continue. The dynamics of his suggestions will be carried out. The inertia of the Packwood move through the Finance Committee will continue, and strangely enough it will continue for years to come without his being there. Thank you.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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

RECESS UNTIL 6 P.M.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move the Senate stand in recess until 6 p.m.

The motion was agreed to, and at 5:36 p.m. the Senate recessed until 6 p.m.; whereupon the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BENNETT).

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BROWN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 2465 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

(Purpose: To provide that funds are expended in accordance with State laws and procedures relating to the expenditure of State revenues)

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. KOHL, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. FEINGOLD, proposes an amendment numbered 2465.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . EXPENDITURE OF FEDERAL FUNDS IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAWS AND PROCEDURES APPLICABLE TO EXPENDITURE OF STATE FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds received by a State under the provisions of law specified in subsection (b) shall be expended only in accordance with the laws and procedures applicable to expenditures of the State's own revenues, including appropriation by the State legislature, consistent with the terms and conditions required under such provisions of law.

(b) PROVISIONS OF LAW.—The provisions of law specified in this subsection are the following:

(1) Part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (relating to block grants for temporary assistance to needy families).

(2) Section 25 of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (relating to the optional State food assistance block grant).

(3) Subtitles B and C of title VII of this Act (relating to workforce development).

(4) The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (relating to block grants for child care).

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I asked the bulk of the amendment be read, as it just was, for a very simple purpose. It is a straightforward amendment. It is very basic. It simply calls for the amount that is block granted under this bill to be spent in a manner in accordance with the laws and procedures for expenditures of the States' own revenues. That may not sound like a revolutionary or even controversial suggestion, but it is terribly important.

The core and essence of this welfare reform is centered around the suggestion that States and communities can do a better job in deciding how their funds are expended on welfare programs assisting the poor than can a centrally planned government, than can a government thousands of miles away from the action. It is the heart, at least in part, of what this welfare reform is all about—the suggestion that money can be spent better by local levels than it can be by the Federal level.

Why would I raise this issue? The facts are that in six of our States it makes a difference. In 44 of our States the money is expended, as is provided under the State's own laws, generally in the same manner that the State's own expenditures are allocated. But in six of our States a practice has been followed where the Governor alone decides where block grant money is spent.

If we believe that the States are better able to decide how that money is spent, then I think we have to be concerned about the situation in the absence of this amendment. Literally, unless this amendment is adopted, we will see six of our States where the Governor is allowed to both appropriate the money, in effect decide where it is to be spent, and administer that money; that is, distribute the money and, as we will explore later on, even have a strong voice in conducting the audit of how that money is spent.

Literally, what we are doing, then, in those six States is giving into the hands of one person the ability to appropriate, the ability to administer, and some significant control over the audit of what they have appropriated and administered. This is contrary to the very foundation of this country. It is contrary to the very theme of our Constitution. It is contrary to those philosophers who thought of our system and brought it to fruition.

Mr. President, any in this Chamber who have read the very significant book of Senator BYRD, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, cannot help but note not only his musings about the history of our system, but the intricacies of the Roman system. One of the lessons is the understanding that there needs to be a division of power.

I want to quote from some of our historical documents because I think Members will find it interesting. In our own Federalist Papers, Madison said it best. It is in No. 47, where he says clearly:

> There can be no liberty where the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person or body or magistrates.

Unless we adopt this amendment, you are going to have that power, both legislative and executive powers, combined in one person in six of our States.

In No. 47 of the Federalist Papers, Madison says this:

> The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.

That tyranny he talked about he goes on to talk about in further depth when he says:

> From these facts by which Montesquieu was guided, it may clearly be inferred that in saying, ''There can be no liberty where the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, or body of magistrates.''

Mr. President, that is the core of the concern of this amendment. This amendment will simply provide, in those six States where they do not now have it, that they will follow the normal legislative process. If we do not adopt this, what we will in effect be doing is saying that the elected representatives of the people and the legislative branch will be ignored and their priorities bypassed when it comes to welfare reform under these block grants. We in this body have long recognized the difference between block grants and others where we have allocated the money ourselves. In categorical programs it has been normal to send the money back to the States, but it has been sent back to the States with guidelines from the Federal Government, including elected legislators, making the decisions on its allocation.

The prime difference between block grants and the categorical grants is the level of government which designs the program. Under our block grants, the States design the programs. For categorical grants, most of the programs are designed and established at the Federal level. The State is to administer the grant in accordance with Federal directives.

Mr. President, it makes sense that when we move to block grants, that we allow the State legislative process to be part of this.

This amendment is offered, not only by myself but by Senator MOYNIHAN, Senator SIMPSON, Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator KOHL, Senator CAMPBELL, and Senator FEINGOLD.

I believe the provisions of this measure are broad and they are bipartisan. I think they unite the interests of this Congress, an interest that we ought to have special recognition of. Would Senators literally want to abdicate the legislative responsibility to a chief executive? Chief executives are responsible, are important members of our governmental functions, but they should not have combined with them the legislative powers.

In addition to this, I want to draw the Members' special attention to another factor in this bill. Under section

408 of the Dole amendment, it requires States to conduct an annual audit of expenditures under the Federal temporary assistance—AFDC, that is—block grant. The auditor is required to be independent of the administering State agency and approved by the U.S. Treasury Secretary and the chief executive officer of the State.

Literally, what we are doing, then, is we are allocating money to the States which, in some cases in effect, will be legislated or appropriated by a chief executive, administered by that chief executive, and audited by someone that chief executive approves of. Or, put a different way, no one of which the chief executive does not approve can audit those funds.

This is untenable. I understand why some Governors may like this power, but I suspect, on reflection, many Governors will not like that power because what it gives them a special burden. Some may say this is in line with what we have done in the past. But let me assure this body that it is not fully in line. Under the General Revenue Sharing Act of 1972, Public Law 92–512, section 123(a) addressed this. In subsection 4 it said this:

> It will provide for the expenditure of amounts received under subtitle A only in accordance with the laws and procedures applicable to the expenditures of its own revenues.

In other words, the State government would have the ability to appropriate those moneys under the same procedures that they follow now for their own revenues. That is what we are asking in this amendment. It is consistent with the provision that Congress enacted in 1972 for general revenue sharing.

In 1977 the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations reported:

> The commission recommends that the State legislatures take a much more active role in State decisionmaking relating to the receipt and expenditures of Federal grants to the States.

Specifically, the Commission recommends that the legislatures take action to provide for: inclusion of anticipated in Federal grants in appropriation or authorization bills; prohibition of receipt of expenditures of Federal grants above the amount appropriated without the approval of the legislature. The recommendation goes on.

But whether it is in the 1972 General Revenue Sharing Act or the 1977 report of the Advisory Commission, or the 1980 report of the U.S. Comptroller General that dealt with the same subject, the theme is consistent. It was also a theme of provisions in the 1981 Omnibus Reconciliation Act, in the 1982 Job Training Act, and in the 1984 U.S. Comptroller General's report to Congress. There the subject was addressed, with this specific language—the public's opportunity to influence State decisions for programs supported with block grant funds has been enhanced through the combined effects of multiple public participation opportunities offered by the States, the increased activity of State elected officials, and the increased activity of interest groups at the State level. This increase is related to the expanded public input opportunities established both in response to the Federal requirements as well as to the greater discretion available to the States.

Mr. President, it is clear from following the background that this Congress and independent advisory groups have recognized the value over and over again of having elected State officials set the priorities.

Mr. President, this amendment is straightforward. And it is basic. What it suggests is that we as a Congress ought to make sure that the appropriating function is performed by the State legislatures or at least with regard to the general standard of appropriation that is followed by the States themselves.

It is endorsed by the National Conference of State Legislators. It is endorsed by the National Speakers Conference. It is endorsed by the American Legislative Exchange Council.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letters from and resolutions of these three bodies.

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

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES,
Washington, DC, August 4, 1995.

Hon. HANK BROWN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BROWN: The National Conference of State Legislatures is greatly appreciative of the leadership you have provided on a variety of federalism and intergovernmental relations issues. Most recently, you were able to include language in H.R. 4 that reaffirmed the state legislature's role in expending federal block grant funds. With the Senate about to undertake debate on the Republican leadership's welfare reform package, S. 1120, we wish to call upon you again to ensure that state legislative policymaking and fiscal authority is in no way compromised regarding any and all block grants included in S. 1120.

As reported from the Senate Finance Committee, H.R. 4 specifically stated that family assistance block grant funds received by the state would be expended in accordance with the laws and procedures applicable to expenditure of the state's own revenues. NCSL strongly encourages you to pursue insertion of similar language in S. 1120, making it applicable to all of the various block grants and consolidations being considered, and stands ready to assist you. Your language clearly reaffirms the roles that state lawmakers play in appropriating funds. We are concerned that giving governors direct control over funds, even if it is optional with food stamps, could well violate state laws and practices. Your H.R. 4 language guarantees that there will be an open, deliberative process in expending any block grant monies. It does not change the governor's role regarding the state's policymaking process and it certainly ensures that the state legislature will be involved.

Thank you again for the leadership on and commitment you bring to these issues. NCSL is prepared to work closely with you as floor deliberations on S. 1120 proceed. Please have your staff contact Sheri Steisel (624–8693) or Michael Bird (624–8686) for further assistance.

Sincerely,

JAMES J. LACK,
State Senator, New York
and President, NCSL.

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING STATE AUTHORITY IN WELFARE REFORM

Whereas, the 10th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserves all powers not prohibited to the states nor delegated to the United States to the states or to the people respectively, and;

Whereas, the Constitution of the United States neither prohibits power over welfare to the states, nor delegates power over welfare to the United States, and;

Whereas, through the years the United States has assumed powers over welfare that are inconsistent with the distribution of powers between the United States, the states, or the people respectively under the United States Constitution, and;

Whereas, restoration of the Constitutional distribution of powers between the United States, the states or the people respectively should proceed at an expeditious pace to restore the consistency of governing relationships with the nation's fundamental law, and;

Whereas, the welfare programs of the United States have been largely unsuccessful, enormously expensive and even counter-productive to the welfare of recipients, and;

Whereas, the states are laboratories of democracy in which different policy approaches are tried, and the most successful policies are copied by states whose policy approaches are less successful, and;

Whereas, restoration of state authority with respect to welfare is consistent with the fundamental democratic principle that government should be as close as possible to the people, and;

Whereas, the United States Senate Finance Committee has reported H.R. 4 which contains language that would allow states to expend federal welfare funds ''in any manner that is reasonably calculated to accomplish the purpose'' of the bill, and;

Whereas, as reported by the United States Senate Finance Committee, H.R. 4 contains language requiring that federal funding for welfare be ''expended only in accordance with the laws and procedures applicable to expenditures of the State's own revenues, including appropriation by the State legislature,'' and;

Whereas, the above reference clauses in H.R. 4 represent an important step toward restoration of state authority with respect to welfare;

Now therefore be it *resolved,* That the Board of Directors of the American Legislative Exchange Council urges the United States Senate to include the above reference clauses in any welfare reform bill which it adopts.

RESOLVING TO PRESERVE STATE LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY AND OVERSIGHT OF FEDERAL BLOCK GRANT FUNDS

Whereas, the National Speakers Conference represents the bipartisan and collective sentiment of the nation's Speakers of the House; and

Whereas, the National Speakers Conference seeks to strengthen and preserve state legislatures' traditional appropriations authority and oversight of all state expenditures; and

Whereas, the National Speakers Conference recognizes that this authority is enshrined in our national and state constitutions and is fundamental to the system of checks and balances that defines the separation of power among the three branches of our government; and

Whereas, the National Speakers Conference believes that the appropriation and administration of block grants require the full participation of both the legislative and executive branches to develop and implement effective policy; and

Whereas, the National Speakers Conference believes the most effective means of ensuring the full participation of the legislative and executive branches of government is through the budget appropriation and approval process;

Now, therefore be it resolved by the National Speakers Conference, that the various Speakers of the House attending the National Speakers Conference in a bipartisan vote urge the United States Congress to support the premise that all federal block grants received by the various states be expended only in accordance with the laws and procedures applicable to expenditures of the state's own revenues, including appropriation by the state legislatures; and

Be it further resolved, that the Conference endorses the bipartisan amendment proposed by Senators Hank Brown of Colorado, Daniel Patrick Moynihan of New York, Herb Kohl of Wisconsin, Frank Murkowski of Alaska and Alan Simpson of Wyoming to the welfare reform bill; and

Be it further resolved, that the National Speakers Conference request the United States and the United States House of Representatives in any block grant legislation that is enacted to ensure that the legislative appropriating authority is protected; and

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Congressional delegations of the various states by the Speakers of the House of those respective states.

Approved this first day of September Nineteen Hundred and Ninety-Five in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I will reserve the remainder of my time.

Let me simply close with this thought. As we give to the States an enormous grant of new authority and new responsibility, an ability literally to appropriate the funds and allocate the funds that have been taken by the Federal Government, I think it is incumbent upon us to make sure that is done wisely, and it is done well. To suggest that we are going to concentrate in the hands of one person, the Governor, the ability to both appropriate and administer and have a control over the audit is unacceptable.

This amendment gives the States the ability to preside over this money just as they do with their own money that they raise.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, may I thank the Senator from Colorado for offering this amendment which appears to this Senator, and I believe to most Senators on either side of the aisle, as appropriate, and necessary because there are principles involved.

I am sure the Senator from Colorado agrees that constitutional government is a division of powers, and always contemplates that resources will be revenues. These are revenues to State governments that will be allocated in accordance with agreements in the legislative branch and the executive branch.

That is the intent of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BROWN. It is precisely that intent and more consistently constitutional, I believe.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. It seems to me, precisely that. By constitutional proviso the Congress guarantees to the States a republican form of government. I am not sure whether this would fall under that admonition or injunction.

Mr. BROWN. Many of us were hopeful that admonition for a republican form of government meant just that. But unfortunately, apparently it was not.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I insist that republican be with a small ''r,'' and at the time when Thomas Jefferson assumed to run the democratic Republican Party. But we will not get into that detail.

I would simply indicate that it would be my disposition, absent any contrary information, to accept the amendment. If the Senator wishes a vote, of course that is his right. But I will defer to the Senator from Colorado in this regard.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would be happy to have it accepted. I am advised there are Members who have concerns about this.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. So they would wish to speak and perhaps to be heard. Very well. I do believe we are at a point where we may be reaching an agreement on tomorrow's schedule, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I see the distinguished Senator from Nevada is on the floor.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will the Chair inform the Senator from Nevada what the parliamentary status now is on the Senate floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is on a second-degree amendment.

Mr. REID. There is no time agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time agreement.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I make appear elsewhere in the RECORD so as not to interfere with the debate on this amendment.

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

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I wonder if we might be able to get the yeas and nays on the Brown amendment. We will set that vote for tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, if we could ask for the yeas and nays on the Brown amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOLE. We will have an agreement to have that vote tomorrow morning at 9:30 unless it can be accepted. I understand there is no objection on the Democratic side.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. DOLE. There may be an objection.

We are still looking for additional amendments to be taken up this evening. We have agreed to amendments on either side. I know the distinguished manager on the other side does not wish to offer his amendment this evening. We can lay it down. I think that would take an hour, or 45 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. If it is agreeable, an hour and 30 minutes equally divided.

Mr. DOLE. I have no objection to that.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Will the Senator from Nevada be generous enough to let us proceed with these technical matters for just a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for that purpose?

Mr. REID. I do.

AMENDMENT NO. 2466 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

(Purpose: To provide a substitute amendment)

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk in the second degree and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment of the Senator from Colorado is temporarily set aside, and the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) proposes an amendment numbered 2466 to amendment No. 2280.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment appears in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.'')

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, in accordance with the agreement, such as it will be reached between leaders, I yield the floor with the understanding that we will take this matter up tomorrow.

Mr. DASCHLE. Will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. REID. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DASCHLE. Just for clarification of the schedule this evening, it is the leader's intention to take up the Moynihan amendment tomorrow and have other amendments offered if we can have them laid down tonight but no additional amendments would be voted upon tonight?

Mr. DOLE. That is correct. I know Members are going to want to be leaving fairly early tomorrow afternoon. It is not going to be possible unless they are willing to come to the floor tonight and debate the amendments and have the votes tomorrow morning. We are searching on our side if we can ask the leader to search on his side.

Mr. DASCHLE. If the Senator from Nevada will yield, let me urge my colleagues. We have been polling our Members and have been told that we have about 130 amendments. If we have that many amendments, there is no reason why tonight we cannot have a good debate on some of these amendments. I would like to see a couple of them offered and debated tonight. The ranking member is here and prepared to work with any of our Members on this side. So I hope we can do that. If we have that many amendments, there is no reason why at 6 o'clock tonight we do not have more of an opportunity to discuss some of these important matters.

So I really urge all of our Democratic colleagues to cooperate in good faith and to come to the floor. This is a good time to be offering the amendments, and we will accommodate Senators as they come to the floor.

Mr. DOLE. If the Senator from Nevada will yield further, I make the same request. This is normally the late evening, Thursday evening, and we have not announced any votes this evening but we are prepared to do that if we can have the cooperation of Members, if they just come to the floor, debate the amendment, with the exception of the amendment of the Senator from New York, and then we can agree to vote on those tomorrow morning.

Following the votes, we would take up the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], with 1½ hours equally divided for debate. So we will put out a hotline on this side, and this is the time to offer amendments. We had 70-some on our list. You have, say, 150. If there are 200 amendments out there, there ought to be somebody willing to come to the floor at 6:20 on a Thursday evening—it is not even dark outside—and offer some amendments. We are prepared to do business. I know the Presiding Officer is very pleased to be here, and we will do our best. I thank my colleague.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

SENATOR BRYAN'S WORK ON THE ETHICS COMMITTEE

Mr. REID. The first criminal jury trial that I had involved a burglary case. As I recall, the jury trial took about 3 or 4 days. The reason I remember the case so clearly is that I was the attorney representing the defendant, the person charged with the crime. The prosecutor of that case was RICHARD BRYAN, then a young deputy district attorney in Clark County, NV. It was a good case. We had two young lawyers who had a real good battle in the courtroom.

Senator RICHARD BRYAN was an outstanding lawyer. He was the first public defender in the history of the State of Nevada. He and I took the Nevada bar together in 1963. We were the only two freshmen elected to the Nevada State Legislature in 1969.

Not only did he have a successful and distinguished career as a private attorney, but he also served in the Nevada State Legislature as an assemblyman and as a Nevada State senator. He served as attorney general of the State of Nevada. He was elected twice to be Governor of the State of Nevada and has been elected twice to be a U.S. Senator from the State of Nevada.

The reason I mention this is I think, in the events that have taken place today, those six members of the Ethics Committee who have toiled months and months have been kind of forgotten about. This was a job not sought by Senator RICHARD BRYAN, who was chairman of the Ethics Committee. In fact, he took the job at his peril. He was running for reelection when then majority leader George Mitchell asked him to do his duty as a U.S. Senator and accept this task, this ordeal, to be chairman of the Senate Ethics Committee.

I have never talked to Senator BRYAN about the facts of the case that has been before this body today. But I know RICHARD BRYAN. I know him well. He and I have been friends for 30-odd years or more. And I know how this case has weighed on him. I see it in his face. I see it in his demeanor. As I have indicated, I have never discussed the case with him. But I know Senator BRYAN well, I repeat. I know that his obligation was to be fair to the victims, to be fair to the accused and to this institution and, of course, the oath that he took as a Senator.

The time that he spent on this case could have been spent working on other issues, could have been spent with his family and his friends, but he spent not minutes, not hours, not days, not weeks but months on this case.

When the elections took place last fall, Senator BRYAN became the ranking member of the Ethics Committee, and Senator MITCH MCCONNELL became chairman of the Ethics Committee.

Mr. President, I think that we, as Members of the Senate, should all acknowledge the work done by the Ethics Committee. I am speaking of my friend, Senator BRYAN. I am doing that because I know him so well. I know the time that he spent. I know his background. I know what a good person he is and how fair he tries to be with everybody in everything that he does.

Now, I can speak with more authority and certainty about Senator BRYAN than I can the other five members of the Ethics Committee, but these other five individuals coming from their varied backgrounds and experiences led to this Ethics Committee that had a sense of duty. It was bipartisan in nature, and being bipartisan in nature reached a conclusion in this most difficult case. Senators MIKULSKI and DORGAN on the Democratic side and Chairman MCCONNELL, Senators CRAIG and SMITH are also to be given appreciation by this Senator and I hope the rest of this body for the time that they spent on this very thankless job.

Mr. President, I, of course, have talked in detail about Senator BRYAN and the person that he is. If I knew the other five members as well as I knew Senator BRYAN, I am sure that I could say the same things about them and the difficulty they had in arriving at the decision they did. I am sure that if I had spent the time with them as I have with Senator BRYAN, I could tell by their demeanor, I could tell by the looks on their faces the consternation and the difficulty they had in doing the work that they did on this case.

Mr. President, there is no way to compliment and applaud these gentlemen and the lady who serve on this committee in an adequate fashion, but I, I hope on behalf of the entire Senate and the people of this country, express to them my appreciation and our appreciation for doing what they did in this case, that is, working the long, hard, tireless hours they did and arriving at a decision that only they could arrive at.

Mr. President, in 1882, a member of the very small Nevada Supreme Court—there were three members of the supreme court in 1882—in a case cited at 106 U.S. 154, Justice Bradley said in that case these words that I think apply to what has taken place here today: ''The event is always a great teacher.''

Mr. President, the event that has taken place today has been a great teacher for us all and will be in the future.

Mr. NICKLES. 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.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DEWINE. 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. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss three amendments that I intend to propose later in regard to this bill we are engaged today, this week, and probably into the next week with one of the most fundamental reforms of the welfare system in over a generation. It really is a debate of great historic importance to not only the people who are on welfare, but to all Americans.

The millions of Americans who are trapped in the cycle of welfare dependency need a way out. As we work on this bill, I believe that we have to make absolutely sure that as we do this, we do, in fact, give them a way out and not just put them into another revolving door.

The purpose of the first amendment that I will offer will be to make sure