

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I strongly support the Daschle amendment to the disaster supplemental appropriations bill.

The amendment makes needed improvements to the bill before us. It restores funding for education, job training, and children's programs, and it renews the commitment we made in the last Congress to community service.

It would be a grave error if the Senate defeats this amendment and decides instead to revoke investments we have already made in improving the lives of working families and children to pay for the Republican contract's tax cuts for the rich and for tax provisions such as the billionaire's loophole that we debated on the Senate floor yesterday.

Majority Leader DOLE said recently that "the American people want a better use of their tax dollars—starting now." But only half of the cuts in the rescission package are needed to pay for the ongoing recovery costs from the 1994 California earthquake. The other half of the cuts are being extracted from hard-working families to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy, and that isn't fair.

Americans are beginning to look behind the rhetoric at the heart of the Republican revolution. The fog of rhetoric is lifting, and the reality is emerging—an attack on children and families to pay for tax cuts for the wealthiest individuals and corporations in our society.

Congress should not be taking from the most vulnerable and defenseless in order to raise even higher the standard of living for those who are already well off.

The new Republican majority is arbitrarily cutting and trimming education programs even before our support for schools has had time to get to the classroom.

For what reason? To provide a tax cut for rich Americans? That makes no sense. Democrats do not believe in depriving young children of the good start they need that is provided in Head Start. Democrats do not believe in depriving public schools the help they need to achieve reform. Democrats do not believe in depriving college students of an affordable education. Democrats do not believe in depriving young Americans of opportunities to contribute to their community through national service and simultaneously earn money to pay for college.

The numbers themselves demonstrate the shortsightedness of the Republican proposals. Who will contribute more to our country's treasury? A college graduate who earns an average of \$32,000, or a high school dropout who earns \$13,000?

It is poor government policy and poor business sense to adopt short-term budget savings that will inevitably re-

sult in much smaller future tax revenues and much more serious long-term social problems. How do you support a family on \$13,000 a year?

The Daschle amendment will restore \$700 million for education, children, and training. It restores these short-sighted cuts and preserves the sensible education investment strategy proposed by President Clinton and Democrats.

We have heard a lot of rhetoric in the last 100 days about the "American people." One thing is unmistakably clear about the American people—they solidly back the Democratic priority on investing in education.

Two out of three Americans favor increased spending for education, according to a recent NBC/Wall Street Journal poll. That confirms a finding in a poll by the Washington Post/ABC News. Eight out of 10 people favor a balanced budget amendment, but 2 out of 3 say they would not support such an amendment if it means that education or Social Security would be cut.

Finally, a poll by the Times Mirror Center for the People and the Press found that 64 percent would increase spending on public schools if given the opportunity to set Federal budget priorities, while only 6 percent would decrease spending.

Among 14 Government programs cited, support for public schools was second only to anticrime programs. The position of the American people on support for education is unmistakably clear. They want to cut the waste and fat in Government, not the muscle of education.

Democrats understand why there is such strong support for education. We are proud to be the defenders of increased investments in students. We are proud to be on the side of all those who understand that a commitment to excellence in education is the basic underpinning of our society and our democracy. Education has made our country great, and it will be the key to our future strength.

A fresh example of the shortsighted thinking is the recommendation to cut investments in technology for education. Yesterday, the Office of Technology Assessment released an impressive report on teachers' use of technology in the classroom. As the introduction to the report states:

OTA finds the lack of attention to teachers and technologies ironic, for at the center of effective use of instructional technologies are those who oversee the daily activities of the classroom—the teachers.

Previous reports by OTA and others on computers in schools have sounded the alarm about the dangers of technological illiteracy in our society. As widely used technologies have become more sophisticated, teachers' roles become even more critical. The rescission packages, however, also cuts teacher training by 31 percent in the House and the Senate by 22 percent.

In an address to the National School Boards Association on February 21,

Speaker of the House GINGRICH called upon school boards to vastly increase the amount of money they spend on technology. Currently, districts spend three-tenths of 1 percent. "We are two generations behind in introducing technology," he said.

Our Republican colleagues respond to the obvious need for technology by cutting an already small Federal technology budget. Star Schools, one of the most successful and popular Federal education investments, was cut 30 percent by the House, and 15 percent by the Senate. The new technology program in title III of ESEA, just authorized last October, was cut by 75 percent in the House and 12 percent in the Senate bill.

Families throughout the country understand that computers, CD Roms, interactive video, and other technological advances have opened the door to vast amounts of scientific and academic information for students. Through these miracles of technology, pupils in classrooms in remote communities can meet students from many other lands, participate in fascinating scientific projects such as the Maya Cycling Expedition, and talk to experts around the world.

The simple fact, however, as the OTA report makes clear, and as a GAO report that Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN will release this afternoon underscores, is that public schools in this country are years behind every other institution in providing students with these opportunities.

It is important to balance the budget. But it will be an impossible task unless students are well-prepared and well-trained to be productive workers who earn good wages and salaries, who can support their families and pay their taxes.

Other education investments restored by the Daschle amendment are equally important.

In the last Congress, in bipartisan action—the vote to pass the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was 77 for and 20 against. That bill reshaped the way the Federal Government supports education.

In ESEA, in Goals 2000, in the Improving America's Schools Act, and in the School to Work Opportunity Act, we said to the States: "If we are going to reach the National Education Goals, all students should be held to the same high standards, and the States should develop these standards."

We said "It's time to cut the redtape. Local schools should be given more flexibility to consolidate small Federal programs to that they can design comprehensive, coherent reform plans."

And finally we said "Accountability should rest on results." Instead of telling schools exactly what to do with Federal dollars, we said "You decide what works best and we won't monitor what you do. But we will hold you accountable for how much students learn."

We backed up our commitment with Federal dollars. States responded. Over 40 States have developed plans to use Goals 2000 dollars. Hundreds of schools have already planned to use their increase title I dollars and their new flexibility to see that students learn more. At the very moment when schools and States and students are responding as we hoped they would, we should not be reducing our investment.

Unless we restore these funds, many of those schools will believe we didn't mean what we said. Seventy thousand school children will be denied extra help in reading and math. Thirteen hundred schools will not be able to implement their plans for school reform.

Consider what States have already been doing with these funds. To pick one district at random, the Lawrence School District in Kansas is using Goals 2000 funds to develop new assessments to more accurately analyze whether students are meeting high standards.

Pennsylvania has given Philadelphia \$250,000 of its Goals 2000 funds to develop clusters, and provide schools and their communities with more freedom from local rules in designing their curricula. Some schools are lengthening their schoolday and extending education services to parents in order to promote literacy.

Massachusetts is using Goals 2000 funds to support the startup costs of 15 charter schools.

My question to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is very straightforward—are these the kinds of activities you want to scale back, just as they begin? Are our promises of support false?

In title I of ESEA, the rescissions are equally irresponsible. Title I is the Federal Government's major commitment to the country's disadvantaged children. For 30 years, the Federal Government has accepted a responsibility to help States educate schoolchildren who need help the most. But that commitment has never been well enough funded to serve the large number of children who need help.

Title I has had successes. It has improved basic reading and mathematics skills of the lowest-achieving children. It has helped close the learning gap between those children and their peers. With the help of title I, the achievement gap between black and white 9-year-olds has narrowed over the past two decades by 18 percent in math and 25 percent in reading.

I hear frequently from people in Massachusetts about how their children have been helped by this program. One parent wrote: "Chapter I is a blessing! For 4 years we tried to coach our son after his regular homework. We created more stress and there was no progress in math. Our son is now proud of himself and his work. Thank you is not enough."

One high school senior wrote: "Chapter I has helped me to grow. Through Chapter I, I am working in groups. I

get along better with others than I used to. Chapter I has shown me how to work hard, and when confronted with a challenge, I am patient but determined to get the job done. The Chapter I math program has helped me gain confidence. Now I can do math with others and I sometimes offer my help to other students * * * Chapter I has shown me that no matter how stupid you think you are there's always someone there to help you reach your goals."

One parent wrote about the Reading Recovery Program funded by title I. "It has greatly affected my son. He has been able to keep up with his class. [It] has lessened his anxiety and helped to make school a pleasant experience. Had he not had the benefit of this program I feel the experience could have been traumatic. I was most apprehensive about sending him to the first grade because I felt he was not capable of doing the work. Our son has blossomed because of the attention, the one-one-one investment his teacher has made. He now comes home and reads us his library books. We never thought our son capable of making the strides he has this year and it's only April. It has been an answer to our prayers."

A teacher in Haverhill writes: "I * * * had a senior citizen from a local nursing home come to my classroom weekly. She spoke French and worked with a child in my class who was non-verbal because his family's primary language is French. A true friendship developed between her and the children in my class. Everyone enjoyed her visits and she looked forward to coming every week. She was in a wheelchair and the children learned about people with handicaps. It was one of many rewarding experiences."

Finally, I heard from a student in Plymouth, MA named Steven. Steven was an angry young man, aggressive toward any authority figure and failing every class. Chapter I was seen as a last resort for him. Now he is a corrections officer who is up for a promotion. He recently said to his former Chapter I teacher, "It could have gone either way. I could have been locked in these cells as an inmate if it hadn't been for your helping me get through the schoolwork and giving me a chance to vent my anger. Thank you."

Even though we know this program helps students, schools are not able to keep up with their needs. The education needs of disadvantaged children are growing, especially in high poverty areas. Evaluations show that children in such schools are held to lower expectations than children in other schools. They are more likely to fall behind in the early grades, and never catch up. First graders in poor schools start school scoring 27 points lower in reading and 32 points lower in math than other schoolchildren. The initial gap widens in later grades. Eighth graders in poor schools are 57 percent more likely to leave school by tenth grade than students in other schools.

Last year, Congress extensively examined this valuable program. We authorized major new reforms, and we increased the funds by \$300 million. For 6 months, teachers across the country have been working and planning on how to use these funds.

That may be then and this may be now. But that is no excuse for the new Republican majority in Congress to pull the rug out from under schools across the country. Unless we support this amendment, 70,000 fewer children will benefit from title I. And schools throughout America will be hurt because Congress is breaking its promise on education.

Another important restoration in the Daschle amendment is \$100 million for the Safe and Drug Free Schools. Among all the Republican cuts, this one is perhaps most bewildering of all. There is hardly a community in America—urban, suburban, or rural—that is not struggling with the tragic effects of violence and the alarming increase of drug use among students.

Students cannot learn when their schools aren't safe. We need to do all we can to keep guns, drugs, and violence out of the schools. The Safe and Drug Free Schools Program is our primary means to give students and schools the help they need in avoiding drug abuse and violence. It provides Governors and local school officials with wide discretion to assess their own problems and to solve them. It is preposterous that Republicans should be proposing to cut back these needed funds.

For example, the Dade County, Florida public school system is using the majority of its funds to support a program called "TRUST"—a comprehensive assistance program to help students and their families overcome substance abuse problems. The program combines established approaches with curricula development, so that awareness of the dangers of drugs is woven into students' classes. It uses innovative approaches such as alternative intervention that offer students and their families a chance to examine their behavior and improve their skills while continuing to attend regular classes.

It is fine to talk about family values and strengthening families. But this bill simultaneously wipes out the kinds of help that struggling families need. Hypocrisy is the word for such action.

For all of these reasons, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the Daschle amendment.

Mr. President, I see the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee with a very distinguished guest, a man I have great admiration and respect for. His presence makes me speechless here on the floor of the U.S. Senate at this time.

I withhold the remainder of my remarks and ask for recognition after we have a recess.

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

from Massachusetts will be recognized after we hear from the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE PRESIDENT OF EGYPT, PRESIDENT HOSNI MOHAMMED MUBARAK

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I have the honor of presenting to the Senate, after I ask unanimous consent that we stand in recess for 5 minutes so the Senators may greet him, the distinguished President of Egypt, President Mubarak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will stand in recess for 5 minutes.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

RECESS

Thereupon, at 5:13 p.m., the Senate recessed until 5:19 p.m.; whereupon the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BENNETT).

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I see other Members here who wanted to speak.

I just finish with this thought about the Star Schools Program. In many different parts of the country, we do not have the highly qualified, highly skilled teachers, high school teachers, for example, in physics, in mathematics, in a number of the languages, with the change of demography and the cutting back pressures on local schools.

What we have seen, I know in my own State and generally throughout New England, is when there are pressures on the school districts there may be a handful of very talented students in a particular class who want to take the advanced math but there is so much difficulty in getting that teacher, and so few students—in many instances brilliant students who want to take it—that the school does not provide that kind of education opportunity. And that is true in pocket after pocket, particularly in many of the rural areas of Massachusetts, and throughout New England.

This program provides the best math, science, physics, chemistry, biology teachers, who instruct those few students that go to these learning centers so those individuals will be able to take their courses at the appropriate level. So they will continue their interest in these areas, which are enormously important in terms of our national interests, for our scientific base and for our research and development.

It has been an enormously successful program. It has had the very strong support of Senator COCHRAN, and others have spoken very eloquently about it. I have had the chance to visit centers in his State of Mississippi to see what it has done in terms of a number of the rural communities in the South.

It is something that is enormously valuable. We are talking here of several millions of dollars. But those several millions of dollars have enormous importance and consequence in one of the aspects of education, and that is technology and technology training. One of the important parts of the Daschle amendment restores that funding. That is the part of that Daschle amendment which I think is enormously important. We will have an opportunity, when we reach the Daschle amendment, regardless of that outcome—I am hopeful it will be accepted, but if not—to come back and revisit that at another time.

I will come back to this when some of my colleagues have finished their remarks.

I yield the floor.

LITTLE DELL LAKE, UT

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to bring to the attention of the chairman a small matter that is of importance to me and the people of my State. It involves a correction in cost allocation of the recently completed Little Dell Lake project in Utah. The Army Corps of Engineers acknowledged that an adjustment in cost allocation is warranted and is in the process of designing recreation facilities and redoing the cost allocation between the Federal and local participants of this project.

We expect the correction to be finalized in a revised agreement between the Department of the Army and the non-Federal sponsors toward the end of fiscal year 1995. This is a matter of equity. The non-Federal sponsors of the project paid for 100 percent of the costs allocated to water supply and 25 percent of the costs allocated to flood control. However, because the local sponsors were inappropriately asked to cost share the joint costs of recreation, the costs for recreation quadrupled and were unaffordable. This raised the costs for water supply and flood control by several million dollars. This error was only recently discovered and the Assistant Secretary of the Army has expressed a willingness to correct the matter.

Is it the understanding of the chairman that the inclusion of recreation facilities, the reallocation of costs, and the adjustment in the Federal and non-Federal cost sharing can be accomplished with funds heretofore appropriated?

Mr. DOMENICI. Given the facts in this matter, it would be appropriate to include recreation and adjust the Federal and non-Federal shares of the total project cost. The project is essentially complete and, as I understand it, has already provided significant flood

control and water supply benefits since the dam was constructed.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the chairman and would urge that the revised local cooperation agreement be consummated in fiscal year 1995 and that the funds be reprogrammed in the current fiscal year as well.

Mr. DOMENICI. I agree with the Senator from Utah that the revised local cooperation agreement and reprogramming should be accomplished this year with funds currently available to the corps.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the chairman.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I will be very brief.

I would like to respond to some comments made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, Senator PRESSLER, a few minutes ago on his conversation with the Vice President of the United States earlier today. I checked with Vice President GORE, and I am told that he did not tell Senator PRESSLER that the President would veto the telecommunications bill.

The Vice President told the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that he would like to see changes in certain provisions of the bill before he could recommend it to the President for his signature. I mention this because only the President issues veto threats, as the Vice President pointed out.

But the Vice President is not the only person who is concerned about certain provisions of this telecommunications bill.

The telecommunications bill that the Commerce Committee has reported will have an enormous impact on multi-billion-dollar cable, phone, and broadcast industries, and the economy of this Nation.

It was introduced just 3 days ago, and the report explaining what the Commerce Committee had in mind with this complex bill was filed late Thursday night.

This bill is a far different bill from S. 1822, which was reported last year.

First, this bill allows RBOC entry into long-distance phone service without a formal Department of Justice role in analyzing the competitive impact.

Second, I have questions about taking the lid off cable rates, and whether sufficient attention has been paid to the special problems of small, rural cable companies.

In fact, I suspect virtually every person that is on cable in this country would have some concern about just taking the lid off the cable rate, because I have not met many cable users who feel they are not paying too much.

Further, I have questions about some provisions in the bill that preempt State laws on judicial review of State