects for free and fair elections impossible. The opposition parties infrastructure had been completely dismantled following the July 1997 coup d'etat, orchestrated by Hun Sen and his Cambodian Peoples Party (CPP). As many as 100 opposition party members were reported killed, and those who remained in Cambodia were forced to campaign in fear if they dared speak out at all. The CPP controlled access to media and thereby prevented opposition candidates from effectively getting their message out. The National Election Commission (NEC), which had oversight of the election process, was stacked almost entirely with CPP party loyalists. Each of these factors on their own would be troubling, but when looked at collectively they are an outrageous example of a government which acts with impunity and has no regard for democratic principles.

Despite this reality, the Clinton Administration joined many in the international community, including the so-called ''Friends of Cambodia,'' in pushing the parties to participate in the July 26 elections. I thought then, and I continue to believe now, that this was a mistake. To use an old phrase—with ''Friends'' like these, who needs enemies? How could we ask these brave men and women to risk their lives and take part in a process which was doomed to failure? To make matters worse, the U.S. Government now seems bent on ignoring the reality of the flawed election. Rather, it is pushing opposition leaders to participate in a parliament at the mercy of a brutal dictator who has no regard for the rule

of law. So, in the end, the United States has invested hundreds of million of dollars and the Cambodian people have little to show for our efforts.

Mr. President, since July 26th, the environment has actually deteriorated rather than improved. Opposition leaders filed hundreds of protests with the National Election Commission, only to see each of these complaints dismissed without consideration. Legitimate claims of fraud have been ignored as the CPP seeks to cement its claim to so-called ''legitimate'' authority. Let's examine a few of these problems:

Prior to the July ballot, the NEC secretly and without debate changed the formula by which parliament seats would be assigned. Only after the votes were tabulated was this new formula announced. To no one's surprise, the result was an additional five seats for Hun Sen's party, thereby preventing CPP from being in the minority. Had the original formula been in place, the parties of Prince Ranariddh and Sam Rainsy could have combined their seats to form a majority of parliament.

Only July 27, as ballots were being processed, the NEC ordered the counting stopped. According to a senior member of the NEC, this halt in the proceedings occurred because the opposition parties had taken the lead. Not surprisingly, when counting was renewed, CPP regained control and went on to be credited with 41 percent of the total vote.

Finally, the violence continues. Immediately following the election, largely peaceful demonstrations broke out in downtown Phnom Phen. CPP armed thugs and soldiers broke up the demonstrations and dismantled the symbolic ''democracy square'' located near the National Assembly. Opposition leaders were subject to a travel ban and intimidation tactics. Finally, and most alarmingly, several Buddhist monks were murdered and reportedly tortured.

Mr. President, the question must be asked, how should the United States proceed in the face of these developments? I believe there are several concrete steps we can and must take to send the signal that we will not tolerate Hun Sen's brutal disregard for his own nation and people.

Number one, we must continue to withhold direct assistance to the Cambodian Government. This year's foreign operations appropriations bill will do just this. Only when each of the election disputes have been dealt with could aid be released.

Number two, we must not appoint an Ambassador to succeed Ambassador Quinn. Many in the opposition have already spoken out against the current nominee and I share their concerns. However, regardless of the nominee, we should send a strong signal to Hun Sen that we will not recognize his illegitimate government. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert a letter from Prince Norodom Ranariddh and Sam Rainsy, leaders of the two most active opposition parties. In this letter, they detail not only the election disputes, but their opposition to the current nominee to be ambassador to Cambodia.

Number three, the United States should identify Hun Sen for what he is, a criminal. Congressman ROHRABACHER has introduced a resolution in the House which calls on the United States to assist in the collection of information that would lead to trying Hun Sen before an international tribunal for violation of human rights. I think Congressman ROHRABACHER should be commended for his leadership, and I am hopeful similar legislation will pass in the Senate this year.

Finally, we should oppose the current Cambodian government being allowed a seat at the United Nations.

These steps are essential to staking out America's position as a defender of democracy and rule of law in Cambodia. Strong actions by the U.S. Government can give hope to the heroic members of the opposition as they continue to strive for democracy in the face of repression.

Before I yield the floor, I will ask unanimous consent that remarks from opposition leader Sam Rainsy be printed in the RECORD. Mr. Rainsy was invited and prepared to appear before the subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee earlier this week, but at the last minute was not allowed to testify due to objections raised by some on the committee. Mr. President, this is a shame.

Sam Rainsy, along with Prince Ranariddh and Son Soubert represent the leaders of those who are working to establish democracy and respect for human rights and rule of law. Had this not been the final hectic week of our Congressional session I would have welcomed the opportunity to host Sam Rainsy before the Foreign Operations Committee. Absent that opportunity, I believe it is important that the Senate have the ability to review Mr. Rainsy's statement, and accordingly I renew my request that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

DEAR SENATOR HELMS: This letter is an appeal to you and your Committee to take immediate action in condemning the recent bloodshed in Cambodia caused by soldiers and police loyal to Hun Sen. Over the past few days, many protestors have been injured and Buddhist monks killed as these forces have tried to silence the Cambodian people. We ask you what kind of government murders Buddhist monks?

We do not recognize the results of the July election. The Cambodian People's Party's (CPP) domination of the Constitutional Council and the National Election Committee have created a grossly uneven playing field. Our appeals and complaints of vote fraud and counting irregularities have been dismissed out of hand and in violation of law. Make no mistake, Cambodia is a country ruled by a single man intent on destroying any and all political opposition. Since last year's coup d'etat, scores of our supporters have been murdered, beaten, and intimidated by Hun Sen's loyalists.

It is imperative that the United States continue to take a principled stand in Cambodia. To this end, we ask that the U.S. Congress continue to suspend official assistance to the current government—formed by a coup—until the current crisis is resolved. More than anything, if Hun Sen were to succeed in securing international legitimacy and the resumption of aid, it would be nothing less than a reward for his lawless and repressive ways. We ask that the U.S. Congress and Administration condemn the use of violence in the strongest of terms. Too many people have died in the hands of reckless Cambodian leaders, like Hun Sen and Pol Pot. Finally we urge you not to replace Ambassador Kenneth Quinn after his term expires in Phnom Penh, and certainly not with Kent Wiederman who we believe may be less than supportive of the cause of democracy in Cambodia. The position should be left vacant as a message to Hun Sen that there are no rewards for corruption, manipulation of elections, and violence. We know a precedent exist for such action in neighboring Burma.

We thank you for your consideration of our views, and we remain committed to bringing about peaceful, democratic change in Cambodia.

Yours Sincerely,

PRINCE NORODOM RANARIDDH,
President, FUNCINPEC.

SAM RAINSY,
President, The Sam Rainsy Party.

REMARKS BY SAM RAINSY, PRESIDENT, SAM RAINSY PARTY, CAMBODIA—SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIAN AND PACIFIC AFFAIRS, SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, OCTOBER 2, 1998

Mr. Chairman, it is a distinct and unique pleasure for me to appear before you today. I am honored to inform this Subcommittee of the political situation in Cambodia following the July parliamentary elections and to highlight the important role the United States can play in bringing democracy, the rule of law, and lasting peace to my country.

The last few months, weeks, and days have been among the most difficult of my life, and it has been equally trying for all Cambodians who support democracy. I know this Subcommittee is familiar with the brutal crackdown of pro-democracy demonstrators in Phnom Penh by forces of the Cambodian People's Party (CPP). Buddhist monks and students have been found tortured and murdered, and many continue to be missing. I know you are familiar with the illegal and unconstitutional travel ban that prevented me and all opposition members from leaving Cambodia one week ago—a ban that was personally instituted by Hun Sen. And I know that you are aware of the CPP-biased election machinery that denied opposition parties due process in the counting of ballots and resolution of election complaints.

There is no one more disappointed and saddened by the total failure of the July elections than myself. However, the opposition in Cambodia warned from the very beginning that democracy cannot be built on an undemocratic foundation that lacks the rule of law. Throughout the electoral process—even before we returned to Phnom Penh from exile in Bangkok—we pointed out to the international community many serious flaws in the political environment and in election preparations. For example, our party structures and property had been totally destroyed or looted during Hun Sen's July 1997 coup d'etat, and our membership was traumatized. I could not agree more with the characterization of the pre-election period as ''fundamentally flawed.''

Mr. Chairman, we were reluctant participants in this election and at one point even withdrew from the process. But under heavy pressure, we accepted the assurances of the international community that the elections would be assessed fairly. We were wrong in accepting these assurances, and today Cambodia is on the brink of affirming the rule of man, not instituting the rule of law. I know this to be true, as I spent ten days under the protection of the United Nations in Phnom Penh because of Hun Sen's pointed threats.

The United Nations and many other sponsors and observers of the election did not effectively challenge the conditions that made a fair election impossible. Throughout the campaign, our activists were harassed, threatened, and killed with complete impunity. While the United Nations has done a commendable job in documenting the abuses of the Cambodian government, not one human rights violator has been prosecuted. And the killings and torture continue.

Other shortfalls in the elections included limited and unequal access to state controlled media, an election framework that was biased and that lacked transparency, a recounting process that failed to conduct recounts, a reluctance to reconcile all ballots, and an illegal change in the method for seat allocation that gave the ruling party a majority of seats with only 41 per cent of the official vote.

The burden of proof that this election was legitimate no longer lies with the opposition—as some asserted immediately after the polls closed—it is now the responsibility of Hun Sen and the CPP.

The Cambodian people are confused, frustrated and angry. They don't understand why many in the international community are supporting the announced election results and pressuring the opposition to join a coalition. Why isn't the Cambodian government pressured into obeying Cambodian laws and its Constitution?

If the opposition is forced into a coalition without being able to resolve underlying problems, Cambodia will continue to be under the complete control of Hun Sen. History has shown that he will do whatever it takes to stay in power. Over the past five years, under Hun Sen's leadership, Cambodia has had unrestrained corruption, human rights violations, and environmental destruction. He kept his political opposition in check while building up his own political and military machine, in part, by making deals with some of the worst Khmer Rouge leaders and incorporating them into the government. Anyone who thought Hun Sen was the solution to Cambodia's problems or that he offered ''stability'' should know better by now.

I understand all of Cambodia's problem cannot be solved at once, and the opposition has demonstrated its willingness to compromise. However, there are some issues where compromise is impossible, such as the resolution of election related disputes before a coalition government is formed and the development of an independent judiciary that enforces and protects the rights of all citizens, not only members of the CPP.

Without proper and full resolution of election complaints, the elections will have no credibility among the Cambodian people. For better or for worse, the Cambodian people look to the United States as the standard-bearer of democracy and the conscience of the world. It was the United States that took Hun Sen's coup seriously last year and the U.S. Congress that acted so swiftly to restrict official foreign assistance to Cambodia. The reaction of Congress was one of the few times that Hun Sen has received a message from the international community other than one of accommodation.

Hun Sen expect that the world will legitimize his rule through these elections and cloak his dictatorial behavior in the mantle democracy. Cambodian democrats are asking the United States to be the standard-bearer again while there is still a chance to get Cambodia back on the road to democracy. We call upon the United States to: make it clear that it will refuse to recognize any Cambodian government that is formed prior to the resolution of election-related complaints filed by opposition parties, or any government formed under duress; strongly condemn the Cambodian government for its human rights abuses and ongoing intimidation of opposition activists; continue to withhold official aid, as it is currently doing, and to oppose IMF and other multilateral lending. Let me make clear that humanitarian and demining assistance should continue; vote to keep Cambodia's UN seat vacant and to oppose other international recognition; leave the U.S. ambassador's post vacant after the departure of Ambassador Kenneth Quinn until a credible government is formed and to ensure that next U.S. ambassador is someone with strong credentials as a supporter of democrats; intensify efforts to deter the Cambodian government's role in illegal logging, drug-trafficking, money-laundering and acts of terrorism such as the grenade attack on march 30, 1997 that killed at least 16 people; and, make public the Federal Bureau of Investigation's report into the March 1997 grenade attack.

Mr. Chairman, as a target of assassination in 1997 and again just a few weeks ago outside of the Ministry of Interior, I know how dangerous Cambodian politics can be. The United States has an opportunity to make an historic contribution to Cambodia's future by demonstrating its leadership and supporting democracy and human rights. Today, I look to you for hope and assistance.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.●

(At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

PATIENT'S BILL OF RIGHTS

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, because of my schedule I was unable to attend the vote to table the Patients' Bill of Rights. The tabling of this legislation was wrong. We are telling the American people that the insurance industry is more important than the patients. We must not let the insurance companies take the place of family physicians in deciding what is appropriate care for patients.

Let me share with my colleagues a situation that occurred in South Carolina. Ms. Lisa Baughman lives in Charleston. She has a type of cancer called ''multiple myeloma.'' Her doctors at the Medical University of South Carolina are the best in the country at treating her particular condition, and they gave her chemotherapy in preparation for a bone marrow transplant.

That is not a light matter, Mr. President. Anyone who has ever watched a friend or relative fight cancer knows it is serious and takes courage, prayer, and all the support you can find to go through that.

Her doctors did what doctors have to do now. They called the insurance company and got ''pre-approval'' that the bone marrow transplant would be covered.

But the day before the operation, the insurance company said she could not have the operation in her home town with her expert doctors. She would have to fly to another state because the insurer had a contract with a different hospital that was cheaper. This was literally the day before the operation. Can you imagine the mental anguish of going through chemotherapy, coming to the day before a bone marrow transplant, and then being told ''not now, not with your doctor, not in your state, not in your home town, who knows when''—all with your life hanging in the balance?

Her doctors protested that she was too weak and needed immediate treatment. The hospital in Charleston offered to do the operation for equal or less payment than the out-of-state hospital. But the insurer would not yield and tried to fly her alone, holding her medical files in her wheelchair, to the other hospital. She got them to approve a relative to accompany her.

When she arrived, there was no one to meet her at the airplane with a wheelchair, no hotel room reservation, indeed, no ''room at the inn.'' These things had been promised.

So she eventually showed up at an appointment with the new doctor chosen by the insurance company to learn about her case. He said he couldn't do the operation for another three weeks, but that she should be getting her care in Charleston, South Carolina at the Medical University because they had the best people. In fact, he had been taught by the surgeon in Charleston.

She had no choice but to fly home. She contracted pneumonia in her weakened condition and is in the hospital right now, trying to recover. Because of the delay, she has to go through chemotherapy again before she can have the operation.

That should not happen in America. No one should be forced to go through chemotherapy twice because an insurance company overrides an expert surgeon's orders and delays critical medical treatment. It should not happen, and there is no one in this world who can do anything about it except the United States Congress.

Because of a Federal statute insurers cannot be sued for making injurious medical decisions and are not accountable to many state requirements. I do not know what we tell someone like Lisa Baughman if we go home this year without fixing this problem we created.

Congress has stood by and watched while ''managed'' health care has taken over. Perhaps that was the wisest course for a while, because we do not have all the solutions. But if we do not agree on basic groundrules for fairness, patients have no protection and it is a race to the bottom. We cannot blame HMO's, insurance, or anything else if the Congress continues to refuse to act.

Let me list some of the groundrules that we should enact with the Patients' Bill of Rights: