theories of science from philosophical or religious claims that are made in the name of science; and

''(2) where biological evolution is taught, the curriculum should help students to understand why this subject generates so much continuing controversy, and should prepare the students to be informed participants in public discussions regarding the subject.

It simply says there are disagreements in scientific theories out there that are continually tested. Our knowledge of science is not absolute, obviously. We continue to test theories. Over the centuries, there were theories that were once assumed to be true and have been proven, through further revelation of scientific investigation and testing, to be not true.

One of the things I thought was important in putting this forward was to make sure the Senate of this country, obviously one of the greatest, if not the greatest, deliberative bodies on the face of the Earth, was on record saying we are for this kind of intellectual freedom; we are for this kind of discussion going on; it will enhance the quality of science education for our students.

I will read three points made by one of the advocates of this thought, a man named David DeWolf, as to the advantages of teaching this controversy that exists. He says:

Several benefits will accrue from a more open discussion of biological origins in the science classroom. First, this approach will do a better job of teaching the issue itself, both because it presents more accurate information about the state of scientific thinking and evidence, and because it presents the subject in a more lively and less dogmatic way. Second, this approach gives students greater appreciation for how science is actually practiced. Science necessarily involves the interpretation of data; yet scientists often disagree about how to interpret their data. By presenting this scientific controversy realistically, students will learn how to evaluate competing interpretations in light of evidence—a skill they will need as citizens, whether they choose careers in science or other fields. Third, this approach will model for students how to address differences of opinion through reasoned discussion within the context of a pluralistic society.

I think there are many benefits to this discussion that we hope to encourage in science classrooms across this country. I frankly don't see any down side to this discussion—that we are standing here as the Senate in favor of intellectual freedom and open and fair discussion of using science—not philosophy and religion within the context, within the context of science but science—as the basis for this determination.

I will reserve the remainder of my time. I have a couple of other speakers I anticipate will come down and talk about this amendment, and I want to leave adequate time. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, do I understand correctly the Senator from Minnesota has the time from Senator HOLLINGS?

Mr. WELLSTONE. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. So Senator HOLLINGS has the 10 minutes. In his absence, the control of the time should be with the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask the Chair whether or not we have 10 minutes altogether on our side or 10 minutes for each of us. What is the understanding from last night?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts controls 10 minutes, and the Senator from South Carolina controls 10 minutes, which has now been——

Mr. KENNEDY. I will be glad to yield 5 minutes of my time if the Senator wants it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has been tendered 10 minutes from the time allotted to Mr. HOLLINGS.

AMENDMENT NO. 798

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, my hope is the Senator from South Carolina will be able to be here. He spoke last night on his amendment, and he can do it with more eloquence and more persuasively than can I. But I told him, since I support his amendment, I would be pleased to try to be a fill-in for him.

I see my colleague is now here. I say to the Senator from South Carolina that I will be delighted to follow him, if he is ready to speak.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina. I will follow my colleague.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina seek recognition?

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Chair.

Mr. President, this Senate, and I say it advisedly and respectfully, in a sense, we are the best off-Broadway show. We engage in these charades, set up these straw men and then knock them down, taking the credit for being so effective politically.

We say we have a surplus; we don't have a surplus. The CBO projected in March a $23 billion surplus for this fiscal year. Mark it down, it will be between a $50 billion and $70 billion deficit. We haven't even passed an appropriations bill. We have not passed any kind of supplemental and already we can foresee, less than a week after the signing of the so-called tax cut—where we had no taxes to cut—a deficit of $50 billion to $70 billion.

Now here is what we set up. We say: Wait a minute. In education there is no accountability; there is no testing. The people back home do not know what they need. If we can get some accountability and testing, we will learn what they need.

Such fanciful nonsense. We have testing coming out of our ears. You mention the State, and I will give you the millions they are spending.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this schedule printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State	Amount spent on testing (in thous)	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Number of 3–8 tests	New tests required	Revenue sharing proceeds
Alabama	$4,000	B	B	B	B	B	B	12	0	$24,915,437
Alaska	3,500	B	B	.....	B	B	B	10	2	8,629,291
Arizona	4,800	B	B	B	B	B	B	12	0	28,129,355
Arkansas	3,200	.....	B	B	B	B	B	10	2	16,983,311
California	44,000	B	B	B	B	B	B	12	0	161,769,009
Colorado	10,700	R	R	B	B	B	B	10	2	23,798,968
Connecticut	2,000	.....	B	.....	B	.....	B	6	6	19,875,848
Delaware	3,800	B	.....	B	.....	.....	B	6	6	8,016,860
Florida	22,400	B	B	B	B	B	B	12	0	68,848,688
Georgia	14,000	B	B	B	B	.....	B	10	2	43,139,333
Hawaii	1,400	B	.....	B	.....	.....	B	6	6	9,961,299
Idaho	700	B	B	B	B	B	B	12	0	11,393,934
Illinois	16,500	B	.....	B	.....	.....	B	6	6	57,731,557
Indiana	19,000	B	.....	.....	B	.....	B	6	6	31,207,328
Iowa	0	.....	B	.....	.....	.....	B	4	8	17,424,763
Kansas	1,100	.....	M	R	.....	M	R	4	8	17,179,348
Kentucky	8,100	B	R	M	B	R	M	8	4	21,605,599
Louisiana	9,000	B	B	B	B	B	B	12	0	24,579,091
Maine	3,300	.....	B	.....	.....	.....	B	4	8	10,704,063
Maryland	17,100	B	B	B	B	B	B	12	0	27,457,342
Massachusetts	20,000	R	B	.....	M	B	R	7	5	31,006,359
Michigan	16,000	.....	B	R	.....	R	R	5	7	48,296,329
Minnesota	5,200	B	.....	B	.....	.....	B	6	6	27,066,118
Mississippi	7,600	B	B	B	B	B	B	12	0	18,198,252
Missouri	13,400	R	M	.....	.....	R	M	4	8	28,736,967
Montana	282	B	.....	.....	.....	.....	B	4	8	9,161,562