

more of our religious institutions speaking out against the illicit use of illegal drugs in the best interests of our children and our young people today. But really it is society as a whole.

So I hope that we will all continue to work harder. I intend to help General McCaffrey as much as I can to do his job, and I believe he will be a great drug czar. And I am going to give everything I can to assist him and help him to be able to accomplish that work in a way that will be beneficial to everybody in America.

Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity to mention some of these things. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUGAR). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

JEREMY ROYAL: NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL HEISMAN AWARD WINNER

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am proud to announce that Alabama's own Jeremy Royal is the recent recipient of Wendy's High School Heisman Trophy. Young Jeremy is a senior at Altamont High School in Birmingham, where he is valedictorian of the class of 1996. This is a truly remarkable honor, since Jeremy was one of over 8,000 nominees for the national award.

The High School Heisman Trophy recognizes not only athletic achievement, but also all-around scholarship and citizenship, all of which Jeremy possesses in huge quantities. He is truly one of the leaders of his generation as we head into the next century.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the school paper, the Altamont News, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. It tells of the remarkable achievements of Jeremy Royal which led to his selection as the High School Heisman Trophy winner. I join his family, friends, teachers, coaches, and school officials in congratulating him and wishing him all the best for what appears to be a bright and limitless future.

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

[From the Altamont News, Winter 1996]

JEREMY ROYAL WINS HIGH SCHOOL HEISMAN
(By Sarah Whiteside)

The philosopher Socrates believed that physical and mental fitness were a duty both to oneself and to the polis. Jeremy Royal, valedictorian of the class of '96 and winner of the Wendy's High School Heisman Trophy, exemplifies this Socratic ideal. This award, which emphasizes scholarship, athletics, and citizenship, recognizes Jeremy's contributions both to the Altamont community and to the community at large. The committee of judges, after rigorous competition from a

field of over 8,000 nominees, selected Jeremy for this national honor.

Among Jeremy's academic honors are the Yale Book Award, which is given annually by the faculty to an outstanding junior; the Smiley Award, which recognizes the most outstanding sophomore; and the Scholastic Award, which he has earned each year. In addition, he was named a National Merit Semi-Finalist. Jeremy has achieved these notable academic honors while maintaining a rigorous athletic program in tennis, basketball, and soccer. His skill, dedication, and determination have resulted in outstanding personal and team records in all three sports, as well as in his serving as team captain and in receiving Most Valuable Player awards.

Jeremy's commitment to community is just as strong as his commitment to academics and athletics. Within the Altamont community he has served each year as student council representative, as director of the Forum for Cultural diversity, as a member of the Honor Society, and as Latin Club president. His contributions to the larger community include serving as Make-a-Change volunteer for the National Council of Christians and Jews and as a delegate to Anytown, participating in the Birmingham Youth Leadership Forum, and volunteering as a counselor at a camp for pediatric cancer patients.

Jeremy's classmates and teachers were delighted and thrilled with the national recognition of his accomplishments and dedication. But we were not surprised, for we knew that there could be no other student in the country so deserving of the Heisman Trophy.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, a vast percentage of Americans don't have the slightest idea about the enormity of the Federal debt. Ever so often, I ask groups of friends: How many millions of dollars are there in a trillion? They think about it, voice some estimates, most of them wrong.

One thing that they do know is that it is the U.S. Congress that ran up the enormous Federal debt that now exceeds \$5 trillion. To be exact, as of the close of business Friday, March 8, the total Federal debt stood at \$5,017,686,664,137.86. On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$19,045.56 of this debt.

CHINA'S AGGRESSION AGAINST TAIWAN

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, it has been said that freedom always entails danger. So perhaps we here, in a country that has seen our share of battles on behalf of liberty and democracy, should not be surprised by China's latest action against Taiwan.

It is no coincidence that China has planned to hold missile tests off of Taiwan's coast during that country's first democratic Presidential elections. But despite China's predictable behavior, it is no less a violation of all that we hold dear to us here in this freedom-loving country.

China's latest act of coercion will accomplish nothing more than to further tarnish her image as a country whose human rights abuses seem to know no borders and no boundaries.

This latest action comes at a time when Taiwan is about to embark on what democratic countries as our own often take for granted—the free and open elections of our leaders.

By conducting missile tests off the shores of Taiwan—the third testing since Taiwan's President Lee Teng-hut visited the United States last June—China is not only effectively shutting down the two largest commercial ports in Taiwan, it is sending a message to the people of that country that their liberty is constantly in jeopardy.

I want my colleagues to be aware that these tests not only will affect Taiwan's exports and imports in the short term, but are bound to have long-term effects as well. Some analysts put the loss at as much as 20 percent for both imports and exports.

Those are losses that will be felt around the world, including my home State of Kentucky here exports to Taiwan ran close to \$73 million in 1994.

This does not even begin to touch on the repercussions for the financial markets from the predicted selling of the Taiwan dollar to driving share prices into a further slump. These financial backlashes will be long felt both in Taiwan and around the world.

And yet, these fiscal concerns probably are not foremost on the minds of a nation who fears first for the safety of her people. One account I have read says that nobody trusts the accuracy of Beijing's weapons, and that even the slightest misfire could hit inhabited areas. Even if these weapons are unarmed, the impact would be enormous if smashed into Taiwan.

Mr. President, let me close my asking my colleagues to remain ever alert to China's actions against this fledgling democracy. They have made their coercive intentions abundantly clear and we should not waver in our belief that nations must adhere to a certain international code of conduct.

I would also call on the administration to continue to monitor the People's Republic of China and to take the necessary steps toward assuring that China understands, in no uncertain terms, that Taiwan must be afforded its due respect in accordance with that international code.

As the leader of the free world, we can do no less than send a clear message of how this behavior is simply unacceptable.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

BALANCED BUDGET DOWNPAYMENT ACT, II

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report H.R. 3019.

The bill 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 proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, this afternoon, the Senate begins consideration of H.R. 3019, the omnibus appropriations bill, providing funding for the departments and agencies normally covered for the five regular fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills. These are appropriations bills that have not yet become law, and this legislation is necessary because the existing funding authority under the provisions of Public law 104-99 expires this Friday, March 15.

After I have concluded my opening remarks, I will offer a substitute amendment on behalf of the Appropriations Committee incorporating the text of S. 1594, as reported from our committee last Wednesday. Senate report 104-236 explains the committee's recommendations on the measure. We are taking the unusual step of reporting an original bill to be offered as a substitute to the House to expedite the Senate's consideration of this necessary legislation.

Mr. President, the committee substitute provides funding that would normally be included in the five regular fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills that have not become law. These are Commerce, District of Columbia, Interior, Labor-HHS, and VA-HUD. Three of those five—Commerce, Interior, and VA-HUD—were vetoed by the President. The committee has attempted to respond to the President's objections listed in his veto message and to modify objectionable language in the two bills remaining before the Congress in hopes of clearing procedural roadblocks and earning the President's approval, finally bringing an end to our fiscal year 1996 appropriations process.

For example, in the Commerce portion of our committee substitute, we have responded to the President's concern about the Cops on the Beat Program by earmarking \$975 million, within the \$1.9 billion block grant, exclusively for that program. An additional \$25 million was earmarked for drug courts. Additional funding was also provided for the Legal Services Corporation, the Ounce of Prevention Council, and the GLOBE Program in NOAA, all in response to objections raised by the President in his veto of the Commerce bill.

In the Interior bill, the committee recommends modifying the timber salvage language and the language concerning the Tongass National Forest in Alaska, attempting to, again, address the President's concerns in those areas.

And for the VA-HUD bill, we have recommended additional funding for National Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Council on Environmental Quality, and the Community Development Financial Institutions Program, all in specific response to objections raised in the President's veto message.

All of these adjustments have been made within the constraints of our existing funding allocations under the budget resolution. I might say, Mr. President, that the funding reductions achieved in discretionary appropriations for nondefense programs constitute the only deficit reduction achievement in the 104th Congress. Our committee has more than done its share.

In addition to these funding adjustments, the committee recommends contingent appropriations for certain programs if, and only if, a subsequent agreement is reached between the President and the Congress with respect to Federal expenditures for fiscal year 1996 and future years.

For some months now, there has been discussion on both sides of the aisle in both Houses of Congress about providing additional funding for certain discretionary programs in the context of a larger agreement on the budget. Republican budget negotiators offered an estimated \$10 billion in budget authority and \$5 billion in outlays last December. The administration has come forward recently with \$8.1 billion in budget authority and an estimated \$3.5 billion in outlays.

Title IV of our committee substitute would provide \$4.7 billion in budget authority and something in the neighborhood of \$2 billion in outlays in additional funding beyond that provided in title I of the bill if—that two-letter word—if agreement can be reached on how to provide those additional resources.

Let me add parenthetically that we are the Appropriations Committee and we are not the negotiating committee on the long-term budget solution. So we have not, in any way, attempted to prescribe how that agreement should be reached. That is not in our jurisdiction.

Our committee did not view its responsibility to come up with those additional resources with offsets derived from programs within the jurisdiction of other committees. It is not for us to decide whether to extend the ticket tax or impose a new banking fee or require the formation of a new uranium enrichment corporation, nor is it our proper role to stipulate the specifics of a potential agreement between the President and the Congress. That is the leadership responsibility.

It is our responsibility, however, to recommend what we believe to be appropriate levels of funding for programs within our jurisdiction, and we have done so.

If an agreement can be reached, our committee recommends additional funding for the Advanced Technology Program, contributions to international organizations and peacekeeping efforts, for energy conservation, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for job training, education and health programs, and for several housing programs. These recommendations are detailed in

an explanatory statement that I ask unanimous consent to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, all of these changes and new recommendations represent the committee's best effort to respond to the legitimate concerns of the administration, changing circumstances, and the view of our colleagues so that we can bring fiscal year 1996 to a close at last and begin our work on fiscal year 1997.

Despite the absence of enthusiastic support from the administration and its comments on our efforts to date, I remain hopeful that the President and his advisers will look favorably upon our recommendations. We have made a sincere effort to respond to the President's concerns. I believe we have gone about as far as we can. If there are the votes to do more, we will, but it is imperative that we move on and, I must add, stay within the budget resolution parameters.

Whatever additions over and above have to be, obviously, offset. If those offsets can be found, that will be the requirement on any amendment that would be offered to expand beyond the scope of this bill.

Finally, Mr. President, I should not overlook the supplementals provided in the bill our committee recommends to the Senate today. Slightly over \$2 billion is recommended in supplementals for disaster relief and for United States operations in Bosnia. Approximately \$1.2 billion is provided for disaster relief, all recommended with an emergency declaration under the terms of the Budget Act and subject to a subsequent request from the President.

Funding in the amount of approximately \$1 billion is provided for Bosnia operations, partially offset by \$820 million in defense rescissions.

In addition, \$70 million is recommended in response to the President's request for aid to Jordan.

This is a major piece of legislation, and like all omnibus packages, it contains many things that various Senators will support and a number of various Senators will oppose. I do not ordinarily support such measures in the appropriations process, but I do believe the committee substitute represents the best option available to us at the time. I hope the Senate will proceed expeditiously and adopt the committee substitute in the earliest possible time.

EXHIBIT 1

TITLE I AND TITLE IV ADD-BACKS (and list of dropped/modified legislative riders)

In addition to the \$4.7 billion contingency funding contained in *Title IV*, the Committee proposes increased funding from conference levels in *Title I* of the FY 1996 Omnibus Appropriations bill in efforts to address concerns and priorities expressed by the Administration.

We are trying to come up with a package that we can all agree upon. It is critical that

an Omnibus bill is signed—provisions must be made for these agencies that have been in limbo for the last six months so that they can do their jobs and we can move on to the FY 97 cycle. That is why we are so earnest about working with the Administration to devise a plan that can be cleared by Congress and that the President will sign. This is our last, best effort. Failure to enact this bill will likely result in an extension of the current C.R. until September 30th. No one likes this prospect.

We must not lose sight of efforts to balance the budget, and that is why some increases are contingent upon a balanced budget agreement with the President. However, in *Title I*, we are recommending increases in response to the President's concerns; we have augmented dozens of conference funding levels with absolutely no strings attached. We are making a good-faith effort to accommodate the President's requests.

Programs whose conference levels that have been increased in response to the Administration's requests for add-backs include: Community Oriented Policing [COPS] Program (Violent Crime Reduction Programs, State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance): \$975,000,000. This program received no direct funding in the conference report to accompany H.R. 2076, the fiscal year 1996 Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary Appropriations bill.

Drug Courts: \$25,000,000 for Drug Courts, which also did not receive funding in the conference report to accompany H.R. 2076.

Legal Services Corporation: \$300,000,000, an increase of \$22,000,000 over the level in the conference report to H.R. 2076.

Global Learning to Benefit the Environment Program [GLOBE] (NOAA): \$7,000,000. This program received no funding in H.R. 2076's conference report.

National Parks Service: \$1,322,000,000, which exceeds by \$38,000,000 the level in the conference report to H.R. 1977, the fiscal year 1996 Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations bill.

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration: \$1,380,000,000, an increase of \$270,000,000 over the conference level for H.R. 2127, the fiscal year 1996 Labor, HHS, Education and Related Agencies Appropriations bill.

Agency for Health Care Policy and Research: \$128,000,000, which exceeds the H.R. 2127 conference report level by \$1,000,000.

Developmental Disabilities: \$112,000,000, an increase of \$2,000,000 over the conference report (H.R. 2127) level.

The overall EPA level is increased to \$5,951,000,000, which is \$340,000,000 more than was included in the conference report to accompany H.R. 2099, the fiscal year 1996 VA, HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations bill.

Under EPA, \$490,000,000 was provided for enforcement, \$40,000,000 more than was included in the conference report.

Superfund receives an additional appropriation of \$100,000,000, bringing its total to \$1,252,000,000.

Clean Water: \$1,225,000,000 under title I, an increase of \$100,000,000 over the conference level.

Council on Environmental Quality: \$2,000,000, which is double the CEQ conference level.

Community Development Financial Institutions: \$50,000,000. No funding was provided for the CDFI program in the conference report to accompany H.R. 2099.

Economic Development Initiatives: \$80,000,000. No funding was provided for EDI in the conference report to accompany H.R. 2099.

Severely Distressed Public Housing: \$380,000,000, an increase of \$100,000,000 over the H.R. 2099 conference report level.

Title IV Contingency funding programs, that is, programs which will receive additional funding in the event the President and Congress are able to reach a balanced budget agreement, include: National Institutes of Standards and Technology (NIST)'s Manufacturing Extension Program: \$235,000,000, which received no funding in the conference report to accompany H.R. 2076, the fiscal year 1996 Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary Appropriations bill.

Department of Commerce's contributions to International Peacekeeping: \$215,000,000 on top of an original conference report level of \$700,000,000.

Department of Labor's School to Work program: \$91,000,000 in addition to \$95,000,000 in the level in the conference report to H.R. 2127, the fiscal year 1996 Labor, HHS, Education and Related Agencies Appropriations bill.

Dislocated Workers program, Department of Labor: \$333,000,000 in addition to an original appropriation of \$867,000,000 in the Omnibus bill's title I.

Summer Youth Jobs, Department of Labor: \$635,000,000. This program received no funding in the conference to accompany H.R. 2127, the fiscal year 1996, Labor, HHS, Education and Related Agencies Appropriations bill.

Head Start, Department of Health and Human Services: \$137,000,000 in addition to an appropriation of \$3,397,000,000 in title I of the Omnibus bill.

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration: \$134,000,000 on top of an appropriation of \$1,380,000,000 in title I of the Omnibus bill.

Goals 2000, Department of Education: \$1,278,000,000 in addition to \$6,514,000,000 in title I of the Omnibus bill.

Drug-Free Schools program: \$200,000,000, a matching amount to the level appropriated under title I of the Omnibus bill.

Charter Schools: \$8,000,000, a matching amount to the level appropriated under title I of the Omnibus bill.

Education Technology: \$10,000,000, in addition to \$25,000,000 in title I of the Omnibus bill.

Environmental Protection Agency, Overall Enforcement, \$162,000,000 in addition to \$5,951,000,000 in title I of the Omnibus bill.

Economic Development Initiatives, Housing for the Elderly: \$150,000,000 in addition to \$780,000,000 in title I of the Omnibus bill.

These represent some of the programs that would receive funding. In addition, the Committee has modified the Tongass language; dropped Mojave language; dropped most of the riders contained in the Labor, HHS and Education bill; modified the Timber Salvage amendment contained in last year's Rescission bill; and eliminated objectionable environmental riders in the House VA, HUD and Independent Agencies bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3466

(Purpose: Making omnibus consolidated rescissions and appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes)

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I send the substitute amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] proposes an amendment numbered 3466.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, S. 1594 is a comprehensive attempt by the Senate Appropriations Committee to bring before the Senate, in a timely manner, all of the pending fiscal year 1996 appropriation issues. By that, I mean that this bill not only would fund the five remaining fiscal year 1996 appropriation bills, which are funded in Title I through the end of the fiscal year, but the bill also contains the President's requests for emergency disaster assistance for thousands of victims of floods and other recent disasters throughout the country. These disaster assistance payments amount to a little over \$1 billion and are contained in Title II of the bill. Title II also contains \$820 million in defense spending relating to Bosnia. These appropriations are fully offset by rescissions from the committee's defense (050) allocation. Finally, Title II contains non-military assistance for Bosnia totaling \$200 million. Rather than offset this non-DoD spending for Bosnia with DoD offsets, as requested by the President, the committee chose not to offset this \$200 million and, instead, to declare it emergency spending under the appropriate section of the Budget Enforcement Act.

Mr. President, as all Senators are aware, the administration has vetoed three of the five fiscal year 1996 appropriation bills contained in Title I of the pending measure—namely, the Commerce-Justice-State bill; the VA-HUD and Independent Agencies bill; and the Interior bill. In all three instances, the President felt that these bills contained too little funding for what he considered critical public investments. In addition, each of these vetoed bills contained at least one objectionable legislative rider. So, the President vetoed these three bills and, in each instance, his veto was sustained. Similarly, the Labor-HHS bill has insufficient funding and riders unacceptable to the administration and the District of Columbia bill, as well, has unacceptable provisions. In an attempt to resolve these funding and legislative objections of the administration, the committee-reported bill has stricken most, but not all, objectionable legislative riders and, importantly, the committee has included additional appropriations in Title IV of the bill, subject to enactment into law 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."

In other words, these additional appropriations contained in Title IV and totaling \$4.8 billion, are beyond the committee's present 602(a) allocation. Therefore, the chairman chose, and the committee agreed, to report these additional appropriations and to set forth where the committee agrees with the President that additional funding should be provided, but at the same time, to do so in a way which did not exceed the committee's 602(a) allocation.

Pages 251–253 of the committee report (104–236), which is on each Senator's desk, contain a table which sets forth each of the individual appropriations for the departments and agencies that would receive the additional funding, subject to enactment of a future deficit reduction act.

I anticipate a number of amendments on this side of the aisle which will attempt to fully offset portions, if not all, of the addbacks included in the committee-reported bill and, consequently, make the funds available immediately upon enactment in a deficit-neutral way.

In conclusion, Mr. President, we have a long way to go in completing congressional action on this bill in a very short time. As Senators are aware, the current continuing resolution expires on midnight this Friday, March 15th. If Congress has not completed action and the President has not signed the conference version of the pending measure by that time, we face another government shutdown. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to work with the managers of the bill so that we may schedule appropriate amendments in a timely way and complete action on them expeditiously so that we may get to conference with the House and complete that conference prior to midnight, March 15th.

Mr. President, I yield the Floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRASSLEY). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 3466

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I send a modification of the amendment numbered 3466 to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The modification is as follows:

Insert on page 771, after line 17 of the amendment.

SEC. 3006. LAND CONVEYANCE, ARMY RESERVE CENTER, GREENSBORO, ALABAMA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Army may convey, without consideration, to Hale County, Alabama, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property consisting of approximately 5.17 acres and located at the Army Reserve Center, Greensboro, Alabama, that was conveyed by Hale County, Alabama, to the United States by warranty deed dated September 12, 1988.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property conveyed under subsection (a) shall be as described in the deed referred to in that subsection.

(c) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 3007. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$15,000,000 made available for

“Operations and Maintenance, Army” in P.L. 104–61 shall be obligated for the remediation of environmental contamination at the National Presto Industries, Inc. site in Eau Claire, Wisconsin. These funds shall be obligated only for the implementation and execution of the 1988 agreement between the Department of the Army and National Presto Industries, Inc.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, there is an error on page 213 of Senate Report 104–236, which accompanies S. 1594, that I would like to correct. Chapter 1 of title II of the bill pertains to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is under the jurisdiction of the appropriations subcommittee which I chair. In this chapter, the committee notes that for fiscal year 1996, the Food Safety and Inspection Service received a 5.5-percent increase over the amount appropriated to it for fiscal year 1995. However, this percentage does not include the supplemental appropriation which the agency received for fiscal year 1995, and should instead be 3.6 percent.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3467 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3466

(Purpose: To provide funding for important education initiatives with an offset)

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], for Mr. HARKIN for himself, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, Mr. KOHL, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. LAUTENBERG, proposes an amendment numbered 3467 to amendment No. 3466.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under “Amendments Submitted.”)

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, today we resume debate on the five remaining fiscal 1996 appropriations bills. We are halfway through the fiscal year. We have had two Government shutdowns. Our country's priorities have suffered greatly. Education, in particular, has suffered a series of extraordinarily difficult circumstances. Last week, the Appropriations Committee reported the Labor-HHS-Education bill that again cuts education by more than \$3 billion.

Many Republicans, once again, are attempting to pass a bill that continues these very devastating cuts in education—cuts that include \$679 million from math and reading programs,

denying services to 700,000 children; cuts in Head Start of \$137 million, depriving 20,000 3- and 4-year-olds of early help that can lead to a lifetime of achievement; cuts of \$266 million in the safe and drug-free school program, currently serving 23 million children.

In the Republican bill, which passed in the Appropriations Committee, all funding for the Summer Youth Jobs Program is eliminated. More than 500,000 young people would otherwise benefit from that program.

Spending levels in South Dakota and every other State are affected. In my State, schools face \$5.3 million in reductions in the availability of education funding for fiscal 1996 and 1997. All this adds up to the fact that students will not receive the services they need. We simply cannot allow that to happen if there is any prospect of avoiding that kind of a disaster in education in the coming year.

This crisis in education is a true emergency. This is not just rhetoric. This is not something we can wish away. All of these, and many other programs directly affecting thousands and thousands of students, will be very directly affected if we cannot address our country's education needs in a more thoughtful and comprehensive way than does the bill now before us.

The cuts in education we have experienced over the last several months represent the single largest reduction in education in history—a 25-percent cut—at a time when, I remind my colleagues, there is record enrollment in the public schools. Not only are we seeing increases in enrollment and a demand for more services, but we are asking our schools to meet that demand at a time when we are asking them to absorb a cut of record proportions.

One quarter of every dollar that was available in 1995 has not been available this year. Next year, nearly 52 million children will be seeking educational services across the country. That breaks the 1971 baby boom generation record.

Schools and colleges across the country are reporting that they are unable to plan their budgets and provide the services at the elementary, secondary, and higher educational levels because of the extraordinary cuts this bill and the past continuing resolutions require them to make.

Schools are already planning to lay off teachers and scale back services as a result of the budget we are contemplating. Not long ago, the mayors of most of our big cities were in Washington to share their concerns about the impact these cuts will have on their school districts. I thought that Detroit Mayor Dennis Archer probably said it as succinctly and eloquently as any I have heard as he discussed the impact this 25-percent cut in education will have on the Detroit school system. “Which 25 percent,” he asked, “of my students should I not educate?”

We ask, which 25 percent of America's children should be denied help

with math and reading? Which 25 percent of preschoolers should lose their chance to go to Head Start? Which 25 percent of children who attend schools where drugs and violence are problems should be forced to face those problems alone?

Mr. President, we should not even be asking these questions. We would not be if Congress had done its job and passed an educational funding bill over 5 months ago when this fiscal year began. The Republican failure to fulfill this basic function of Government, causing chaos in classrooms around the country, is becoming increasingly clear. But the time has come to end the chaos and to address this problem in a more forthright manner. The time has come for us to stand up and recognize that unless we deal with these issues more directly, we will find ourselves in a situation that continues to increase in seriousness and increase exponentially in terms of the difficulties it presents for school districts, as well as for the students themselves.

Throughout the budget process our Republican colleagues have said that their agenda is about protecting our children's future. The question we have is, "How can you protect their future, or ours, if we deprive children of the education they need to succeed?" The time to solve this problem is now. We cannot afford simply to pay lip service to it.

The contingency fund that has been incorporated into this bill is, in my view, an attempt on the part of some Republicans to have it both ways—to pretend they are funding education but to do so without releasing any of the money. The so-called addback that we see in this bill is not real. Enacting this bill into law would not produce one dime of this contingent funding. If we believe education is important, we have to ensure that funding is there regardless of contingencies—regardless of what may or may not occur as a result of additional action this Congress may take at some point in the future.

Mr. President, that is why every Democrat believes as strongly as we do that, of all the amendments we are offering, this one holds our greatest priority. This one says as clearly and as unequivocally as we can that we cannot mess around with education. We can have our policy differences throughout the year, and throughout this Congress, but when it comes to the crunch, when it comes to really dealing with the issue that we recognize is as important as anything to our future, we have to ensure that the investment is there.

So this amendment will restore the \$3.1 billion in educational cuts represented in this bill. And when I say "restore," I use that word very intentionally. We are simply restoring the funding necessary to bring us to the level schools had the last time we appropriated funds for education in 1995. This is real money with a real offset. It restores real funding to the 1995 level

without adding one dime to the deficit. We are willing to consider other offsets. We do not feel necessarily wedded to these particular ones. If there are others that are more acceptable, we will certainly take a look at them. But we wanted to find a dollar-for-dollar offset that allows us to fully restore the funding in education that we believe to be so critical.

There are two nonnegotiable principles. First, education must be adequately funded; and, second, education must be fully paid for.

Siphoning off money from education consigns American children to second-class futures and opportunities that are simply unacceptable.

Democrats are united in opposition and offer this amendment to reverse the failed policies that got us to the position we are in today. The chance for all of us to cast a vote for the future of our country's children lies with this amendment.

Children learn by example. We have an opportunity to set one by educating them properly and showing them how important they really are, that their future is our highest priority.

A lot of my colleagues have had a great deal to do with the fact that we are offering this amendment this afternoon. I applaud them—each and every one—for their effort. No one has put more effort into education and the priority it deserves than my colleague from Rhode Island, Senator PELL. And Senator HARKIN, Senator KERRY, Senator WELLSTONE, Senator LEVIN, and certainly Senator KENNEDY—who has devoted his entire public career to the priorities that we argue today must be included in this bill—they, along with Senator DODD, Senator KOHL, and Senator LAUTENBERG have all indicated how strongly they feel about this amendment. I applaud them, and thank them for their leadership in bringing us to this point this afternoon.

Other colleagues are on the floor who seek recognition to speak in support of this amendment. I yield the floor to allow them to be recognized.

Mr. PELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise merely to congratulate the minority leader on his speech, and to join him in his emphasis about the importance of education. It is important for the future of our children, our young people, and our country.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Senator DASCHLE, the minority leader. We are talking about the subject of education.

There is a lot of discussion in this country about where our country is headed and what kind of economic future we will have. Will we have jobs?

Will we have opportunity? All of this begins with the first step, which is education.

Thomas Jefferson once said that anyone who believes that a country can be both ignorant and free believes something that never was and never can be. Our economic progress in this country starts with education. That is what the Senator from South Dakota is saying with this amendment.

Mr. President, I have told this story on the floor a couple of times, but it is worth repeating. The first week I came to Congress, I walked into the office of the oldest man in Congress, Claude Pepper, and I saw something I have not forgotten. Claude Pepper was the oldest man serving in Congress at the time that I was elected to the Congress. I walked in, and met him. And he had behind his chair on his wall two autographed pictures that I have never forgotten. One was an autographed picture of Orville and Wilbur Wright making the first airplane flight. And it was autographed "To Congressman Claude Pepper" by Orville Wright before Orville Wright died. Then hanging just above that was a picture of Neil Armstrong setting his foot on the Moon autographed "To Congressman Claude Pepper."

And I thought about what lies between going from the ground to the air in the first airplane flight, and then from the ground to the air to the Moon. What is it that connects that vast difference in technological achievement? The answer is education.

It struck me when I saw those two pictures that in this one person's lifetime Claude Pepper had the autographed picture of the first person to fly and then the first person to go to the Moon. And what did it all come down to? In this country, a massive investment in education made possible technological breakthroughs—breakthroughs in virtually every area—that not only have allowed us to go to the Moon but to cure polio, and to do so many things in just this century.

Anyone who believes that this country can move ahead by deciding that education is somehow less important than many other things in our country just does not understand the value of and the role of education in building our country's opportunities and our country's future.

I have, I suppose, on a half-dozen occasions in recent months come to the floor of the Senate and lamented the juxtaposition of two programs that seem to me to demonstrate the misplaced priorities these days. A little program which I understand is now funded in this omnibus appropriations bill—a program called Star Schools that was designed to try to create Star Schools in the maths and the sciences through the use of technology—was cut by 40 percent in an earlier continuing resolution. That little program suffered a 40-percent funding cut—which I understand has now been reversed—but a 40-percent funding cut in Star

Schools at the same time that a 115-percent funding increase was provided for star wars; a much, much larger program. And it occurred to me that those who think that we will advance this country's interests by cutting a Star Schools program while at the same time increasing a star wars program really do not understand the genesis of progress and the rewards from the investment in education that have given this country the kind of economic strength and the kind of glorious past it has had, and the kind of glorious future it will have if we continue to make the right decisions in this Congress. The Senator from South Dakota has offered an amendment that tries to restore some of the funding for some education programs. There are some who would perhaps like to go further than the Senator from South Dakota goes. But, for certain, there are many of us in this Congress who believe that we can and should provide the kind of funding that is necessary for the education programs that the Federal Government is involved in without at all deviating from our goal of balancing the budget. This is not a question of anything other than selecting the right priorities.

Those of us who have spent time in classrooms in recent years understand that there are a number of elements that must be present in our schools in order for education to work in our country. First, there must be a young student who is interested in learning. Second, there needs to be a teacher who understands how to teach. And third, parents who want to be involved in their children's education.

All of those elements are necessary for education to work. But education also cannot and will not work unless we have funding for training good teachers, for funding school facilities, unless we make a commitment to have the best education system in the world.

Aside from this amendment, I hope and I wish that in the Presidential contest in 1996 and in the political discussions between our two parties not only in this year but beyond that we will have a thoughtful and thorough discussion about what role education should play in this country. Is education a discipline that establishes for us a goal that we want to have the finest education system in the world? Do we want America to have an education system that we can say is the best in the world? Is that our goal? And if so, then how do we reach that goal? It ought to be our goal. And that is what the Senator from South Dakota is saying with his amendment. Let us not step back on the issue of education. Let us not retreat in the investment that we ought to make. When we tell 55,000 little kids 4 and 5 years old, each of whom has a name, that we are sorry; we cannot have you in a Head Start Program—and incidentally, that is a program that works—when we are willing to tell a Jimmy or Betty or Johnny or Susie that we cannot afford to have

you in a Head Start Program; yes, you come from a low-income family; yes, you come from a disadvantaged family, but you cannot be in a Head Start Program, I say that is a shame. That is why we need to select the right priorities.

Let us fund Head Start. Let us make sure a whole range of these education programs, school-to-work programs, title I programs, the vocational education programs, and dozens of other programs that we know work and make this a better country, let us make sure those programs are adequately funded. That is what the Senator from South Dakota's amendment would do. I fully support the amendment and appreciate the fact that he has offered it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jan Gamby, a fellow of the Bureau of Land Management, be allowed floor privileges for discussion we will have shortly on another amendment.

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

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President I would like to indicate just for the record some wrong figures. This bill pending before the floor now does not cut 25 percent. It is cut 12 percent. The Federal education bill in this present form represents support for education comprising 67 percent of the national education expenditures. It has been cut, of course; it has been cut 12 percent as we are moving toward reductions of Government spending. Thus, the Federal cut is on a base of 6 percent of national expenditures on education. On the total national expenditures, it is a 6-percent reduction. With the additional funds in the title IV, the education cut is reduced less than 5 percent.

Now, those are contingent upon agreements being reached between the President and the negotiators on the long-term balanced budget.

I just want to make that correction for the record. I wish to say also that last spring when we allocated the 602(b) allocations we indicated our strong support on the Senate Appropriations Committee for education. We allocated \$1.5 billion more than the House had allocated for the Labor, HHS Subcommittee 602(b).

I cannot fault any of the arguments made by those advancing the amendment in terms of commitment to education, and I might say I do not take a back seat to anybody on that side of the aisle or anyplace else in this Senate Chamber on supporting education. But, nevertheless, I think we have to realize that when the proponents of this amendment say that it is offset, Mr. President, I have to correct that as well. It is not totally offset because even if you look at the uranium enrichment source to which they dip in for an offset, it does not in 1996 fully offset it. In fact, it costs money to do the uranium offset. It will in 1997 more than

provide money to offset back for the additions made in 1996 and 1997.

But let us understand this. We are offering here in this amendment not a total offset, which I think probably would make it subject to a point of order. Second, there is an emergency declaration used to compensate for the inability to totally dollar-for-dollar offset. Now, this is the right of the Senate. It is the right of the Congress at any time to put an emergency to any measure. I do not challenge the correctness. I am challenging the wisdom in adding an emergency declaration as a part of the offset that does not happen in a dollar-for-dollar offset.

I understand that we are going to lay this amendment down according to the leader and embark upon a major debate on this issue tomorrow when the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, Senator SPECTER, will be here to engage in an analysis and discussion of this amendment.

Mr. President, I also understand the Senators from North Dakota are anxious, once the discussion or comments made on this amendment have been finished, to offer an amendment to the emergency supplemental that is incorporated in this vehicle relating to North Dakota which we will be very happy to accommodate in that we have accommodated Idaho, Washington, and Oregon for similar problems that North Dakota has.

AMENDMENT NO. 3467 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3466

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I rise to support, as an original cosponsor, the amendment proposed this afternoon by the Senator from South Dakota with the objective of restoring some of the funds that have been cut from the education budget of this country.

I know that most Americans will quickly agree that money is by no means the whole solution for the schools of this country. I think all of us agree with that. The reason this fight is taking place is not because of some automatic response that suggests that, "Gee, they are cutting education. It doesn't matter how much. We must fight to put the money back." This amendment is not such a reflexive action.

But I think, just as most Americans would automatically agree that throwing money at something is not the solution, so they would also agree that they want schools that are free of drugs and that are safe. So they would also agree that they want 3- and 4-year-olds to have the maximum exposure to early intervention school programs. So they would also agree that it is critical to take kids who are at risk in their teenage years, who have either dropped out of school or have a drug problem or are facing some other kind of difficulty in life, and give them an opportunity to get into the workplace. So they would also agree that it is important to share the wealth of this great Nation with a disadvantaged

community, an urban community which depends on the property tax to fund its schools but which has very, very little tax base because of the problems it faces, in order to help the kids in that community get a decent education.

What we have here in the Republican approach to this continuing resolution is a disavowal of each and every one of those realities. I do not think there is any American in a community that is affected who is coming to the Congress and saying, "Hey, we only have 50 percent of our kids getting drug education last year. Let us lower the funding for drug education." Or, "Hey, we know that this community cannot match the high-income communities in the rest of our State in the local funds it invests in schooling its children, but, nevertheless, let us lower the Federal funding provided to that community and make it harder to educate its children."

No one has come to me in my State and said, "Senator, it's too bad that those kids at the Jeremiah Burke School only had 12 computers a year ago for 900 kids. But that's really not so important. Let's make sure they only have five next year—or maybe none."

That is the effect of what is being proposed by the Republicans in their approach to education, because the hard, inescapable truth in the United States of America is that we have district after district that does not have sufficient resources to provide kids with an adequate education.

I was at the Healy School in Somerville, MA, the other day, which receives title I money.

In that community there are kids who are in a joint first and second grade class. Some of those kids have special needs, and they are trying to mainstream through the education process those kids with special needs, because to take them out of the mainstream is to have them miss the very important experiences to which other children the same age are exposed. And the evidence is that they perform better and advance further scholastically when they feel they are part of the regular group.

It is an important component of building self-esteem. It is an important component of helping people to grow up to be productive citizens. It is an important component of reducing the later costs that are imposed on taxpayers in this country for people who are not able to be part of the mainstream.

In that school in Somerville, they have teachers' aides, part-time teachers helping the regular teachers to be able to keep these kids progressing as close to the norm as possible.

What is the rationale for the Republicans to come along and say, "That doesn't matter, we're going to cut Federal funding for that effort, because we have to balance the budget of this country?"

We do not disagree, of course, that we have to balance the Federal budget.

In fact, we emphatically state that we must balance the budget. The debate is not over whether we have to balance the budget, the debate is over how the budget should be balanced. And most Americans, I believe, would say, "Do we really need to build a B-2 bomber in 1996 instead of educating these kids in Somerville and in all of America's other communities from coast to coast? Could we not find other parts of our \$1.6 trillion budget to trim in order to guarantee we have the best education system in the world?"

I fully understand that we need standards, we need testing, we need a change of attitude in the school place. We need principals who have the power and authority to direct the schools and hold teachers accountable for satisfactory teaching. Of course, we need all those things.

But, Mr. President, we need to guarantee that our kids have computers. We need to guarantee that our schools are wired to the computer age. We need to guarantee that the libraries that they have are open in the afternoon. We need to guarantee that those libraries that are open have current reference books.

We need to guarantee that teachers are not doing just the minimum in order to stay employed, that they are not just xeroxing materials in order to be able to put something in front of children so they have something to work on during the day. We need teachers striving to be the best they can be, and motivating children to be the best they can be.

The Republicans, a couple of months ago, suggested to us that it was OK to zero out the money for summer jobs—eliminate summer jobs entirely. That was their priority. They went back home and talked to their constituents and read the polls, and they saw their agenda was not working as they intended. The American people did not like what they saw. So they came back to Washington and have included in this bill about two-thirds of the amount the President requested for summer jobs for teenagers. But they are not through with their intransigence. They have nominally appropriated funds to pay the costs of two-thirds as many jobs as the President requested, but then in the same bill they prohibit expenditure of those funds until a further deficit reduction bill is enacted that is to their liking. They say they are no longer holding schoolchildren and teenagers who want to work as hostages, but we all should look behind the story they are telling and closely inspect the facts of their bill.

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program is being cut by over 50 percent. I do not understand that. This will equate to a reduction of about \$2 million from a program that serves over 14,000 kids in Massachusetts. It serves 39 million students nationwide. I do not know of any American today who will come in here and say, "We've got

the drug problem licked, let's go home."

We just appointed a new drug czar. Most people will agree that the incidents of youth violence are increasing. Most people have accepted the stark reality of statistics that show us that 36 percent of all the kids in the United States of America are born out of wedlock, which means that they are mostly, not all, but mostly starting in one-parent families with one parent who has to struggle to make ends meet.

Most people in this country understand that those kids are going to be most at risk, and most people understand the devastating effects of drugs within those communities where a huge number of children are born out of wedlock.

So what is the rationale for reducing our effort to provide teen counselors, peer programs, all of the DARE programs and other efforts in our schools that make a difference in the lives of these at-risk children and young people? There is no credible rationale, Mr. President, and yet, in the name of balancing the budget and so-called fiscal austerity, the Republicans suggest that we can do more with less with respect to our education system.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon said earlier, "Well, we're not really cutting the amount of money being claimed, we are actually cutting a lesser amount of money." But the fact is that the only way that a lesser amount of money is being cut is if you count the funny money in this bill. What do I mean by funny money? I mean the money in the bill, \$8 billion, that depends on a future agreement with respect to budget legislation.

Let me read the very language of the bill. Page 780 in S. 1594, the pending legislation, line 20:

No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be made available for obligation or expenditure, nor any authority granted herein be effective, until the enactment into law of a subsequent Act entitled "An Act Incorporating an Agreement Between the President and Congress Relative to Federal Expenditures in the Fiscal Year 1996 and Future Fiscal Years."

So, Mr. President, this is funny money. This is a fake. This is a scam. This is the Republicans coming along with another political gimmick to suggest to the country that they are really providing money for purposes the American people believe are vital when they are not providing money at all, because what they are providing depends on a subsequent agreement for the entire budget which, as we all know, depends on both sides being willing to move much further than they have given any indication they are prepared to move.

The result will be even worse than the funding cuts that will be enforced when the subsequent budget agreement legislation proves to be a mirage that is unreachable by anyone. In fact, no school district in America can plan its budget for the next school year, because they do not know how much

money they will get for these purposes from the Federal Government.

Is that a real problem? Let me just share with you this information.

Because there are no 1996 commitments for key Federal education programs, Boston is proceeding to budget on a worst-case scenario, because they have to. Why? Because Boston must pay all teachers who have a contract for next year unless a teacher has been notified he or she is being laid off by May 15. So the school system has to plan for the worst, and send out the layoff notices.

What does that do for morale in the schools? What does that do for the capacity to build education reform programs and other areas where we have been making some progress in Massachusetts and other States?

The truth is that in school district after school district, people are left, by virtue of this game that is being played, making worst-case plans and not being able to implement the full measure of the reforms for which most of us have fought very hard over the last few years.

Goals 2000 is an example of those reforms. The Republicans are cutting Goals 2000 money. Why? Goals 2000 money is used to help teachers get the ongoing education and the ongoing training necessary to help them deal with reform, to produce reform, to teach better, to be state-of-the-art teachers and, hopefully, transition our kids successfully into the modern, complex workplace of the future.

Mr. President, all you have to do is look at the statistics on reading in America. If one does so, it is then impossible to answer why we are making these kinds of reductions.

Only one-third of the kids in the United States of America last year who graduated from high school, graduated with a passable—passable—reading level. Out of 2½ million kids who graduated from high school, fully two-thirds were below a basic high school reading level.

Out of 2½ million kids who graduated from high school in America, only 100,000 had a world-class reading level. And what are we doing at the Federal level? We are going to pull back from the incentives we can offer for providing an adequate education for our kids.

Mr. President, every one of these efforts, frankly, is critical. Title I money enables schools to provide additional training in math and in reading and also provides technology resources and assistance to parents of at-risk students in order to help those students learn to read and write adequately.

I can introduce you to one Boston student who started as a below-average elementary student, but after completing the title I program, this student went on to become his high school's class president and is currently enrolled at MIT in Cambridge.

There are, thank God, thousands of other similar examples. I know stu-

dents who were having great difficulty with math or with reading who, only because of the extra attention they were able to get, were able to go on in the mainstream, attend college, graduate and secure a career, and, in some cases, proceed to an even higher level of education.

It is incomprehensible, Mr. President, that in 1996, out of our Nation's \$1.6 trillion budget, when we know that there are wiser offsets, we are being asked to reduce the safety in our schools, the quality of our education, and the access by kids to additional training and assistance, and to make it impossible for our children to receive the highest level of teaching. My colleagues supporting this amendment and I believe that all of these things are being sacrificed needlessly.

I might add that, given the new recognition in recent months of the problems in the American workplace, it is even more puzzling that our friends on the other side of the aisle would find some virtue in trying to balance the budget by giving a tax cut to the wealthy while simultaneously taking away help for kids to go to school in the poor communities of this country.

It is ironic. Patrick Buchanan and the Republican Party have been experiencing a certain awakening with respect to some of those things that many of us have been fighting for in the Senate for a long time—the problem of people raising their wages in this modern economy, the problem of people holding on to the jobs that they have or getting the jobs they want to have, all of which in today's world depends more and more on the linkage of technology and skill and training to a particular job opportunity.

What is the rationale, in the face of that clear connection, for reducing our commitment to those kinds of efforts, particularly where each of those efforts has been proven to be competent, valuable, and productive?

It is not as if our colleagues are coming to the floor of the Senate and saying, "Look, here's this program. It is a terrible program. It doesn't do anything. The kids aren't learning. We have had 10 years of wasted money. Nobody seems to be able to get ahead." That is not the evidence. I hear no one making that claim. Instead, they are saying, "Our eyes are closed. Our minds are made up. We have to cut these programs regardless."

The evidence is that every single one of these efforts has made a difference in the lives of children, in the schools they attend, and in the communities where they live. And that is what makes up the fabric of this country. And that is what produces the real values of this Nation.

Mr. President, if we are going to hear lectures about values, it should be clear that the vote we will have on this education amendment will be a vote about values. If you care about values, you are not going to strip money from children who are trying to mainstream

in a school in an inner city that is struggling to obtain adequate resources. You are not going to take that away from them in order to give some larger tax break to people who have seen the stock market go up 43 percent in the last year.

So, I respectfully say to my colleagues that this is one of the most important amendments the Senate will consider this year, and the vote we will cast on it will be one of the most important votes we have an opportunity to cast in the Senate this year, because this really is a vote about where we want this country to go and what kind of people we are going to be. No one has made up the statistics or the studies which document the linkage of early intervention, of structure, of quality reading and math and science education to the ability of students to achieve their maximum potential.

I hope that tomorrow or the next day, whenever we vote on this measure, we will articulate to the Nation our sense of the proper values in this country and of the proper priorities in this budget.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3468 AND 3469, EN BLOC

(Purpose: To appropriate \$2.8 million to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for upper basin water storage in order to prevent flooding on its land in the Devils Lake Basin in North Dakota, which funds are designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985)

(Purpose: To appropriate \$10 million to the Economic Development Administration for assistance to prevent flooding in the North Dakota's Devils Lake Basin, which funds are designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985)

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I send two amendments to the desk and ask for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent to set aside the Daschle amendment?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And consider these amendments en bloc?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and that these two amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], for himself and Mr. CONRAD, proposes en bloc amendments numbered 3468 and 3469.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the amendments be considered as read.

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

The amendments are as follows: