

least 3 years of math, science, and social studies. By 1990, according to the National Center for Education Statistics, 40 percent of high school graduates had taken at least those basic courses.

Candidate Dole said that SAT scores are dropping. He was right 10 years ago, but he is very wrong now. In 1983, SAT scores had been dropping for a decade. In the 1990s, they are rising. The national average score for the class of 1995 was 910, the highest since 1974.

Candidate Dole also said that dropout rates are rising. In fact, more students are finishing high school and going on to college than ever before. The high school dropout rate has been cut by a third—from 17 percent in 1967 to 11 percent in 1993. Almost 90 percent of students are graduating from high school. Between 1980 and 1993, the proportion of high school graduates going to college increased—from 49 percent to 62 percent.

Despite these improvements, much more needs to be done, and I commend candidate Dole's new-found support for education. As Senate majority leader, he helped lead the Republican attempt to slash funds for education. He even wanted to slash support for safe and drug free schools by more than half. But now he agrees that every student has the right to be safe in school.

Candidate Dole voted to cut support for reading and math by \$1 billion last year. Now he rightly agrees that all students need a solid grounding in basic subjects.

Candidate Dole voted against the Improving America's Schools Act in 1994, which encourages greater parent involvement in the full range of educational decisions for their children. Now he rightly says parental participation is a key component of successful education.

Obviously, when it comes to education, candidate Dole has a difficult time escaping his anti-education record.

By contrast, President Clinton is the "Education President." He has worked tirelessly and effectively to improve education since he was elected in 1992. He led the opposition to the Republicans' attack on education last year, and he has proposed a budget that invests significantly more in education in the years ahead, and while still achieving a balanced budget in the year 2002.

If Americans want an Education President, they already have one. Any "Education Consumer" would be well-advised to go with the proven product, not a candidate who is suddenly discovering the error of his past ways.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

(The remarks of Mr. FAIRCLOTH pertaining to the introduction of S. 1968 are located in today's RECORD

under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senator from Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 4575, AS MODIFIED

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a modification of the amendment No. 4575, and ask it be considered immediately.

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

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. SPECTER, for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. LOTT, proposes an amendment numbered 4575, as modified.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 19, line 7, before the period insert the following: "Provided, That of the funds provided in this paragraph and not withstanding the provisions of title 31, United States Code, Section 1502(a), not to exceed \$25,000,000 is available for the benefit of the Army National Guard to complete the remaining design and development of the upgrade and to increase gunner survivability, range, accuracy, and lethality for the fully modernized Super Dragon Missile System, including pre-production engineering and systems qualification".

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask this amendment be agreed to because it will provide up to \$25 million to upgrade the Dragon Missile System that is currently employed by the Army National Guard. It has been cleared on both sides, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. We have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4575), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4493, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide \$1,000,000 to assist the education of certain dependents of Department of Defense personnel at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask the clerk lay before the Senate amendment No. 4493, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. HELMS, proposes an amendment numbered 4493, as modified.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 9, line 22, before the period, insert: "Provided further, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$1,000,000 is available, by grant or other transfer, to the Harnett County School Board, Lillington, North Carolina, for use by the school board for the education of dependents of members of the Armed Forces and employees of the Department of defense located at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina".

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, this amendment will help restore equitable treatment for Fort Bragg-based military personnel and dependents who live in and attend school in nearby Harnett County, NC. To achieve this, my amendment authorizes \$1,000,000 from fiscal year 1997 Army O&M funds to be applied to the costs of Harnett County schools' providing quality education to dependent children of Fort Bragg personnel.

This amendment will remedy the gross disparity that now exists in the distribution of impact aid dollars intended to help defray the costs of the schooling of military-connected dependents. Over the years, and despite a substantial increase in Fort Bragg-connected student populations, the Federal Government has provided a declining amount of impact aid dollars to Harnett County. Under current law, Harnett County no longer qualifies for any impact aid funding.

Mr. President, much of the growth in Harnett County's public school system is directly attributable to the influx of military personnel. According to one housing developer in Harnett County, 98 percent of the families buying in one of his communities are military families.

During the past few years, thousands of students have been added to the rolls of Harnett County's school system. Many of them are children of Army personnel and DOD civilians employed at Fort Bragg. This growth has caused severe school overcrowding in Harnett County. Many children attend classes in temporary facilities, such as cafeterias, gymnasiums, auditorium stages, libraries and trailers. In some schools, students must wait in line up to an hour to use the bathroom.

Mr. President, projections indicate that Harnett taxpayers will have to spend \$87,000,000 for new schools within the next decade merely to keep up with this growth. The county simply does not have the resources to build another school without substantial assistance.

The Federal Government has an obvious obligation to provide for the education of military dependents. Because of the nature of military service which requires frequent moves and reassignments, military families seldom have an opportunity to establish strong roots in a community and to become active in local schools. The Federal Government has a duty to ensure that these parents need not worry about the quality of education afforded their children.

To further exacerbate the education funding crisis, Fort Bragg is now seeking to purchase an 11,000-acre property—known as the “Overhills property”—which will nearly double the amount of land the Federal Government presently owns in Harnett County—7,000 acres of the Overhills property are in Harnett County. This purchase by Fort Bragg will cause Harnett County to permanently lose an additional \$24,000 in annual tax revenues.

Some may ask why Harnett County should be singled out to benefit from this amendment. It is because it's the right thing to do. Harnett is the only county in the Fort Bragg Impact Area that suffers an economic loss due to its location near Fort Bragg. According to 1990 figures, Harnett County has been losing \$122,000 per year because of Fort Bragg.

Since then, impact aid funding has been eliminated, the number of military dependents has soared, and the Army has proposed to erode further the tax base. Without help, the situation will worsen further.

Let there be no doubt, I fully support the acquisition of the Overhills property by the Army—provided that Harnett County's school system is given the assistance it needs and deserves.

Mr. President, North Carolinians are proud of the several great military installations within our borders. For more than 50 years, North Carolinians have been especially proud of Fort Bragg, home of the United States Army's XVIII Airborne Corps and the 82nd Airborne Division. These units and other units stationed at Fort Bragg are on the front line of our Nation's defense; standing ready to deploy anywhere, any time, to preserve freedom in the world.

Mr. President, I spent four non-heroic years in the Navy during World War II. I have great affection and respect for the soldiers and defense support personnel who are devoting their lives to the defense of our country. I will do anything in my power to ensure that they are provided everything they need to do their jobs.

This includes not merely providing an adequate training area, equipment and hardware; they also deserve the quality of life and peace of mind to enable each soldier to focus on his mission, accomplish it, and return home safely.

Unmistakably essential to that quality of life is the proper education of their children.

Mr. President, I urge Senators to support this amendment which takes a small step towards addressing the educational needs of the children of our Nation's finest soldiers.

I ask unanimous consent that “Education Equity Fact Sheet” be printed in the RECORD.

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

EDUCATION EQUITY FACT SHEET

The Helms amendment would authorize \$1 million over two years to ensure that Fort

Bragg-connected dependents who attend school in Harnett County, N.C. are treated the same as Fort Bragg-connected dependents who attend school in Cumberland County, N.C.

CRITICAL SITUATION

Currently, Harnett is the only county in the Fort Bragg Impact Area that suffers an economic loss due to its location near Fort Bragg. (Fort Bragg-Pope AFB Impact Assessment, Sept. 1990).

Military dependents are attending classes in makeshift classrooms including cafeterias, gymnasiums, auditorium stages, libraries, and trailers. It is projected that \$87,000,000 is needed to provide for new school facilities over the next 10 years. (Harnett County News, Apr. 10, 1996).

According to 1990 figures, Harnett loses \$122,000/year and that deficit has substantially worsened as the number of post-related personnel and dependents moving into the county has increased dramatically. (Id.)

It costs the same amount to educate a child in Harnett County as it does to educate a child in Cumberland County.

No child of a military service member should be treated as a second-class citizen.

The federal government's responsibility to provide for the education of military dependents should not depend upon where their parents live.

UNJUSTIFIABLE IMPACT AID DISPARITY

FY96 Cumberland—\$2,586,932.00/14,143 Students=\$183 per student.

FY96 Harnett—\$47,176.00/1,025 Students=\$46 per student.

However, under current law, Harnett County no longer qualifies for any impact aid funding, even though their base-connected student population is soaring.

Fort Bragg wants to buy a Rockefeller Estate known as the “Overhills Property”, lying primarily in Harnett County—the purchase will almost double the amount of land the federal government owns in Harnett County, causing an additional annual tax loss of \$24,000.

Each new resident pays an average of only \$231 per person in taxes to Harnett County while it costs the county \$500 to educate each child.

Military families flock to Harnett.—Fayetteville Observer-Times—Sun., Dec. 3, 1995.

“Ninety-eight percent of the families buying [in Heritage Village] are in the military.”—Bill Arnold, Partner in the Kilnarnold Corp.

Out of room.—Harnett County News—Wed., April 10, 1996.

“We've reached the critical stage for Harnett County. No. 1 we're a low wealth county and No. 2, we're fast growing. We're picking up 600 extra students a year.”—Hank Hurd, Assistant School Superintendent.

“Western Harnett Middle is now in an extremely overcrowded situation right now. . . . It's a crisis situation as far as the school facilities needs of our county are concerned.”—Harnett's Assistant School Superintendent Hank Hurd.

“We're going to see more and more mobile classrooms. But, it's no long term solution. The more mobile classrooms you put in, the more bathrooms and cafeterias are overtaxed.”—Hank Hurd.

“We need construction that is stable in our classrooms that will last for years to come instead of this patchwork. . . . Sometimes students don't understand why we don't have the same things that we need as other students in the main building have.”—Special Education Teacher Angela Williams.

“Sometimes we have to wait at least one hour in line to use the bathroom. . . . The bathroom we have to use has only four stalls for 50 girls. . . . Then when we are late for

class, we get written up by our teachers.”—Student Sandra McNeill.

“All of these trailers were supposed to have handicapped ramps to follow federal guidelines. . . . We do have a special-ed child who walks on crutches. . . . We had a Physical Education class out here last year and they had to carry the child up the steps.”—Angela Williams.

“They have educational TV's in the main classrooms and we can't even get a TV in our hut classrooms.”—Angela Williams.

Growth squeeze in Harnett County Schools.—The News & Observer—Sat., Feb. 3, 1996.

“It will be years before the needs of our children are met.” Comments on the schools condition without the prospect of outside help, county schools superintendent Bob Beasley.

“We spend a lot of our time just figuring out what we're going to do next” in an effort to make room for new students, Principle Ned White.

“To one new schoolhouse per year,” that the county needs “but can't afford to be built.” The space needed to accommodate the estimated 500 new students per year, for the next three to five years, Chairman H.L. Sorrell Jr. of the county commissioners.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this amendment has been cleared on both sides. I ask for its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4493), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield to the Senator from Indiana for a request.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent a staffer of mine, Maj. Sharon Dunbar, be granted the privilege of the floor during debate on the defense appropriations bill.

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

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I wonder if I can inquire of the Senator from Alaska whether he anticipates there will be any time for additional morning business, or does he have a full schedule on appropriations?

Mr. STEVENS. We would be happy to. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, 5 minutes at most.

Mr. STEVENS. We promised the Senator from Iowa he could proceed with his amendment. As soon as he is finished, we will be glad to consider that, if that is agreeable.

AMENDMENT NO. 4890

(Purpose: To permit up to \$10 million of appropriated funds to be used to initiate engineering and manufacturing development of airborne mine countermeasure system)

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment proposed by Senators DODD and LIEBERMAN and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], for Mr. DODD, for himself and Mr. LIEBERMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 4890.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 29, on line 20, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof: "Provided further, That up to \$10 million of funds appropriated in this paragraph may be used to initiate engineering and manufacturing development for the winning airborne mine countermeasure system."

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment on behalf of myself and Senator LIEBERMAN that will help to preserve strong technological innovation in the State of Connecticut, as well as contribute to the safety of U.S. troops.

The amendment will allow the Navy to spend up to \$10 million to initiate engineering and manufacturing development of the Magic Lantern airborne mine countermeasure system, which was created by the Kaman Co. of Connecticut.

This important measure maintains the ability of one of Connecticut's businesses to continue development of vital antimine technology. The Magic Lantern system was deployed in a prototype stage during Desert Storm, and in subsequent tests, the improved system has met and exceeded every Navy-established criteria, including probability of detection and classification, area coverage, and false alarm rate.

Mr. President, I understand this amendment will be agreed to, and I am pleased that the Magic Lantern program will be able to continue to contribute to both the economy of Connecticut and the safety of U.S. troops.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, this amendment has been cleared by both managers.

Mr. STEVENS. This deals with using funds within appropriations to initiate engineering and manufacturing development of an airborne mine countermeasure system.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4890) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

AMENDMENT NO. 4463

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds for support of more than 68 general officers of the Marine Corps on active duty)

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I call up an amendment filed at the desk, No. 4463.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] proposes an amendment numbered 4463.

On page 88, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

SEC. 8099. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be used for supporting more than 68 general officers on active duty in the Marine Corps.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Just to bring my colleagues up to date as to where we are on this amendment, I have spoken a long time on it. I have one more point I want to make.

I have been told two individuals want to speak, one who wants to speak for my amendment and one against it. I do not think Senator STEVENS cares to prolong the vote on this amendment. When the time comes, I will be willing to do that. I am saying, a couple of others want to speak. I am not sure they will be able to speak. I notified their offices. If they do not come over, as far as I am concerned, we can go to the completion of the amendment. Is that all right with the Senator from Alaska?

Mr. STEVENS. I am pleased to agree with that procedure. We normally try to get a time agreement, if the Senator wishes a time agreement. We do not know how many other Members wish to speak on the Senator's amendment, so we will defer that. Has the Senator submitted his amendment?

Mr. GRASSLEY. It is called up.

If you will remember, my amendment, just read, would not fund the 12 additional Marine Corps generals that the Marine Corps wants, and the money is in this bill to do that. My argument, obviously, was as the number of marines has gone down from 199,000 to about 172,000 to 173,000, it seems to me that as we are downsizing, we should not be topsizing the administrative overhead from the standpoint of adding 12 more generals.

We have seen a reduction in the number of generals and admirals—maybe not enough—but we have seen a reduction in the other three forces. They still are not as efficient from the standpoint of the number of generals and admirals as the Marine Corps is.

Regardless of that, it seems to me inconsistent with balancing the budget, when the Secretary of Defense is pointing out to us the need for every dollar that we can get going into modernization, that we do not spend more money on administrative overhead. If 70 generals were in charge at the time there were 199,000, it seems to me we do not need 80 generals when we have 172,000 marines.

One argument that has been made by the Senate Armed Services Committee, the authorization committee, is that this issue should be decided in conference between the House and the Senate on the authorization bill and should not be a point to discuss when we have the Senate defense appropriations bill up.

I disagree with that, and I disagree with that because this is a legitimate

appropriations matter. The Marine Corps requested 12 additional generals, and these generals do cost extra money. In fact, it involves a lot more money. That extra money is in the bill that is before the Senate right now. Regardless of what the Senate Armed Services Committee said, if the money is not in this bill, then the new generals do not get paid. Period. You cannot pay people if there is no money appropriated for it. You cannot pay these new generals based on the authorization bill. DOD cannot write one check based on an authorization.

The money is in the military personnel account. You can turn yourself, if you want to see it, to pages 6 and 7 of the committee report, and there you find a listing of the branches of the military, the number of people who are being funded by this legislation. You are not going to receive a paycheck if there is not money appropriated, because you cannot spend money in our Government without the consequence of an appropriations bill.

So these generals are expecting to be paid. They will only be paid if the money is in this bill, and my amendment would take that money out. It would leave the money to the Defense Department, hopefully to do what the Secretary of Defense said should be done, and that would be to modernize our military capability.

The last point—at least I think it will be the last point I will have to make because we have not had the debate on this amendment that I hoped we were going to have, particularly from people on the Senate Armed Services Committee. Most of their arguments have been procedure, that this is in their bailiwick, it should not be decided now. They have not been willing to state their case. Maybe somebody will come over here and do it, and I hope they will.

But the last point I want to make is that if there is a real need for additional personnel to be funded in the Marines, it is for more sergeants and more lieutenants, because those are the people who lead Marine platoons in battle. That is the place where there is a tremendous shortfall in the number of qualified people who are needed, and I will refer to a study in just a minute.

Earlier in this debate, I talked about the driving force behind the request for 12 more Marine Corps generals. I said even though the Marine Corps said that war fighting was the reason they needed more generals and even though the Senate Armed Services Committee said war fighting was not the reason for needing more generals, in either case, this cannot be justified because these positions are not going to war fighting, and it is not because of Goldwater-Nichols.

With all due respect, I think people who make these arguments are using smokescreens. If war fighting were the top priority, the Marine Corps would be adding more platoon sergeants, not more generals to fill the highest levels

in headquarters positions. I said the Marine Corps has a critical shortage of sergeants and lieutenants. I said that in one of my earlier statements today. These are the people, lower in the ranks, who train the force and keep it ready to go. If war breaks out, they would lead our platoons into battle.

Everyone knows that the heart and soul of the Marine Corps fighting force is its 27 infantry battalions. That is what the Marine Corps is all about. Everything the Marine Corps does is focused on moving, protecting and supporting those units. If those 27 battalions are not healthy, then the Marine Corps is not strong.

Well, a doctor has been examining the battalion's vital signs, and they are not up to snuff. I repeat what I said a moment ago, there is a critical shortage of platoon sergeants. That statement is based on an important piece of information. It is based on the Marine Corps briefing paper that I have in my hand, "Making the Corps Fit to Fight." It is called a unit cohesion task force interim report.

This review was conducted by the unit cohesion task force in April of this year, just 3 months ago. It was under the leadership of Marine Col. G. S. Newbold.

I ask unanimous consent to print a portion of this briefings in the RECORD.

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

MAKING THE CORPS FIT TO FIGHT—UNIT
COHESION TASK FORCE INTERIM REPORT
UNIT COHESION TASK FORCE—COL. G.S.
NEWBOLD

MM

Sgt. Maj. J.H. Lewis III.

MMEA

Lt. Col. B. Judge.
Maj. J.P. Diffley.
Maj. D.J. Donovan.
Maj. S.J. Jozwiak.
Maj. R.J. Vandenberghe.
Mr. R.W. Spooner.

MMOA

Maj. J.M. Lynes.
Maj. R.A. Padilla.
Maj. M.J. Toal.

MMP

Lt. Col. G.R. Stewart.

MA

Lt. Col. R.L. Reece.

RAM

Maj. R.B. Harris.

THE LEGEND

First to Fight.
Most ready when the Nation is least ready.
The Nation's 9-1-1 Force.

THE REALITY

Infantry Battalions are staffed at 57% of ASR requirements for 0311 Sergeants.

The inventory of MPs/Corrections Marines exceeds that of Artillerymen.

We have more Utilities Specialists than Tankers and Amtrackers combined.

Less than 50% of Enlisted Marines remain with the same Infantry Battalion for two deployments.

OFFICER REALITY

88% of Majors are not in the FMF.
Nearly 15% in Northern Virginia.

Only 11% of 0302 Lieutenants & 29% of 0302 Captains make two deployments with the same Battalion.

Despite aviator shortage, nearly 52% of all aviators are not in the FMF.

REALITY FROM COMMANDERS

...We had to pull our boat platoon from the CAX before FINEX to get them to Little Creek to start the [MEU SOC] cycle.

Our training cycle is not in sync with the personnel cycle.

Without stabilizing our ranks, cohesion's benefits are lost and training is the equivalent of pouring water into a bottomless bucket...

If maneuver warfare seeks to shatter the enemy's cohesion, we must seek to strengthen our own as a matter of self-protection.

I have lance corporals as platoon sergeants and sergeants as platoon commanders.

Three weeks ago we went on a battalion run and fell out with 121.

The concept that numbers are more important than morale, cohesion etc., must be reconsidered.

We do have quality NCOs and SNCOs, but the best go off to other key billets (DI/Recruiting).

ENABLING PHILOSOPHY

In order to fulfill its role as the Nation's crisis response force, the Marine Corps will re-establish the primacy of the operating forces by creating manpower and training policies and programs that support cohesion and stability.

PRIORITIES (PILLAR 4)

The FMF will be manned at 90% of T/O—General C.E. Mundy, Jr., 1990.

Reality—enlisted 88%; officers 84%.

"Our system is geared to the success of individual careers vice the success of individual units"

PRINCIPLE

Since our heart and soul is our warfighting capability, service in the FMF must be our top priority.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I want to quote selectively from this paper.

The first slide has this title, "The Legend," with bullets, "First to Fight," "Most Ready When the Nation Is Least Ready," "The Nation's 9-1-1 Force."

Who is going to argue with that about the Marines? They have that reputation. They live up to that reputation, and we ought to support that reputation.

Colonel Newbold is talking about the Marine Corps' mission. Then, of course, he gets down to the guts of his briefing, what he calls "The Reality." Of course, this is what we ought to be concerned about. In fact, we ought to be disturbed about this.

The very first bullet is a blockbuster. I want to quote: "Infantry Battalions Are Staffed at 57 Percent of ASR for 0311 Sergeants." Of course, a 0311 sergeant is an infantry noncom. He is a platoon sergeant. Every platoon must have a sergeant, and a platoon is in deep trouble without a good one.

So what does the Marine Corps do with 43 percent of its platoon sergeants missing, at the very same time when the command of the Marine Corps is asking for 12 additional generals?

Another slide is entitled "Reality From Commanders." This provides an answer. The commander's answer:

I have lance corporals as platoon sergeants and [I have] sergeants as platoon commanders.

At a time when the Marines are asking for 12 additional generals, and they are using lance corporals as platoon sergeants and sergeants as platoon commanders. The commander, of course, has to make good with what he has, but that is not good enough.

Corporals are normally squad leaders, and lieutenants are platoon commanders. If corporals have to do the job of a sergeant, and sergeants are called upon to do the lieutenant's job, then why cannot colonels do a general's job?

I referred to that in the sense that every one of these so-called vacancies that is called for, the need for these new generals, all but one is filled with colonels who are getting the job done. If the colonels would take up some of the slack—and it is being done already, and the job is being done well—what is the need for 12 additional generals, when we need sergeants and lieutenants, when we had 70 generals here when it was 199,000, and we are down to 172,000 now, and we have 68 generals? Why do we need 80?

The briefing paper does indicate that the quality of the noncoms and the sergeants on hand is excellent. Unfortunately, the good ones are being shipped off to nonoperational, noncombat assignments.

This is what the briefing paper says: "We do have quality NCO" and "SNCO", but the best go off to other key billets," like drill instructors and recruiting duty.

This is Colonel Newbold in his task force report, "Making the Corps Fit to Fight."

Mr. President, recruiting duty, that is where some of the new generals would go. We have been told that by this report. If recruiting duty is not a good place to send your best NCO's, then why is it a good place to put generals?

The briefing paper concludes with this piece of philosophy. I quote from the briefing paper.

In order to fulfill its role as the Nation's crisis response force, the Marine Corps will re-establish the primacy of the operating forces by creating manpower and training policies and programs that support cohesion and stability.

Those are very profound words by people in charge who are going to get the job done even though they do not seem to get the support of people higher up. Because I do not think they are getting the support when they need sergeants and lieutenants and we are putting the money into generals.

We are downsizing the Marine Corps and topsizing the administrative part of it. If the operating forces are the top priority, why are only 25 percent of the Marine Corps general officers command combat officers? Well, the paper draws a conclusion to that.

I want to quote from the paper again.

Our system is geared to the success of individual careers versus the success of individual units.

Mr. President, this is what my amendment is all about, promotions at the top versus the needs of the infantry battalions, sergeants versus generals. What does the Marine Corps need more, sergeants or generals? If we want the Marine Corps to be the 911 force, always ready to go, then we should make sure that the 27 infantry battalions are rock solid. We better make sure they have the essentials to be effective. We better make sure that they have a full complement of sergeants and lieutenants.

It would be irresponsible to give the Marine Corps more generals when its heart and soul is short of the stuff that it needs to do battle. The Marine Corps should not be topsizing while it downsizes. As the Marine Corps gets smaller, it seems to me it is legitimate to cut the brass at the top, as the other services have already done. I had a chart here to demonstrate that.

Of course, most importantly, the point was made by our Secretary of Defense of how important modernization is. Those at the top of the heap should have what they need to get the job done. By voting for my amendment, you will send the right message to the Marine Corps. I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield, as in morning business, to the Senator from Indiana for such time—how much time would the Senator wish? Five minutes.

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

Mr. COATS. I want to thank the Senator from Alaska for yielding this time.

EDUCATION IN AMERICA

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon the Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, spoke on the floor indicating his concern and expressing his criticism of remarks that Senator Dole made today in Minneapolis. I want to take just a few moments to respond to those remarks. I thank the Senator for yielding the time for me to do that.

What Senator Dole said today in Minneapolis was that this country needs education reform, not education reform as defined by this administration and by some in this Congress, but real education reform. Education reform that ensures that parents have authority to be involved in their children's education, and in their curriculum, and in the formation of educational programs for their children. Education reform that would break up the monopoly that dominates public education. Education reform that gets money into the classroom instead of the bureaucracy. Education reform that rewards teachers, and rewards the Governors who run effective programs, and rewards mayors and school boards. Education reforms that try new ap-

proaches, and education reform that loosens Washington's grip on this country's schools.

For a decade or more now, the Congress and the public have been debating how we can improve our public education system, and a number of proposals have been made. But there is an entrenched bureaucracy that insists on making no real changes, on perpetuating the status quo. What Senator Dole was talking about was shaking up that status quo and bringing about reform that brings real results.

One of the issues that was discussed and was criticized earlier is the question of choice for low-income students. This is an issue that I have been involved with for some time. I have offered amendments, on a bipartisan basis with Senator LIEBERMAN, allow test programs, or pilot programs, for vouchers for low-income parents which would allow us to test the concept of school choice.

It seems hypocritical for those of us who have the means to afford school choice, whether by moving to another school district because we are unhappy with the public school where we currently are situated, or by enrolling our children in private schools or parochial schools, to deny that freedom of choice to those families who do not have the resources to send their children to a private school.

The voucher demonstration program is an attempt to understand the impact of enabling families choice over their children's educational opportunities. Many of these families have children who are consigned to some of the most violence-prone, educationally challenged schools in America. Mothers and fathers know that the only way to successfully give their children a chance to escape a lifetime of these difficult environments is to get a better education. Yet the Congress and this administration have repeatedly blocked attempts at even the most minor of reforms to allow low-income children to escape their poor-performing, violent schools.

The reform Senator LIEBERMAN and I proposed was a 3-year demonstration grant. We proposed trying it in 10-20 school districts around the country—costing a very modest amount of money—to see if it works. Even that small of a reform effort is rejected, time after time. My Project for American Renewal includes an expansion of that concept to provide experiments in up to 100 school districts. By trying a demonstration program, we'll be able to see if what the opponents of school choice say is right, but the only way to test their arguments is to get some objective evidence to evaluate school choice. I fear, Mr. President, that the opponents know that school choice would work: they know it would pose a challenge to the existing system.

I suggest that that is exactly what the existing system needs—a challenge, a challenge to improve its educational efforts. That challenge will come

through competition. Public schools and private schools and parochial schools can exist side by side. The competition among the three of them provides better education for all students involved. This has been demonstrated in my hometown of Fort Wayne, IN, on a number of occasions. We ought to move in that direction.

To criticize Senator Dole for calling for education reform because he has failed to support the status quo initiatives provided by this administration that make no major change, efforts of the Clinton administration and the status quo that is perpetuated by Members of this body and call that educational reform—I think the American people know better. Call this what it is, and that is an attempt by a Presidential candidate to bring about some change in our educational system that will benefit the children—not the bureaucracy, not the unions, not the administration—the children that are actually receiving the education, or would like to receive the education. I commend Senator Dole for his remarks, for his initiative in this area. I hope he has the opportunity to carry it out.

I regret we cannot seem to get beyond the status quo of what in many cases is a failed education system, particularly in areas where children live in poverty, the District of Columbia being the prime example. We have struggled and struggled and struggled to try to give the young people opportunities that others of us have and they do not have. It is regrettable that we cannot discuss this on a rational basis and cannot support the efforts of someone trying to bring about this change.

I thank the Senator from Alaska for his patience and his time on this. I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 4443, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To strike \$2,000,000 available for environmental activities with respect to the Joint Readiness Training Center at Fort Polk, Louisiana)

Mr. STEVENS. I send to the desk an amendment numbered 4443, as modified, pertaining to the Joint Readiness Training Center in Fort Polk, LA, and ask to set aside the pending amendment.

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

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. MCCAIN, proposes an amendment numbered 4443, as modified.

The amendment (No. 4443), as modified, is as follows:

On page 8, line 3, before the period, add the following: "Provided, That the amount made