

you resolve your problems. Also, your family will be notified so that they know you are all right.

Little did you know that the first step of walking up to the counter and asking for help would open up to you all the local community service organizations that you have in your area. Little did you know that it would be that easy to gain help for yourself when you need it.

It is almost as easy to become a Safe Place site. Now, I took that first step last year when I asked my regional office in Pocatello, ID, to consider becoming a Safe Place location. After my employees passed a background check, they attended a short training session to become familiar with the do's and the don'ts and the what if's of greeting those who might seek help. Remember, all an employee in a Safe Place location needs to do is act as the middle person between the victim and the local Safe Place office. The Safe Place volunteers and the local youth shelter take care of everything else.

As Safe Place grows in my home State of Idaho, I will ask that all of my regional offices might join the program as well. I encourage my colleagues in the Senate to do the same in their regional offices. This morning—this very day—I have delivered information about Safe Place programs to each of my colleagues' offices, and I urge you to call the national Safe Place office to find out how you can join in this program. I also urge every business owner in the Nation or anyone who might be observing C-SPAN to talk about it and to encourage business owners to get involved. This is such an effortless way to give something back to the community you live in.

And community is what it is all about—the businesses in a community working together with Safe Place volunteers, and these private volunteers working together with community organizations and agencies. Project Safe Place brings together the best of every community into a long chain of people and resources working together to save young lives.

This chain is growing. Since I introduced the "National Safe Place" bill itself back in June of last year, 700 sites have been added to the Safe Place family. But this is only the beginning. The goal is to have a Safe Place in every State before the end of the millennium. That is not very far away. But I know that just as America's ingenuity created these Safe Place for kids, American industry and hard work is a guarantee that every troubled teen, every runaway and every abused or neglected child will know there is a Safe Place right in their own neighborhood if they need it.

Mr. President, I thank you. I yield back the balance of my time and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PROTOCOLS TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY OF 1949 ON ACCESSION OF POLAND, HUNGARY AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC

The Senate continued with the consideration of the treaty.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I happened to be sitting in the Presiding Officer's chair when the distinguished Senator from Texas came and spoke of her concerns about NATO expansion and expressed some of her regret that some of the debate had been cast in terms of, those who are opposed are somehow less than patriotic or pursuing appeasement. I want her to know that while I am a strong advocate for NATO expansion, I view with appreciation and respect all my colleagues who, for reasons of their conclusions and conscience, have decided that this is not appropriate.

The Senator from Texas has made some points that I think are valid parts of this debate. I would like to respond to the point, however, that she made about the advisability of having a formal dispute resolution process in the NATO alliance. On the surface, I think this may strike some as a very good idea because within the alliance there are long and historic disputes between member countries.

I note that it is a matter of historical record that NATO membership has been one of the primary ways in which longstanding enemies such as Germany and France have been able to resolve these historic enmities, I think in large part because of NATO. This is also occurring on a daily basis as Greece and Turkey—two NATO allies of ours—struggle to remain peaceful neighbors; also between the Spanish and the Portuguese, issues of borders and islands are being resolved; between the British and the Spanish there are ongoing discussions about the island of Gibraltar. All of this is occurring between NATO members.

I believe there is a very informal process going on that because you are a NATO member you don't attack your allies. This is a powerful peer pressure, if you will, that exists in a nonformal way in the NATO alliance.

Why shouldn't there be a formal process? I will tell you this: If it isn't broken, don't try to fix it. Moreover, what NATO does is have all of us who are members who have disparate national interests focus on one common theme, which is common security, a secure alliance, so that all of a sudden you get Germans and Frenchmen—hopefully Hungarians and Czechs—countries that have had disputes over the past—all of a sudden they will be working together for a common goal of mutual defense.

Now, if all of a sudden we say we recognize you have these internal problems or national disputes and we want you to take those into NATO, then what have we done? We have all of a sudden taken a defensive alliance and turned it into a mini European United Nations. I suggest that is the wrong thing to do for NATO. NATO needs to keep its purpose as a defensive alliance and it must not become a vehicle, a formal vehicle, for resolving national disputes. It has been a way in which we cooperate and get along and focus on common purposes and solving common problems, not as a vehicle for bringing our national interests and resolving them within this alliance.

I suggest, while on the surface this amendment sounds very good, it would operate in a very destructive fashion for NATO's well-being in the future. There are already institutions for resolving these kinds of differences, dispute resolutions. NATO must never be one of those.

Now, I have said this with the greatest respect for the Senator from Texas. I know of few people who are more thoughtful and more dedicated to their task in the U.S. Senate than Senator HUTCHISON. She is a great woman by any measure. I say that even though I intend to vote and lobby against her amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I second what the distinguished Senator from Oregon has just said. First, let me repeat what he said about the distinguished Senator from Texas. I know of no one for whom I have greater respect than the junior Senator from Texas. Ever since she has been a Member of this august body, she has contributed greatly to the debate and discussion of all issues, including those of security and defense. When she speaks, I listen with great care. It is my hope that she will not raise this amendment.

As I understand, her proposal is to establish, not study, a binding dispute resolution within the NATO current structure. Frankly, it is my concern that the effort to establish such a mechanism would have the unfortunate impact of reducing U.S. influence, weakening the alliance, and undercutting the North Atlantic Council, NATO's supreme decision-making body. Above all, I think it would increase, increase—not reduce—tensions in the alliance.

It is important that we remember NATO is first and foremost a war-fighting institution. It is not and it was never intended to be a mechanism for dispute resolution. That is a charter for the OSCE. I cannot emphasize too much the importance—we already have an international organization in Europe dedicated to mediating and bringing to an end disputes between countries. As an institution of collective defense, it is true NATO, for 50 years, has fostered trust among parties, trust

that has provided the foundation for dispute resolution among allies.

In its role as an institution of collective defense, NATO's currently flexible methods for handling differences among allies maximizes U.S. influence. Frankly, this is most visible in the alliance's effort to mediate disputes between Turkey and Greece. We should not tinker with this success, the success that NATO has had in resolving differences because of the trust in which it is held by the members of this great alliance. I fear that the proposal would create the impression that the NAC has failed in its realm. I do not believe any of us would say that is true.

By introducing the proposal on this resolution of ratification, we would be communicating that the Senate regards Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic as more disputatious than NATO's current 16 members. I do not believe that is the sense of the Senate.

We should never, never in any way, undermine the supremacy of the NAC over all alliance matters and all alliance bodies. Yet, I fear that is what this proposal would do by creating a new body independent from the NAC.

Finally, this proposal would undercut its very own objectives. It would create the very tensions I assume it is intended to diffuse. Members of the Alliance will no longer focus primarily on the Alliance's core mission of collective defense, but will address the Alliance as a means to pursue their own strictly national interests. And, that will change the very culture of the Alliance.

How do you think Greece and Turkey are going to respond to this proposal? More importantly how will such a proposal affect their attitudes toward the Alliance?

It would certainly change the ways in which these two countries view their membership in NATO and their bilateral relationship within NATO. It will prompt them to become suspicious of the NAC. It will introduce greater tensions between them.

As well intentioned this amendment may be, it is nonetheless totally counterproductive.

In brief, Mr. President, this amendment would diminish U.S. influence in the Alliance. It would undercut trust between Allies. It will direct the very focus of our Allies away from NATO's core mission of collective defense. It will undercut trust within the Alliance. Ultimately, this proposal will weaken the Alliance.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Therefore, I urge, first of all, my distinguished colleague from Texas not to raise the amendment. But if she does, I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I yield the floor and 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. KENNEDY. 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. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

CUTS IN EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it's Friday noontime, and I want to make clear that the eyes of the Nation are going to be on the Senate of the United States next Tuesday when we will vote on a proposal that will provide a \$1.6 billion tax cut that will mostly benefit the wealthy individuals who send their children to private school. That is \$1.6 billion that could be used to support our public school system.

I think it's important for the Nation that parents review what has happened in the U.S. Senate over the last few days. Some very important decisions have been made by the Budget Committee. They have decided how to allocate the nation's scarce federal resources—and education doesn't get its fair share. And, next week, we will be voting on this \$1.6 billion tax break that will primarily benefit the private schools.

I take issue with those who believe we ought to support the Budget Committee's decision to cut \$1.6 billion from education. We should not abandon the public schools in this country. No challenge we face as a Nation is more important than strengthening the academic achievement and accomplishment of the young people in this country—the 48 million young people who attend the public schools in this country every single day.

On the one hand, Republicans want to use \$1.6 billion to support for tax breaks to help private schools. And, at the same time, our Republican friends on the Budget Committee cut federal education funding by \$400 million from last year, and \$1.6 billion below the President's level. Those who are making the speeches about the importance of public schools, if they stand behind the public school system, are going to have to answer the questions why they continue to cut crucial support for education.

Now, look at what the Budget Committee provided in this past week. We will have the chance to debate the budget when it comes up here in the next several days. But let's look at where our Republican friends place their priorities and what they said about public education. They cut \$1.6 billion below President Clinton's budget on public education. Now, money is not always the final indicator about what is a good program or what is a bad program; we recognize that. But it is a pretty good indication about where a nation's priorities are. If we go out and start to cut, as the Budget Com-

mittee did this past week, \$1.6 billion in discretionary assistance for the public schools, we know that education is not a national priority.

That means that they cut education and Head Start funding by \$1 billion below the level needed just to maintain the current services. In order for communities to be able to continue to serve the current number of children in Head Start, you would need an additional \$1 billion just to meet inflation. Right now, we provide enough funding in Head Start to serve about 40 percent of all the children that are eligible. But now some of those children currently in Head Start programs won't get the help the need.

Now, the Head Start Program doesn't solve all of our problems in early education. But what is undeniable is the importance of early intervention with children. What we have seen with the various Carnegie Commission reports, and the other reports, is that the earlier the intervention, the more confidence young children will have. The Head Start Program is a tried and tested program. If a child gets help in the Head Start Program, they are more likely to succeed in school and as adults. All you have to do is look at the Ypsilanti programs, the Beethoven project, and various other studies that have been done, and they show what the importance is in terms of early intervention. This Republican budget cuts \$1 billion out of that Head Start Program and other important education programs. It also cuts funding for the education programs \$400 million below even last year. It prohibits funding for any of the new programs.

So we are having a reduction of \$1.6 billion in discretionary funding for education, which includes cuts in the Head Start Program. That Head Start Program has had bipartisan support. President Bush increased it \$300 million or \$400 million a year. We ran into problems during that period of time that we weren't giving sufficient support and help for those teachers that were involved in those programs. And some of the quality issues were important to address, but we addressed them in a bipartisan way. We also indicated in the reauthorization of the Head Start Program some special funding for the earliest interventions, going down to 3-year-olds and 2-year-olds. That was very important. But this Budget Committee says no to those programs, no to even those that are in those programs, by cutting back funding.

The President of the United States is working hard to address the challenges that we are facing out in our public schools, particularly that we are going to need additional teachers in our schools and we need to rebuild the nation's school buildings. Because of enrollments rising and massive teachers retirements, we are going to need 100,000 new teachers. The President has committed enough funding for 100,000 new teachers in his budget to reduce class sizes in the early grades. The