

come every week. Requests for teaching materials have come from every State in our Nation. Over 400,000 students from around the country came in school groups this year.

Mr. President, the success of the Museum demonstrates our country's interest in studying the Holocaust. It is most reassuring to note, indeed, that the desire to learn the moral lessons of the Holocaust dwarf the messages of hate perpetuated by the Holocaust deniers.

Mr. President, I wish to close with two more quotes. Again from Professor Lipstadt:

Holocaust denial . . . is not an assault on the history of one particular group. Though denial of the Holocaust may be an attack on the history of the annihilation of the Jews, at its core it poses a threat to all who believe that knowledge and memory are among the keystones of our civilization. Just as the Holocaust was not a tragedy of the Jews but a tragedy of civilization in which the victims were Jews, so too denial of the Holocaust is not a threat just to Jewish history but a threat to all who believe in the ultimate power of reason. It repudiates reasoned discussion the way the Holocaust repudiated civilized values. It is undeniably a form of anti-Semitism, and such it constitutes an attack on the most basic values of a reasoned society. Like any form of prejudice, it is irrational animus that cannot be countered with normal forces of investigation, argument, and debate.

And now, from an article by the current executive director of the Holocaust Memorial Museum, Dr. Walter Reich, who wrote a few years ago:

The devastating truth about the Holocaust is that it was a fact, not a dream. And the devastating truth about the Holocaust deniers is that they will go on using whatever falsehoods they can muster, and taking advantage of whatever vulnerabilities in an audience they can find, to argue, with skill and evil intent, that the Holocaust never happened. By being vigilant to these arguments we can all fight this second murder of the Jews—fight it, and weep not only for the victims' mortality but also for the fragility, and mortality, of memory.

Mr. President, we are nearing the end of a bloody century, littered with so many man-made catastrophes that it invites a numbing relativism. Today, on "the night of broken glass," let the legacy of the victims strengthen our memories and sharpen our consciences to remain ever vigilant to the profoundly compelling and universally resonant moral lessons of the Holocaust.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, we have been trying to reach an agreement the

last couple of hours on the continuing resolution. We have not been able to do that, so I think since it may take some time and some debate—if we could get consent to go to the so-called CR—we should start as quickly as we can, because in addition to disposal of this legislation today we need to dispose of the debt ceiling extension, which will not arrive from the House until 5 o'clock.

It is my hope we could complete action on both of those. There will probably be, hopefully, not many amendments, but an amendment or two, and we have to get it back to the House yet this evening or be here tomorrow, notwithstanding the fact that it is a Federal holiday.

I hope we could have everyone's cooperation and that we can move very quickly on the continuing resolution, and then be in a position when the debt ceiling extension arrives to move quickly on that.

The President has indicated he will veto both the continuing resolution and the debt extension, which I hope is not the case because we would have very little time to act on Monday to prevent a shutdown of the Government. I hope the President would understand that and accept these very modest proposals.

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of the continuing resolution, House Joint Resolution 115, just received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A Joint Resolution (H.J. Res. 115) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to proceed for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS REPORT

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I wanted to call to the attention of the

Senate today the release of the fifth annual national education goals report, which was released earlier this morning by a group, a bipartisan group of Governors, myself, and several State legislators who are members of this national education goals panel.

The panel is presently chaired by Governor Bayh of Indiana, and soon it will be chaired by Governor Engler of Michigan. Governor Engler was there this morning, as were Gov. Christine Todd Whitman from New Jersey and Governor Romer from Colorado, who was the first chairman of this panel, and various others of us.

I wanted to just briefly summarize what was found in that national education goals panel report, because I do think it is important. This is the midpoint between 1990 and the turn of the century. As people will recall, in 1989, President Bush met with 50 Governors in Charlottesville, VA, to set out national education goals for the country to pursue between the year 1989 and the year 2000. Those goals were agreed upon. I think they are good goals for the country. And we began the process.

Part of what was agreed to there was that we not only had to have goals, but also had to have some standards, and we had to have a way of assessing progress, to determine whether or not the country was moving in the right direction or moving in the wrong direction. The report today says that we are moving in the right direction but at a very, very slow pace. In some States the pace is very much slower than in others. It also makes the point, strongly, that we do not have enough data to understand what is happening to the extent we would like to.

There is good news in the report. There is also bad news in the report. Let me just summarize a little bit of the good news first.

The report shows that during the period 1990 through 1992, and unfortunately we only have statistics now through 1992, but during that period math achievement at grades 4 and 8 in the United States did improve. It went up fairly significantly, I would point out. It did not do near as well in some States as it did in others. Where the national average went from 20 to 25 percent, that is 25 percent of the students who were tested measured up as being proficient in math in the eighth grade in 1992, in my home State of New Mexico, unfortunately, the figure was 14 percent. So we have a ways to go, not just in my State but throughout the country.

The same basic questions and same basic testing and proficiency measurements were used internationally as well as in this country. Where we have set a goal, and the President and Governors set a goal of being first in the world in math and science achievement by the year 2000, this set of statistics we released today shows that in fact we are substantially behind Taiwan, which is at 41 percent on this same graph. So

though there is progress to report, it is not enough progress.

Another item of progress that should be noted is that students took more of the challenging advanced placement tests in basic academic subjects—in English and math and science and history. That also is good news.

We also are able to report that, among adults, more adults took adult education classes throughout this country in 1992. A significantly larger number took adult education classes than they did in 1990. Again, that is good information and good news.

The bad news, unfortunately, is in the report as well. That is what the report's purpose is. It is to point out where we are making progress and where we are not. Unfortunately, high school graduation rates have remained at about 86 percent. That is not a change. That is not improvement. We need to make improvement in that area.

Reading achievement at grades 4 and 8 have remained about the same. Again, that is not good news.

There is a large gap that continues, between minority and white students as far as college enrollment and completion of college. Again, that large gap is not good news.

In my home State of New Mexico, as I indicated, we have not done as well as the national average in some important respects, particularly in the math criteria, but also in the reading. I think other States can also learn from this data that was released today, where they need to make progress.

The bottom line is that the work of improving educational performance in this country needs to continue. We are part way through the 10 years. We are not all the way. We have a great distance to go.

I would point out one important fact. That is, the greatest progress that is shown in all of this data is in the area of math achievement, and that is the only area where we have general agreement on the standards that we are striving to achieve. The credit for that goes to the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. They came up with their own set of standards, which they have promulgated throughout the country and urged math teachers to adopt. Many teachers have. Many school districts have. Many States have. And I think progress in math performance is improving. Performance in math is improving to a significant extent because we have focused on that area and we have concentrated on how to, in fact, define what we want to accomplish and go about accomplishing it.

So I wanted to make the point that this effort continues. It is a bipartisan effort. I think it is a very important effort.

I know we get caught up in all kinds of political battles here in the Congress. In my opinion, this is one subject and one issue that ought to be above politics. Both Democrats and Re-

publicans should, I believe, renew our commitment to improving education in this country. I think the Congress has a role in that, which of course we have debated. The States have the primary responsibility. I do not think anybody would argue with that. Of course, local school districts, local schools, teachers, principals, parents and students have the ultimate responsibility.

I appreciate the chance to bring these issues to the attention of my colleagues and I yield the floor.

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

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

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask the Chair, are we now on the continuing resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, there is a provision in this continuing resolution—indeed, there are many provisions in it. But there is one in particular that deals with lobbying.

Just on the face of it—I know other Senators are concerned about it; I know the Senator from Colorado was prepared to move to strike this provision—I believe it should be stricken.

Let me make, first and foremost, this point about the appropriateness of having lobbying reform on the continuing resolution. I just think it is totally inappropriate. This Congress cannot function with 70 Members of the House basically writing a letter threatening that they are not going to support the continuing resolution if it does not contain this provision.

I have an interest in impact aid. I have an interest in things relating to agriculture—things that are not likely to pass this year. I suspect that I could probably round up 15 or 20 people or so who would say, send a letter to Leader DOLE and Leader DASCHLE saying that, if this is not included, we are not going to vote for it.

I know these new Members of the Congress get quite enthusiastic about saying they have a mandate to do everything that comes to mind. But this lobbying reform provision was not in the Contract With America. It is not in any contract that I have seen. I appreciate their enthusiasm for change. But this provision—a lobbying provision changing our lobbying laws—does not belong on this bill. Indeed, I find it rather odd that the House has not taken up the lobbying reform legisla-

tion that this body has addressed already. We debated it as a freestanding bill. Those who are enthusiastic about lobbying reform did not just write a letter insisting that lobbying reform provisions be included in the continuing resolution.

I see with regret that the Speaker, the majority leader, and the President are now at loggerheads saying maybe the Government is going to be shut down on Tuesday because we cannot get a continuing resolution passed. It is tough to pass a continuing resolution, even one that is clean, even one that has some provisions that connect to the budget. I can stretch and understand that.

But when we have provisions relating to lobbying, I just think we have to take a stand on this side and say to the House that we passed lobbying reform on this side. We brought it up on the calendar. We had a lengthy debate about it. We changed the law. We propose to change the law relating to lobbying. The House should take it up over there; take up lobbying reform. If you want to add this amendment to lobbying reform legislation, do so.

I think it is a bad change. I would like to have the opportunity—if they pass that over there, go to conference on the bill and it comes back over in that fashion, I would argue against it.

But I think that Republicans and Democrats here, if this body is going to function, are going to have to take a stand against 60 or 70 Members of the House who are constantly saying, "Do it our way or we are going to shut the place down."

Mr. President, we all understand, for example, the rules of the Senate allow us to come down and expel large volumes of air and tie things up with repeated debate. With all kinds of conversation, we could slow this thing down, shut it down, and get nothing done, if that is what we choose to do.

I think the Senate, in this particular case, needs to take a stand. I know the Senator from Wyoming, in fact, feels strongly about this. When we took up the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill, I joined with him and allowed an amendment to be accepted. But in the Treasury-Postal conference, again we find ourselves faced with a threat. We find ourselves faced with a single individual who says in the conference committee, "I do not care what happens to Treasury-Postal. I do not mind shutting the Government down. I insist that I get this provision accepted and changed into law."

Mr. President, again, I do not mind sitting down here and fighting the battle over something important. But nobody is calling me from home proposing this thing. This does not come from the grassroots. This came from a couple of people who had an idea that somehow we are increasingly calling upon 501(c)(3) organizations to help us. But I suspect every Member of this body has gotten up and talked about the kind of partnerships that we need