

going to squeeze other programs. That is really what has happened.

I daresay that at a time when we are gaining increased awareness and understanding about what actually helps children expand their academic achievement and their accomplishments, as a result of some dramatic reports, which I find compelling—and actually self-evident—we find we are really not taking the benefits of those reports and using them in ways that can benefit the greatest number of children in this country.

I think again of the excellent presentations of the Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY, when she spoke time and time again about the importance of smaller class sizes. She referred again and again to the excellent studies done in Tennessee with thousands of children, going back to 1985, that resulted in smaller class sizes, and we find that children have made very significant progress.

I remember Senator MURRAY mentioning the SAGE Program in Wisconsin, which has been enacted in recent years. I myself met these past weeks with members of the school board, parents and teachers out in Warsaw, WI, who participated in that program and commented about the importance of investing in children with smaller class sizes. So we know this is something that works. If we are going to have scarce resources, we ought to give focus and attention to something that works, as Senator MURRAY has pointed out. I think she brings credibility to this issue because she is a former school board member and a former first grade teacher herself. She has been in the classroom and knows what works. We have been very fortunate to have her presentation on this issue and her enthusiasm for it.

We also know, looking over the recent history, that we have actually had bipartisan support for smaller class sizes. We saw yesterday her amendment was not successful, but it was very closely fought in a divided Senate, and I am hopeful, with the strong support of the Senate, we can finally persuade Congress, as we have in the past, to move ahead in that direction.

We have to understand this legislation is going to go to the House of Representatives, which has seen a very sizable reduction in its commitment to the funding of these various programs. Whatever we do here is going to be knocked back significantly. That is why many of us were very hopeful we could go ahead and add some additional resources so at least coming out of the conference we would have something worthy of the children of this country. But we have been unable to do that. We have to look back over the years and see what has happened, ultimately, in allocating funding resources in the area of education when we have had Republican leadership. We hear a great deal about the importance of investing in children, but the tragic fact is that it is not reflected in the requests by

the Republicans either in the House or the Senate in recent years.

I remember very clearly the 1995 rescission because I remember the debate in 1994, when we had a rather significant enhancement in our investment in children. The ink was hardly dry, the results were in, and the results of 1994 and 1995 were that we had a very vigorous debate on rescinding money that had already been appropriated and signed by the President. After the extraordinary efforts made by the Republican leadership to actually rescind those funds, we had those rescissions in 1995.

Then the House bill in 1996 was \$3.9 billion below what was actually enacted in 1995. Then in 1997, the Senate bill was \$3.1 billion below the President's request; the House and Senate bill in 1998 was also below the President's request. This was a time when the Republicans were trying to abolish the Department of Education.

I think most parents feel it is important to have a Cabinet Member sitting in the Cabinet room so that every time the President of the United States meets with the Cabinet to make decisions on priorities, there will be someone in there to say, "What are we going to do on education, and particularly education that is going to affect the elementary and secondary schoolchildren of this country, particularly at a time when we have exploding numbers of children who are going into our classrooms?"

Nonetheless, what we continue to see, in 1999, is the House was \$2 billion below the President's request; in 2000, \$2.8 billion below the President's request; and in 2001, \$2.9 billion below the President's request. This is what has happened.

Members ask: "Why do the Democrats try to force these issues? Why don't we just go ahead and accept what these appropriations committees have done?" They try to defend their positions with all these facts about what is really happening out there in education, but when you add them all up, this is what you are finding: The Federal share of education funding has declined. If you look at higher education, from 1980 to 1999, the federal share declined from 15.4 percent to 10.7 percent.

If you look at elementary-secondary education, from 1980 to 1999, we see a decline from 11.9 percent to 7.7 percent. Only 7.7 percent of every dollar spent locally is Federal money, and this is perhaps the lowest figure we have had in elementary-secondary education. In terms of the amount of our budget, which is \$1.8 trillion, this is less than one percent. It is less than one penny per dollar. If you combine the elementary and higher education, you may be getting close to two pennies. That, I think, is what concerns many of us, particularly at a time when we are finding out the total number of children is increasing.

We recognize there should be a partnership among the Federal, State, and

local governments in enhancing academic achievement. We have learned important lessons: Smaller class sizes work and better trained teachers work. Take the two States that have invested in teachers: North Carolina and Connecticut. They are seeing dramatic results in academic achievement.

We have been fighting to provide the resources to do that. That is what the debate is about. We have, I think, demonstrated to this body and, hopefully, the American people the seriousness of our purpose in allocating resources to what the American families want, and they want to invest in children and education. We believe that is quite preferable to the large tax breaks which have been included in the overall budget. We will continue this battle.

I yield the floor.

THE RURAL RECOVERY ACT OF 2000

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced the Rural Recovery Act of 2000 to help address the economic malaise that has gripped certain rural areas of our country. The legislation will authorize the Department of Agriculture to provide grants to rural communities suffering from out-migration and low per-capita income.

Rural areas of our nation continue to experience an erosion in their economic well-being. Statistics bear out the decline in rural economic activity, but they fail to fully capture the human suffering that lies just beyond the numbers. Economic downturns lead to the migration away from farm-dependent, rural communities, further stifling economic opportunities for those left behind. The 1990 Census highlighted these migratory trends, and I anticipate that similar trends will be captured by the 2000 Census, as well.

In short, the prosperity from which many Americans have benefited from during the past decade has left many rural areas standing by the wayside. If this trend continues, more and more young people will be forced to leave the towns they grew up in for opportunities in urban areas. In towns like Webster, Eureka, and Martin, South Dakota, we are seeing farm families broken up, populations decline, and main street businesses close their doors. While there is no doubt that economic growth in our urban areas has benefited our nation, the disparity of economic development between our rural and urban areas cannot be ignored. If nothing is done to address the economic challenges facing these areas, we will jeopardize the future of rural America.

That is why I have introduced legislation to provide the nation's rural areas with the resources necessary to make critical investments in their future and, by doing so, to create economic opportunities that will help them sustain a valuable and important way of life. It also will help rural areas provide basic services at times when they are losing a significant part of

their tax base. While federal agencies, such as the United States Department of Agriculture's Office of Rural Development and the Economic Development Administration, provide assistance for rural development purposes, there are no federal programs that provide a steady source of funding for rural areas most affected by severe out-migration and low per-capita income. For these areas, the process of economic development is often most arduous. This legislation will provide the basic, long-term assistance necessary to aid the coordination efforts of local community leaders as they begin economic recovery efforts and struggle to provide basic public services.

County and tribal governments will be able to use this federal funding to improve their industrial parks, purchase land for development, build affordable housing and create economic recovery strategies according to their needs. All of these important steps will help rural communities address their economic problems and plan for long-term growth and development.

Mr. President, I believe this legislation holds great potential for revitalizing many of our nation's most neglected and vulnerable areas. I urge my colleagues to support its enactment.

COMMEMORATING SENATOR DANIEL INOUE: RECIPIENT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today to join my fellow Senators in honoring Senator DANIEL INOUE with the Congressional Medal of Honor. This man is a representative of our nation who has persevered through war, debate, and many had fought campaigns. I have had the pleasure of working with Senator INOUE and applaud my colleagues for bestowing this great honor upon him.

Senator DANIEL INOUE is a Veteran of World War II and was a captain in the Army with a Distinguished Service Cross (the second highest award for military valor), a Bronze Star, a Purple Heart with cluster, and several other medals and citations. Serving in the Senate almost 40 years, Senator INOUE is also the first Congressman from the state of Hawaii. His courage in combat is a testament to the Senator's true commitment to his country and to freedom. Serving on the Defense Appropriations Committee, I know how much Senator INOUE cares about the protection of our country and his professionalism and dedication to finding a balance for defensive spending. His diligence and dedication speak for themselves and I am proud to serve our Armed Forces with a man of this caliber near the helm.

I have also had the pleasure of working with Senator INOUE on the Indian Affairs Committee for over 20 years and know first hand that his bravery did not cease on the battlefield, but

still continues today. When he was chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, Senator INOUE was highly regarded among tribal leaders for his efforts to re-establish their sovereignty over their own people and their own affairs. Tribal leaders consider Senator INOUE to be a true leader and friend to the Indian people to this day. I thank Senator INOUE for his leadership and dedication to service to our country, and I thank him for his friendship and example.

Mr. President, inscribed on the medal is the word "Valor." Senator INOUE is one of the most valiant men I know. I praise the Members of Congress for honoring him and hope that our young people may see that it takes courage, bravery, and valor to enjoy the freedom which so many men like Senator INOUE fought to protect. Thank you, once again, to Senator INOUE for your example, and thank you to all of the veterans who have served to protect liberty and justice.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will read some of the names of those who lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is in session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight. Following are the names of some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago today.

June 29, 1999: Rokisha Denard, 18, Trenton, NJ; Herman Eastorly, 79, St. Louis, MO; Scott M. Echoles, 27, Chicago, IL; William Hunter, 33, Nashville, TN; Elton James, 28, New Orleans, LA; Craig Jones, 28, New Orleans, LA; Bernard Lathan, San Francisco, CA; Jackie Lee Nabor, 39, Detroit, MI; Billy J. Phillips, 43, Chicago, IL; Richard Rogers, 16, Fort Wayne, IN; Sidney Wilson, 14, Fort Wayne, IN; Tonya Tyler, 24, Nashville, TN; Unidentified male, 16, Chicago, IL.

POSITION ON VOTES

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I was absent from the Senate last Thursday afternoon to attend the high school graduation of my daughter, Kelsey. I missed two different votes, and I would like to state for the RECORD, how I would have voted in each instance.

I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote number 141, the third reading of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 2001.

I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote number 142, the motion to instruct the Sergeant at Arms during the consideration of HR 4577, the Labor-

HHS-Education Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001.

I also was unavoidably detained due to a family commitment on the evening of June 27, and I missed one vote during that time. I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote number 149, Senate amendment number 3610, a McCain amendment as amended to HR 4577, the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001.

SEPARATING THE FACTS FROM THE PARTISAN RHETORIC

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this statement is part of my continuing effort to bring clarity to the facts underlying the oversight investigations on campaign finance being pursued by Senator SPECTER within the Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts. Staying focused on the facts becomes even more important as the volume of the political rhetoric continues to increase.

Although oversight is an important function, there are obvious dangers of conducting oversight of pending matters. Applying, or seeming to apply, political pressure to pending matters has real consequences, which we are now seeing first-hand. Recently, the Judiciary Committee received requests for information from the defense attorney for Wen Ho Lee, a criminal defendant facing charges of improperly downloading classified information from computers at Los Alamos Nuclear Laboratory. Mr. Lee's defense attorney wants the Republican report on this matter, as well as other documents gathered during oversight, presumably to aid his defense or at least to get potential impeachment materials for prospective government witnesses.

Just today we learned that the Committee has now also been dragged into the pending case of Maria Hsia, a criminal defendant who was recently convicted of campaign finance violations and is awaiting sentencing. Ms. Hsia's attorney apparently found the questioning of the Justice Department prosecutor in charge of her case at last week's hearing so offensive that it is now the basis for a claim that Ms. Hsia's sentencing should be delayed because to set a sentencing date now would only serve political purposes.

Indeed, at a hearing of the Specter investigation on June 21, 2000, a Republican member of the Judiciary Committee queried Robert Conrad, the current head of the Justice Department Campaign Financing Task Force about the Hsia sentencing, despite Conrad's statements that he could not properly discuss pending matters. The Republican member stated that he expected Conrad to pursue Hsia's sentencing vigorously, and asked whether the government had filed a sentencing memorandum. After Conrad explained that the sentencing submissions had not yet been made, the Republican member stated: "I would expect that you would pursue vigorously the sentencing phase