

Mr. REID. The one thing I would like to do is make sure that the—we have had Senators over here waiting literally all morning to speak for a short period of time. I know Senator ABRAHAM wants to speak on his amendment and that of Senator KENNEDY. I would like to propound a unanimous consent agreement that Senator DORGAN be recognized for a half hour, that 10 minutes of that time be allotted to Senators SCHUMER and MOYNIHAN to speak about the death of the New York Cardinal, and that Senator FEINGOLD be allowed to speak for 12 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to ask the majority leader if he would yield for a question.

Mr. LOTT. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. I am relatively new to the Senate. The House rule used to say committee members could offer only germane amendments. Do I understand the majority leader is suggesting that as a standard in the Senate?

Mr. LOTT. No, I didn't suggest that. I am saying that members of the committee have education amendments and would like to have them offered. We have some members on both sides of the aisle now who are saying, "I want my amendment to be next," and I am not inclined to be impressed with that suggestion. We need to go forward with the way we have been trying to proceed and get our work done. But, no; the way it works around here is, if you can horn your way into a debate that is underway, then that is the way it is.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, how about my request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, just to facilitate the flow here, let me make sure we have some sort of a sharing of time, alternating back and forth. The Senator's proposal was 30 minutes for Senator DURBIN, 10 minutes for Senators SCHUMER and MOYNIHAN, and 12 minutes for Senator FEINGOLD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator repeat the unanimous consent request.

Mr. REID. What I proposed is that Senator DORGAN be recognized for 30 minutes, with 10 minutes of his time being allotted to the Senators from New York, and that 12 minutes be allotted to Senator FEINGOLD. They have been here literally all morning.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the block of time for those speakers, an equal amount of time be allocated to Senator ABRAHAM and to myself, or my designee. I know the Senators from New York are going to talk about the Cardinal's death.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would like to speak after Senator ABRAHAM.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I amend my request that Senator ABRAHAM be recognized first, and then Senator SESSIONS, and any remaining time will be used by myself or my designee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ABRAHAM. Reserving the right to object, although I would like to speak on the amendment, as well as the second degree, because of a ceremony taking place in the Capitol rotunda now, of which I am to be a part, I may not be in a position to immediately follow the final speaker. I suggest that perhaps we might slightly modify the Senator's proposed unanimous consent agreement to allow for the fact that I may be unable to be here right at that time.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we will make it simple. I ask unanimous consent that when this block of time is completed, as outlined by Senator REID, there be an equal amount of time on this side for me or my designee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield to the two Senators from New York to use their 10 minutes of time now to speak about the death of Cardinal O'Connor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN CARDINAL O'CONNOR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I will use 5 minutes and then yield to my senior colleague from New York for 5 minutes.

It is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the memory of His Eminence, John Cardinal O'Connor. As you know, His Eminence was a man of immense honor and conviction, a man who dedicated his entire life in service to our Nation and the betterment of humanity. He was completely loyal to Catholic doctrine but was able to reach out to New Yorkers of all races, religions, and ethnic and economic backgrounds. His loss is New York's loss, America's loss, and humankind's loss.

Today, all New Yorkers mourn this profound loss. And while today will be one filled with great sorrow, I believe that during this period of grief, many will find moments of joyous reflection in thinking about the innumerable ways this servant of God was able to touch the lives of millions.

Earlier this year, I rose alongside a number of my colleagues in the Senate and called upon this body to support legislation to honor the enormous contributions made by the Cardinal to religion, humanity, and service to America, by bestowing upon him the Congressional Gold Medal.

The measure passed unanimously, and I had the honor to personally present His Eminence with a framed copy of that legislation, and although he was weakened, you could see a man of peace. He believed he had accomplished much of his life's goal and was proud of what he had done, although in his own modest way. It is my prayer that all of us, when our time comes, may feel just that way.

The Cardinal cared about the poor, the sick, and the elderly. He would be giving a speech on Catholic doctrine at the cathedral one hour and the next hour would quietly slip off and minister to an AIDS victim in a hospice. He was a man of great intelligence and of great passion. He was a man who believed and didn't flinch from those beliefs but at the same time had a unique ability to reach out to others who might not believe what he did. He served, of course, as a military chaplain and at the same time was a voice for the poor. He cared about working people and spoke up for the union movement repeatedly.

He loved all of God's children, and he will be forever cherished and remembered by people of the Jewish community for bringing Jews and Catholics closer together. I truly believe that much of the Vatican's rapprochement with the Jewish community worldwide started with His Eminence Cardinal O'Connor. He served as an international ambassador, traveling the world over, to: Israel, Jordan, Haiti, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Russia, as a messenger of peace, humanity, and freedom. Wherever war, oppression, and poverty have threatened to weaken the human spirit, he has been there—a tireless servant of the Roman Catholic Church and as an American citizen.

John Cardinal O'Connor was an institution in New York, a beacon of hope and inspiration who, from our cherished St. Patrick's Cathedral championed the simplest of causes—the betterment of humanity. He was a man that I respected a great deal because of his unwavering commitment to his convictions, even when we disagreed.

So, last night, Mr. President, New York, America, and the entire world lost one of our greatest treasures. This morning, the earthly world is a bit poorer for the passing of this great man and the heavenly world a bit richer. I thank you and my colleagues for allowing me to express, on behalf of all New Yorkers, the profound sense of sorrow we feel today with the loss of Cardinal O'Connor.

I yield the remainder of my time to the senior Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, on February 22, my beloved colleague, the junior Senator from New York, introduced legislation to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York, in recognition of his accomplishments as

a priest, a chaplain, and a humanitarian.

Congress finds that His Eminence, John Cardinal O'Connor, was a man of deep compassion, great intellect, and tireless devotion to spiritual guidance and humanitarianism.

I think it is a special note that the Cardinal joined the Navy Chaplain's Corps in June of 1952 during the Korean conflict. He served with elements of both the Navy and the Marine Corps and saw combat action in Vietnam.

He later served as chaplain of the United States Naval Academy and was appointed Chief of Chaplains of the Navy with the grade of rear admiral, from which position he retired 4 years later.

In May 1979, he was ordained a bishop by Pope John Paul II. He then served as Victor General of Military Ordinance—now the Archdiocese for Military Services—until 1984.

This son of a working-class laborer, a union man from Pennsylvania, found himself, on the one extreme, in the jungles of Vietnam saying mass in foxholes and asking himself, as he saw the deaths on all sides of all the combatants, why?

He came back with that same courage to the Archdiocese of New York. There are 2.37 million of us, and we have been rancorous from the first, and continue so. He quickly adapted to that environment and adopted some of those characteristics.

But he was a wonderful priest. As my friend, Senator SCHUMER, said, he was a healer and a man who reached out to others.

He is in his heaven now. As we mourn his passing, we celebrate his life.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this has been an interesting and certainly a thoughtful debate about education. This is exactly the topic we ought to be discussing in the Senate. We have a lot of folks in this country who care about the state of education and the condition of America's schools. They say America's schools are failing its children. What shall we do about that?

Before us is the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We debate this law every 6 years, and at that time we talk about what kind of policies we believe will work for America's schools and what kind of policies will give us the kind of education system we can have pride in. Are our children walking through classroom doors that give them the best opportunity for a good education?

Let me also say that I am a little tired—not only in Congress but in politics and in discussions generally—of the notion in this country of blaming America's teachers first.

I visit a lot of classrooms. I see a lot of teachers and a lot of students. In

most cases, the teachers I see in America's classrooms are extraordinary men and women who do a wonderful job with our children in America's schools. They have a very tough job. Their students come to schools all over this country with problems that affect how well they will learn. There are children who are hungry, without a caring parent, who are regularly faced with violence, guns, behavior issues. All sorts of issues come to school with children. We have to respond to those and deal with those issues. But this notion of somehow blaming America's teachers is wrong.

Let me talk for a moment about who has new ideas. I was listening a while ago to a speech that I thought was interesting. But the notion was that only the majority party had new ideas, and somehow the Democratic caucus in the Senate was offering proposals that are just the same old thing.

The majority party offers, as its version of how to fix our education system, to provide block grants. Is there anything new about block grants? Block grants aren't new. In fact, this is the oldest idea in politics, and it is an idea that doesn't work.

We have very serious problems with our schools that we need to help solve. A lot of schools are in radical disrepair.

I was at a school Monday in North Dakota. It is a school whose student population is almost exclusively Native American. These young Indian children are attending a school that is not in good repair. They know it. I know it. The teachers know it. The school board knows it. This is a school that doesn't have much of a tax base because it is on an Indian reservation. It is a public school district, but does not have much of a tax base.

This is a school that doesn't even have an athletic field. Is there a place for these children to go out and run? Is there a place for them to play football or to practice soccer? No. This is a school without an athletic field.

As we were going through the classrooms in this school, the principal said to me: Senator, is there any chance you could help us try to get an athletic field for these kids? They have too much energy. They have so much energy and want the opportunity to go out on an athletic field to play football, or play soccer, or perhaps run track. But we don't have the money.

Again, this is a school without a tax base so they don't have the money.

As I was touring the school, the teacher said: Now, children, are there any questions you would like to ask the Senator?

One little kid in the third grade raised his hand real high, and he said: Yes. Mr. Senator, I would like to know how many bathrooms there are in the White House.

I thought: Gosh, that is a funny question. How many bathrooms are there in the White House?

One little kid on the other side of the room said: I think there are 18.

Another little boy said: I think there are 46.

I said: You are both probably right. It is probably between 18 and 46.

Do you know in that school, with 150 kids, they have only two bathrooms, a boy's bathroom and a girl's bathroom? I guess he was thinking it would be a luxury to have a lot of bathrooms.

That is the sort of question that comes from a third grader. But it relates to the condition of the school. The third grader knows that he is not walking into the same kind of school that other kids are. This school needs repair.

One of the new ideas we proposed—that has been opposed, incidentally, by the majority party—is to provide the opportunity to repair, renovate, and rebuild America's schools that are in disrepair all around this country. But there is not much interest in that. Instead, the response is, let's send them block grants, and then pray that someone will use it for the right thing.

We have some experience with block grants. In fact, title I started out as a block grant a long time ago. However, Congress quickly learned that the funding was not helping the poor children who were intended to be the beneficiaries.

Let me give just a couple of examples of what title I was used for: They bought three tubas in one school. Another one used it for band uniforms. Another bought 18 portable swimming pools. That is block grants.

Of course, these block grants won't go directly to the schools. The block grant funds will go to the Governors. Then the school districts are going to have to go begging to the States asking: Can we get some of that Federal money you have back there in block grants?

We think maybe a new idea would be to say, let's renovate, remodel, and rebuild those schools that are in disrepair around this country, and let's help the local governments that do not have the resources to accomplish that task. We think a new idea might be to say, let's help those schools that are radically overcrowded, with kids sitting with an inch between their desks in a classroom, with 35 students taught by 1 teacher. We know better teaching goes on in the classroom when you have 1 teacher and 15 students or 1 teacher and 20 students, so let's decide to help schools reduce the size of their classes.

When someone says there are no new ideas, it is just that they have not heard them. We have talked about them. They have not heard them. They have not been willing to vote for them.

There are a lot of things we can do to improve education. I agree that we cannot throw money at problems, but I also believe we cannot withhold the resources necessary to fix this country's schools. We cannot send kids to inferior schools and ask why we didn't get a good student out of that school. We