

Service to pay private landowners for the voluntary use of private land to store water in restored wetlands. These funds were not provided to any specific region and should be allocated on a competitive basis.

This amendment has been cleared on both sides and the version I have submitted to the desk is a modification of the original amendment No. 90.

I urge its adoption.

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

The amendment (No. 90), as modified, was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 144

(Purpose: To make technical amendments with respect to education)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. DOMENICI, for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BROWNBAC, and Mr. ROBERTS, proposes an amendment numbered 144.

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:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. . TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO DISCLOSURES REQUIRED WITH RESPECT TO GRADUATION RATES.

(A) AMENDMENTS.—Section 485 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3)(B), by striking “June 30” and inserting “August 31”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(9), by striking “August 30” and inserting “August 31”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by subsection (a) are effective upon enactment.

(2) INFORMATION DISSEMINATION.—No institution shall be required to comply with the amendment made by subsection (a)(1) before July 1, 1998.

SEC. . DATE EXTENSION.

Section 1501(a)(4) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6491(a)(4)) is amended by striking “January 1, 1998” and inserting “January 1, 1999”.

SEC. . TIMELY FILING OF NOTICE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Education shall deem Kansas and New Mexico to have timely submitted under section 8009(c)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7709(c)(1)) the States’ written notices of intent to consider payments described in section 8009(b)(1) of the Act (20 U.S.C. 7709(b)(1)) in providing State aid to local educational agencies for school year 1997–1998, except that the Secretary may require the States to submit such additional information as the Secretary may require, which information shall be considered part of the notices.

SEC. . HOLD HARMLESS PAYMENTS.

Section 8002(h)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7702(h)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) for fiscal year 1997 and each succeeding fiscal year through fiscal year 2000 shall not be less than 85 percent of the amount such agency received for fiscal year 1996 under subsection (b).”.

SEC. . DATA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8003(f)(4) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(f)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting “expenditure,” after “revenue,”; and

(B) by striking the semicolon and inserting a period;

(2) by striking “the Secretary” and all that follows through “shall use” and inserting “the Secretary shall use”; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (B).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal years after fiscal year 1997.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today to offer the following amendment to S. 672. This amendment involves the New Mexico Department of Education’s intent to take credit for \$30 million of Federal impact aid funds. I am offering this amendment on behalf of the 331,000 public school children of New Mexico.

New Mexico is one of three States in the country which uses an equalization formula to distribute educational moneys among its school districts. Presently, 40 out of New Mexico’s 89 school districts qualify for \$30 million dollars’ worth of impact aid. The New Mexico Department of Education relies on impact aid in calculating the amount of State funds which will be used to equalize educational funding among all 89 school districts.

Without this amendment, the New Mexico Department of Education would not be permitted to consider \$30 million of impact aid in its formula for distributing State education moneys among its school districts. The inability to consider Federal funds would create an imbalance in the distribution of educational funds between non-impact aid school districts and impact aid school districts.

This amendment allows the U.S. Department of Education to recognize as timely New Mexico’s written notice of intent to consider impact aid payments in providing State aid to school districts for the 1997–98 school year.

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. President, I rise to give some remarks on an amendment being offered today by myself and by Senator ROBERTS as well as my colleagues from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI and Senator BINGAMAN.

This amendment, which is revenue neutral, is critically important to education in the State of Kansas.

It should be noted that this amendment does not cost the Federal Government any money. In fact, it simply allows the Department of Education in Kansas to grant deductibility in the school finance formula for impact aid funding. Without this amendment it is

likely that the Kansas taxpayers would have to pay an extra \$6 million in taxes to fully fund the State’s education programs.

This amendment corrects for a potentially very expensive technicality. I therefore urge the timely consideration of this very important and time sensitive amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. These technical amendments were passed by the Senate unanimously April 16. The bill is now pending in the House. These are amendments that are deemed to be important and should be considered on a timely basis. That is why they are being added to the bill at this time.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

The amendment (No. 144) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak as in morning business for not to exceed 5 minutes.

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

GENDER SCHIZOPHRENIA

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, by all accounts, Lt. Kelly Flinn has had a remarkable Air Force pilot’s career. Becoming an astronaut was her childhood dream; becoming an Air Force pilot was an achievement accomplished upon completion of her basic pilot training in December 1994. She was the most distinguished graduate of her training class, rated exceptionally qualified to fly a B-52 bomber, an assignment earned from her high class ranking.

Today, she is confined to a desk job, stripped of her security clearance, grounded, publicly disgraced. On May 20 the Air Force will court martial her for adultery.

The United States military has experienced its share of scandal in the past 5 years. In Aberdeen, MD, a court-martial jury recently convicted an Army drill sergeant of raping six soldiers under his command. In 1991 the Tailhook scandal rocked the Navy and the Marines. In both instances women were physically abused by their colleagues or superiors, on military facilities or at military functions. The acts committed against these women range from the lewd to the violent.

Lt. Kelly Flinn stands accused of conducting an affair with a married man, a civilian, who lied to her about his martial status. Their relationship was for all intents and purposes a private matter; they did not attend military functions together or while she was in uniform. If she is convicted, she

will be grounded forever, dismissed from the Air Force and could even spend time in prison.

I call attention to this particular case because I believe it speaks to the highly publicized gender schizophrenia we are witnessing as the military grapples with women's role in our Armed Forces. On one hand, women have had a traditional, but non-expanding role in the military. On the other hand, we are shocked by what appears to be a pervasive resistance to women in the ranks, and the scandals that bear the most extreme illustration of this behavior and mindset. Put differently, assimilation to the military's rules of conduct is separate and distinct from assimilation of the military's culture.

The Armed Forces are institutions premised on order and command, governed rigidly by rules, written and implied; by codes, some memorized and some unspoken. In some instances however, the strict application of military codes appears to suspend reasonable judgment about the seriousness of the offense committed.

In this case, clearly, the punishment does not appear to fit the crime. As Lieutenant Flinn says, "I fell in love with the wrong man." For this offense, which she committed unknowingly because Mr. Zigo lied about being legally separated from his wife, her Air Force career is slated to come to an ignoble end.

Lets not forget that of those 140 Navy officers involved in Tailhook, none were court-martialed.

It is difficult for me as an officer who served for more than 20 years as an Air Force judge advocate, to imagine that no other officer at Minot Air Force Base has committed the offense of which Lieutenant Flinn stands accused.

Wisdom and good judgment seem clearly to demand a dismissal of the criminal charges against Lieutenant Flinn and the substitution of non-judicial or informal sanctions. I trust that the Air Force will promptly see the wisdom of this suggestion.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BINGAMAN addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes as if in morning business.

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

FCC RULING

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, this morning the Federal Communications Commission made its ruling on implementation of the Universal Services Fund. They passed it by a 4-to-0 vote supporting the findings of the Federal-State joint board. This decision by them has opened the door to affordable Internet access for schools, libraries, and hospitals throughout this country.

I want to congratulate Commissioner Hundt and his colleagues on the Com-

mission for their leadership and their commitment to putting technology to work in our schools and in our communities.

I also want to congratulate my colleagues, Senator SNOWE, Senator ROCKEFELLER, Senator EXON, and Senator KERREY, especially, for their leadership in proposing the Universal Services discount as a provision in the Telecommunications Act which we passed last year.

Their hard work on behalf of education technology was critical in getting us to this point.

This Universal Services Fund will provide telecommunications discounts of between 20 and 90 percent, depending in part on the income levels of families in the particular school communities.

I have done some back-of-the-envelope calculations about my State, and, as far as I can determine, the FCC's decision could mean a discount of more than 70 percent for many New Mexico schools.

Education technology is important to my State. We have all seen how it can allow even the smallest or most isolated school across the State to develop a level playing field with larger school districts and, in fact, with wealthier States.

In a cost-effective manner, education technology can provide advanced courses and access to amazing amounts of information for all of our students.

That is why I am very proud. In 1994, we passed an act that I proposed entitled "Technology in Education Act." That act will provide \$200 million to America's schools for purchase of advanced technology. It has brought \$1.7 million to my home State of New Mexico this year alone.

I support the President's request in his budget to increase the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund from \$200 million this year to \$425 million next year.

The 1994 Technology in Education Act also created the Regional Technology in Education Consortia, these consortia providing schools and school districts with the technical assistance that they need to be full participants in this information age.

This technical assistance will be more needed than ever now that the telecommunications costs will be less of an obstacle to schools seeking connections to the Internet.

Our country has also made some progress in raising the awareness of the need for high academic standards. I serve on the National Education Goals Panel, and, as such, I have supported the effort to build a nation of learners, and education technology is an important part of doing that.

One of the things that we have to do a better job of clearly is training teachers to be comfortable with this new technology. I believe we need to pursue legislation on this area this Congress. I hope to have a part in that.

In my view, the educational technology movement will change the way people teach and learn from now on.

Distance learning is more than delivering instruction any time and anywhere, although that is an important part of what is involved. It is also about giving teachers the resources that they need to be effective as learning coaches. It is about empowering students to explore and learn in ways that are best for them as individuals.

Today's FCC ruling is an important step forward. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to help ensure that our teachers and schoolchildren have the best technology that we can offer as we prepare them for the 21st century.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 83 AND AMENDMENT NO. 177

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to amendment No. 83 offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to S. 672, the underlying bill. I gather that Senator FEINGOLD's amendment has been second-degreed by the Senator from Texas with amendment No. 177.

In brief, the underlying amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill would prohibit the use of funds for ground deployment in Bosnia after September 30 of this year, 1997. The second-degree amendment changes the date of September 30, 1997, to June 30, 1998.

Mr. President, after all the debate and discussion here on the floor of this Senate for the last 6 years, really after all of the diplomatic effort by our Government and other governments in Europe and throughout the world regarding the conflict in Bosnia, after all of the blood that has been spilled in Bosnia with hundreds of thousands of people displaced and killed, and after the heroic service of the American soldiers that have been part of IFOR and SFOR, joined with soldiers of other countries in separating the warring parties in the former Yugoslavia and stopping the conflict and beginning the peaceful reconstruction of that land, it is fundamentally inconceivable to me that the Senate here on an amendment to this supplemental appropriations bill would direct the military to pull out of this conflict, to walk away, in my opinion, before the job is done, to do something that is not in the best traditions of American diplomacy, let alone the American military.

So, Mr. President, I strongly oppose these two amendments.

If I may, I would like to take just a few moments to recall with my colleagues some of what has happened in this Chamber, in the former Yugoslavia, and in the capitals of the world