The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 19) to disapprove the certification of the President under section 490(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 regarding foreign assistance for Mexico during fiscal year 1997.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I object to further proceedings on this joint resolution at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be placed directly on the calendar.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1 p.m. on Wednesday, March 5, the majority leader may turn to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 5, the waiver resolution with respect to the Barshefksy nomination. I further ask that there be one amendment in order to the resolution, to be offered by Senator HOLLINGS, regarding trade agreement negotiations which shall be considered under a 3-hour time limit equally divided in the usual form; further, no other amendments or motions be in order other than a motion to table the amendment. I further ask that there be an additional hour equally divided between the chairman and the ranking member of the Finance Committee for debate on the resolution, and, upon the disposition of the Hollings' amendment and the expiration or yielding back of any debate time, the resolution be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of Senate Joint Resolution 5, as amended, if amended, without any intervening action or debate.

I further ask consent that upon the disposition of Senate Joint Resolution 5, if it passes, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Charlene Barshefsky to be the U.S. Trade Representative, the Senate proceed to a vote on the confirmation of the nomination, and, following that vote, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 22

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send a joint resolution to the desk and ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 22) to express the sense of the Congress concerning the application by the Attorney General for the appointment of an independent counsel to investigate allegations of the illegal fundraising in the 1996 Presidential election campaign.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the second reading of the resolution, and I object to my own request at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 5, 1997

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 noon on Wednesday, March 5. I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted and that there be a period of morning business until the hour of 1 p.m. with Senators to speak for up to 5 minutes each, except for the following: Senator BROWNBACK for 30 minutes and Senator GRAMM of Florida for 15 minutes.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. LOTT. For the information of all Senators, following morning business tomorrow, the Senate will consider Senate Joint Resolution 5, which is the waiver resolution of the Barshefsky nomination. Under the order, there will be 3 hours of debate on one amendment and 1 hour of debate on the resolution. Following the disposition of the amendment and the resolution, the Senate will proceed to a vote on the Barshefsky nomination. Senators can therefore expect several rollcall votes, probably at least two or three, tomorrow, in Wednesday's session. I thank my colleagues for their cooperation as we have worked for a couple of weeks to get this agreement.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LOTT. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the introduction of legislation by Senator GLENN and remarks by Senator SANTORUM.

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

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Chair.

PUBLIC FAITH IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise to make a couple of comments about the action that just took place here on the Senate floor with respect to the balanced budget amendment and to express, obviously, my disappointment as someone who supported the balanced budget amendment, my disappointment that we did not succeed in passing what I believe is a vitally important measure for this country's future. We will have another day where we will be back here and try again, whether it is this year or next year or in the next session of Congress, to fight that fight again. In a sense, the battle is not lost; it only continues.

I am a little more concerned about another battle which I fear has at least as lasting consequences as not passing this constitutional amendment, and that is something that is important to all of us here and to all Americans. As important as our Constitution is the public's faith in our institutions, our governmental institutions and the people who serve in them.

One of the real concerns I have—in fact, I have been traveling around my State of Pennsylvania talking at a lot of high schools and expressing there my concerns that a lot of young people choose not to vote. In fact, in the last election, of 18 to 24-year-olds, I believe only a third even bothered to turn out to vote. That is a low since 18-year-olds were given a right to vote. Not only that, but the last election was the low point in turnout for the general electorate. I think it was under 50 percent in the last Presidential election.

A lot of people have postulated as to what is going on with the American public, that we seem to become either disinterested or cynical about the electoral process and our Government in general. I think, unfortunately, what has happened in this debate over the last 2 weeks has added to that cynicism, has added to the mistrust that many Americans feel toward their institutions and toward the people who serve in those institutions.

I speak, of course, about the people who campaigned promising the electors of their State that they would vote a certain way on what many people consider the most important issue we will vote on here in this Congress. It is a seminal issue. It sort of divides you between the politics of the old and the politics of the new, in my opinion. You had at least 12 Members in this most recent election who campaigned, and campaigned vigorously, stating that they were going to support the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution in the same form they had supported it in the House of Representatives. And yet not more than 3 or 4 months after their election, they have changed their minds.

Yes, the Constitution is important. Yes, amending the Constitution, in my opinion, is important. But public confidence in us is as important, for if the public does not see us as legitimate, if the public does not see its institutions and the people who run them as trustworthy, then the Constitution is not nearly as strong a document—in fact, some would suggest it is even a worthless document—because democracy cannot exist without the public faith in what we are about and the legitimacy of our Government.

So I think this debate is sad for, yes, the reason we did not pass the balanced budget amendment. That is very sad. But I think the greater long-term

threat to our country is public cynicism over this institution and all of our democratic institutions.

That was harmed and, in some places, it was devastated in the past few weeks. That is something we will have a hard time with when fighting the battle again. It makes the battle to come back much harder. It is not as if we can bring this up again as we can a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. It now is something young and old people will be looking at, what happened here, and saying, does politics really matter? Why bother to vote; they do not mean what they say anyway.

I commend the Members; some of them had very tough votes in bucking their President and their leaders, for standing up and doing the right thing, doing what they said they would do. When it comes down to it, in this institution—and I suspect in every workplace in America—the bottom line comes down to you have nothing here except your word. You have nothing except your word. With respect to me and my relationship to my constituents in Pennsylvania, I find that to be a solemn vow. My word means something. And if my word is no good, then they have every right to question me and question the institution in which I serve.

So I think we did have a defeat today. We had a defeat not for the constitutional amendment. Yes, we had that defeat. We had a defeat for our institution. We had a defeat for our democracy. We had a defeat for the process that legitimizes everything we do here. And that truly is a sad thing. It is a sad day for the Senate. It is even a sadder day for this country.

I would just suggest as some anecdote to the people who feel disenfranchised as a result of what happened here that most of the people in this Senate did do what they said they were going to do, on both sides of the aisle. Most of the Members of this Senate stood up and told the public the truth when it, frankly, may have not been easy to tell the truth. And from that, I think, we should take some solace, that, in fact, most Members do stand up and say what they mean. And I hope that we can learn from this lesson, all of us learn from this lesson, the importance of having the public's faith in who we are, what we say and what we do. It matters.

We have a lot of people in this town now who seem to be pushing the edge on a lot of activities. And you see the public just does not seem—I get this question all the time—to care about all these shenanigans that go on around here. I agree. I think there are so many shenanigans going on around here they discount them at the time. They think they are all bad, and why is he any different than anyone else.

Wow, that is a dangerous sentiment in this country. That is a sentiment that gets you in trouble. We should be outraged when people do things that are illegal, when people do things that are unethical. We should be outraged when our public officials, whom we hold up to represent us, do not meet the standards that we ourselves meet, and we should think differently about them because they do not meet those standards.

It is a sad day, but I hope that we again have learned the lesson that it is important for us to be men and women of our word. And that goes beyond any bill, any amendment, any issue that we deal with in this body. Once we understand that lesson, I think we will be a greater body and a greater country as a result.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. GLENN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. GLENN pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 61 are located in today's RECORD under ''Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.'')

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate, under the previous order, will stand adjourned until 12 noon, Wednesday, March 5, 1997.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:04 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 5, 1997, at 12 noon.