

as public stations. Another part can only be attained, or at least thoroughly attained, by actual experience in the station which requires the use of it.

In the same Federalist paper, Madison writes as follows:

A few of the members, as happens in all such assemblies, will possess superior talents; will, by frequent reelections, become members of long standing; will be thoroughly masters of the public business, and perhaps not unwilling to avail themselves of those advantages. The greater the proportion of new members and the less the information of the bulk of the members, the more apt will they be to fall into the snares that may be laid for them.

Mr. President, I speak today of a Senator who has demonstrated superior talents, a Senator with 22 years of experience in this body—Madison, having referred to men of “superior talents” and also to the advantages of “experience”—and BENNETT JOHNSTON is that man of whom I speak.

There is no department of public life in which the test of man’s ability is more severe than service in this body. Little deference is paid to reputation previously acquired or to eminent performances won elsewhere. What a man accomplishes in this Chamber, he does so by sheer force of his own character and ability. It is here that one must be prepared to answer for the many talents or for the single talent committed to his charge.

BENNETT JOHNSTON came to this body 22 years ago as a man of many talents. He did not wrap his talents in a napkin or hide them in the earth, as both Luke the Physician and Matthew make reference, but he put them to use that they might bear increase for his State, for his country, for the Senate, and for his fellow man. He has proved himself to be a superior legislator. I have served with him these 22 years on the Committee on Appropriations. He has proved himself to be a man with courage, with vision, with conviction, a man who is diligent in his work and faithful to his oath of office.

As the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations during the last 6 years, I found him always to be conscientious and a man of his word. Fully aware of the admonition by Polonius that “those friends thou hast and their adoption tried, grapple them to thy soul with hoops of steel,” it is with pride that I call BENNETT JOHNSTON friend. It is with sincere sadness that I have heard of his decision and I regret that, with the passing of these final 2 years of his term, the Senate will have witnessed the departure of one who has effectively toiled here in its vineyards and who has earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues. The people of the State of Louisiana chose well when, by the exercise of their franchise, they sent him here. Someone will be selected to take his place, just as someone will, in due time, stand in the place of each of us here.

After he lays down the mantle of service, we shall feel the same revolu-

tion of the seasons, and the same Sun and Moon will guide the course of our year. The same azure vault, bespangled with stars, will be everywhere spread over our heads. But I shall miss him, just as I know others will miss BENNETT JOHNSTON. Other opportunities will come to him, other horizons will stretch out before him, and he will sail his ship on other seas.

Erma and I will miss BENNETT and Mary, but the memories of these past years during which we have been blessed to render service together to the Nation will always linger in our hearts.

I think of lines by Longfellow as being appropriate for this occasion:

I shot an arrow into the air;  
It fell to earth I knew not where,  
For so swiftly it flew, the sight  
Could not follow it in its flight.

I breathed a song into the air;  
It came to earth, I knew not where,  
For who has sight so swift, so strong  
That it can follow the flight of song?

Long, long afterwards, in an oak,  
I found the arrow still unbroke,  
And the song, from beginning to end,  
I found again in the heart of a friend.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. 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. GLENN. 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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no objection, under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 nearly having arrived, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:22 p.m., recessed until 2:16 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. GRAMS).

CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 8 TO AMENDMENT NO. 4

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now vote on amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. MCCONNELL of Kentucky to amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. FORD of Kentucky.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 6 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Abraham	Gorton	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gramm	Murkowski
Bennett	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Packwood
Brown	Gregg	Pressler
Burns	Hatch	Roth
Campbell	Hatfield	Santorum
Chafee	Helms	Shelby
Coats	Hutchison	Simpson
Cochran	Inhofe	Smith
Cohen	Jeffords	Snowe
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Specter
Craig	Kempthorne	Stevens
D'Amato	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Lieberman	Thompson
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
Faircloth	Mack	
Frist	McCain	

NAYS—44

Akaka	Feingold	Leahy
Baucus	Feinstein	Levin
Biden	Ford	Mikulski
Bingaman	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Graham	Moynihan
Bradley	Harkin	Murray
Breaux	Heflin	Nunn
Bryan	Hollings	Pell
Bumpers	Inouye	Pryor
Byrd	Johnston	Reid
Conrad	Kennedy	Robb
Daschle	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kerry	Simon
Dorgan	Kohl	Wellstone
Exon	Lautenberg	

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

So the amendment (No. 8) was agreed to.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the situation is that we are now on the Ford amendment, as amended by the McConnell amendment. Then we have, I believe, four other amendments that can be voted on immediately, if the authors of those amendments are done with their discussion, and I hope the authors of those amendments are done with discussion.

I would like to ask the Democratic manager if we can move forward then on the Ford amendment for adoption of the amendment by voice vote. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the Ford amendment, and I would ask that we go to the Wellstone amendment.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the pending business is the Wellstone amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the Ford amendment.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we lay aside the Ford amendment.

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

## AMENDMENT NO. 9

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, now the pending amendment is the Wellstone amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I do not want to get into a quarrel with my good friend from Minnesota.

I indicated on the Senate floor that there will be gift ban legislation, as well as lobbying reform legislation. I do not know precisely the date. I would hope that the majority leader, in effect, gives his word to our colleagues; or the minority leader gives his word to our colleagues on this side of the aisle, and that they would accept that in good faith.

I just think that this sense-of-the-Senate amendment does not add anything. We believe there should be gift ban legislation. We may want to make some changes. We are in the process of looking at lobbying reform, gift ban. I would hope that my colleague from Minnesota would not press the amendment. If he insists, I would have no alternative but to move to table the amendment. I indicated last week, and I think the Senator from Kentucky, Senator MCCONNELL, indicated we will be doing perhaps not precisely what the Senator from Minnesota may wish, but if not, he can amend it when it comes to the floor. I wish he would at least express enough confidence in us in the first week that we do keep our word.

If I fail to do that, I certainly would not quarrel with coming back again with another amendment. I do not see any real purpose in pursuing this. In the interest of time, if the Senator persists in the amendment, I move to table and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I wonder whether I could just respond for a brief moment to the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I withhold my request.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, first of all, I very much appreciate what the majority leader said. This morning I did make it clear that I knew the majority leader had made a commitment to bringing this up and talked about May 31 being the original date that we wanted this to be effective.

I take the majority leader's word very seriously. I think he is a leader of his word. Second of all, I know that the majority leader had said last week that there would be some additional work that might be done. This does not spell out the specifics of what the comprehensive gift ban legislation would be, but it says we should consider it no later than May 31.

I want to make it clear that I have no quarrel with the majority leader

whatever. This amendment is not about that. What this amendment is, is an amendment to put the Senate on record. Since I have been working on this for several years I just thought it would be important for the Senate to be on record essentially confirming what the majority leader has said. That way I know as a Senator that we will all be behind what the majority leader has already proposed.

I would like to have in that spirit, not in a personal quarrel whatever, a vote on this, and I would hope that the majority leader would support me. I think we are all in agreement. It just puts the Senate on record behind what the majority leader has already recommended.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Minnesota.

Again, it is our intent to try to move as quickly as we can. I am not certain about any date. I am not certain it will be May 31. It could be before, maybe after May 31. It does seem to me that we should be given that opportunity. If we do not produce something around May 31, obviously, the Senator from Minnesota and a number of others, some on this side, would be offering maybe the same amendment.

In view of the fact that we have not had any hearings on it this year, we have new Members of the Senate, I think they will all support a gift ban.

I might add, I would rather be given some latitude in setting the agenda and setting when we might schedule this for debate.

Therefore, I move to table the amendment and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [ROCKEFELLER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 7 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Ashcroft	Faircloth	Kyl
Bennett	Frist	Lieberman
Bond	Gorton	Lott
Brown	Gramm	Lugar
Burns	Grams	Mack
Chafee	Grassley	McCain
Coats	Gregg	McConnell
Cochran	Hatch	Murkowski
Cohen	Hatfield	Nickles
Coverdell	Heflin	Packwood
Craig	Helms	Pressler
D'Amato	Hutchison	Roth
DeWine	Inhofe	Santorum
Dole	Jeffords	Shelby
Domenici	Kassebaum	Simpson
Dorgan	Kempthorne	Smith

Snowe  
Specter  
Stevens

Thomas  
Thompson  
Thurmond

Warner

NAYS—44

Abraham  
Akaka  
Baucus  
Biden  
Bingaman  
Boxer  
Bradley  
Breau  
Bryan  
Bumpers  
Byrd  
Campbell  
Conrad  
Daschle  
Dodd

Exon  
Feingold  
Feinstein  
Ford  
Glenn  
Graham  
Harkin  
Hollings  
Inouye  
Johnston  
Kennedy  
Kerrey  
Kerry  
Kohl  
Lautenberg

Leahy  
Levin  
Mikulski  
Moseley-Braun  
Moynihan  
Murray  
Nunn  
Pell  
Pryor  
Reid  
Sarbanes  
Simon  
Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 9) was agreed to.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, may we have order. I cannot hear, and I am in the front row.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GLENN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to lay aside the Ford amendment and then move to consideration of the Leahy amendment and hopefully to vote on it immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, could we have order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please come to order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the request?

Mr. LEAHY. What was the request? I did not hear the request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. LEAHY. I have no objection.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will make this very brief. I think most Members are in the Chamber, and I know they want to get to a vote. In 20 years here, I can count on how they might vote.

I would really urge Senators to think carefully about voting to table. This is basically saying that we are not going to allow ourselves to set up the kind of political litmus test that nobody in private business would be allowed to do. This does not stop any Senator from saying I do not want to hire somebody because I do not feel ideologically compatible with him or her.

But what it is saying is when you go and just put your people into a general overall pool of available staff members you do not have to go down through the kind of things that asks you to rate everything from the American Civil Liberties Union and Common Cause to the National Rifle Association and

United Nations, rate everybody from AL GORE to BOB DOLE as the study committee's grading was. Can you imagine if somebody at IBM was saying before we even consider your application where do you stand with the Sierra Club or the National Rifle Association, or where do you stand with Planned Parenthood or with Right to Life? There would be a hue and cry.

We should not do the same thing here. It is an outrageous mistake. But if we are going to apply the same laws to ourselves as is applied to everybody else, they should be so applied.

I told my good friend from Iowa I would be brief. I yield the floor.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Ford amendment be set aside to provide time for this vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it may be that the Leahy amendment has a great deal of merit. Let me say again that the House passed this bill after 20 minutes of debate by a vote of 429 to zero. This is our fourth day on this same bill to cover Congress as we cover every other business in America. And I do not quarrel with that we have not raised any objection to any amendments or taken too much time. No cloture has been filed or anything of that kind. It may be that sometime later this year when we get around to congressional reform there would be an appropriate amendment.

But I hope that my colleagues will join me in tabling the amendment at this point so we can finish this bill without amendments. This may be a good amendment. I am not going to pass judgment on it because I have great respect for the Senator from Vermont. But since I do not fully understand it and I am not certain how many others do, since we will have congressional reform legislation before us, I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll. Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 8 Leg.]

YEAS—79

Abraham	Feinstein	McConnell
Ashcroft	Frist	Mikulski
Baucus	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Bennett	Graham	Moynihan
Biden	Gramm	Murkowski
Bingaman	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Nunn
Bradley	Gregg	Packwood
Breaux	Hatch	Pressler
Brown	Hatfield	Pryor
Bumpers	Heflin	Reid
Burns	Helms	Robb
Byrd	Hollings	Roth
Chafee	Hutchison	Santorum
Coats	Inhofe	Shelby
Cochran	Jeffords	Simon
Cohen	Kassebaum	Simpson
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Smith
Craig	Kerrey	Snowe
D'Amato	Kerry	Specter
DeWine	Kyl	Stevens
Dodd	Lautenberg	Thomas
Dole	Lieberman	Thompson
Domenici	Lott	Thurmond
Dorgan	Lugar	Warner
Exon	Mack	
Faircloth	McCain	

NAYS—20

Akaka	Ford	Leahy
Boxer	Glenn	Levin
Bryan	Harkin	Murray
Campbell	Inouye	Pell
Conrad	Johnston	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kennedy	Wellstone
Feingold	Kohl	

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. GLENN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Ford amendment be once again set aside and that we proceed to vote on the Kerry amendment.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I will be moving to table the KERRY amendment. Before I do so, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I discussed with Senator KERRY my support for his amendment. I expressed earlier my support for Senator Kerry's amendment. It is exactly similar to legislation that I proposed last year. It is legislation and very important reform that must be addressed by this body and addressed this year, in my view. I believe that the amendment will be tabled. If it is not brought up in a reasonable length of time, I will join in co-sponsoring this legislation in the future with Senator KERRY.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I move to table the KERRY amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) to table the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY). The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. SANTORUM). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 9 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Abraham	Gorton	McCain
Ashcroft	Gramm	McConnell
Bennett	Grams	Moynihan
Bond	Grassley	Murkowski
Breaux	Gregg	Nickles
Brown	Hatch	Nunn
Burns	Hatfield	Packwood
Chafee	Helms	Pressler
Coats	Hollings	Roth
Cochran	Hutchison	Santorum
Cohen	Inhofe	Shelby
Conrad	Jeffords	Simon
Coverdell	Johnston	Simpson
Craig	Kassebaum	Smith
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Snowe
DeWine	Kerrey	Stevens
Dole	Kyl	Thomas
Domenici	Leahy	Thompson
Dorgan	Lieberman	Thurmond
Exon	Lott	Warner
Faircloth	Lugar	
Frist	Mack	

NAYS—35

Akaka	Feingold	Levin
Baucus	Feinstein	Mikulski
Biden	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Glenn	Murray
Boxer	Graham	Pell
Bradley	Harkin	Pryor
Bryan	Heflin	Reid
Bumpers	Inouye	Robb
Byrd	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Campbell	Kerry	Specter
Daschle	Kohl	Wellstone
Dodd	Lautenberg	

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

So the motion to table the amendment (No. 10) was agreed to.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GLENN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, is the Ford amendment the pending business now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be temporarily set aside to permit Senator BINGAMAN to bring forth his amendment, which I believe is going to be agreed to.

Mr. GRASSLEY. And the amendment is taking the place of the Levin amendment. Bingaman for Levin.

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

## AMENDMENT NO. 12

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding adoption of simplified and streamlined acquisition procedures for Senate offices consistent with the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994)

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], for himself and Mr. LEVIN, proposes an amendment numbered 12.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V add the following:

**SEC. 508. SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING ADOPTION OF SIMPLIFIED AND STREAMLINED ACQUISITION PROCEDURES FOR SENATE ACQUISITIONS.**

It is the sense of the Senate that the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate should review the rules applicable to purchases by Senate offices to determine whether they are consistent with the acquisition simplification and streamlining laws enacted in the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 104-355).

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment for myself and Senator LEVIN that I believe is acceptable to both sides. I thank the distinguished managers of the bill, Senator GRASSLEY and Senator GLENN, and the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Senate Rules Committee, Senator STEVENS and Senator FORD, for this assistance with this amendment.

Last year, Congress enacted a bipartisan bill to put an end to antiquated and expensive procurement rules that governed the way Federal agencies buy goods and services. The Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994, spearheaded by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Senator GLENN and the distinguished Senator from Delaware, Senator ROTH, repealed or modified more than 225 outdated laws. The goal of the legislation was simplification, and much to the credit of Senators ROTH and GLENN, it is being realized today.

Already, dozens of Federal agencies are changing the way they do business. They are functioning like cost-conscious private businesses, getting rid of old rules that, more often than not, led to "spending millions to save thousands and thousands to save hundreds."

In the Senate, our offices may not spend millions to save thousands, but I would bet that we often spend "hundreds to save tens" and "tens to save pennies." Take my office in Santa Fe, NM, for example. When my staff runs out of staples, how do they purchase refills? The logical, economical course of action would be to run over to Woolworths, only two blocks away. But under our interpretation of current Senate regulations, they cannot do

that. Senate rules prohibit it. Instead, my New Mexico staff must call my office here in Washington; a member of my staff here must make a purchase from the Senate; then he or she must ship the staples to Santa Fe. The cost of a \$1.50 box of staples just rose to at least \$10.

The same antiquated and expensive rules apply to purchases of paper, envelopes, pens, clocks, computers, and teleconferencing equipment—virtually everything a small office needs to function day-to-day. I believe it is time to put an end to this costly practice.

S. 2, which is before us today, provides the ideal opportunity. Today, while we are taking action to make other laws applicable to the legislative branch, we should do the responsible, economical thing and make the cost-saving goal of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act applicable to the U.S. Senate.

My amendment would help us accomplish this task in a short and straightforward manner. The amendment simply expresses the sense of the Senate that the Senate Rules Committee should review rules applicable to purchases by Senate offices to determine whether they are consistent with the acquisition simplification and streamlining laws enacted in the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994.

I believe this amendment will help bring simplified, cost-effective purchasing procedures to all Senate offices. In the end, everyone from Senate staff to America's working families will benefit from the cost-savings we can achieve. Again, I thank the distinguished managers of the bill, and the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Senate Rules Committee for their assistance with this amendment.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I compliment the Senator from New Mexico for his amendment. It is an amendment that is acceptable to us both from the standpoint of its substance and it will not jeopardize our bill as far as avoiding conference and all the other things we have been trying to do by not amending this bill with nongermane amendments.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from New Mexico. I know he has worked on the 800 panel as part of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the work we did on that procurement bill. It was about 3 years in the making. I think that should be applied here. I think the procurement bill was an excellent bill, and its provisions can well be applied here. I am glad to accept it on our side.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I, too, compliment the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his amendment. As ranking member of the Rules Com-

mittee, I pledge to him that we will move forward to try to give him the kind of answers I think he wants and I support. So I pledge to him we will attempt to get this out to the Senator in a reasonable length of time.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the Bingaman amendment.

So the amendment (No. 12) was agreed to.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on the Ford amendment.

## AMENDMENT NO. 13 TO AMENDMENT NO. 4

(Purpose: To apply to the legislative branch the requirements regarding use of frequent flier awards for official travel that are established in the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] proposes an amendment numbered 13 to FORD amendment No. 4.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the amendment add the following:

(d) **APPLICABILITY TO LEGISLATIVE BRANCH.—**

(1) The requirements of section 6008 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (5 U.S.C. 5702 note) shall apply to the Legislative branch, except that the responsibilities of the Administrator of General Services under such section shall be exercised as prescribed in paragraph (2).

(2) The responsibilities of the Administrator of General Services under section 6008(a) of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 shall be exercised, with respect to the Senate, by the Committee on Rules and Administration, with respect to the House of Representatives, by the Committee on House Oversight, and, with respect to each instrumentality of the Legislative branch other than the Senate and the House of Representatives, by the head of such instrumentality. The responsibilities of the Administrator of General Services under section 6008(c) of such Act shall be exercised, with respect to each instrumentality of the Legislative branch other than the Senate and the House of Representatives, by the head of such instrumentality.

(e) **EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.—**The provisions of this section that apply to the House of Representatives and the Senate are enacted—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be

considered as part of the rules of such House, respectively, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of each House.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, my amendment would apply to the legislative branch the same principles on frequent flier programs that Congress adopted last year in section 6008 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994.

That procurement act was worked on for about 3 years here, as I mentioned just a few moments ago in referring to Senator BINGAMAN from New Mexico. Part of that bill provided that frequent flier miles would not accrue to the benefit of the individual in the executive branch but would come back to the Government for the Government's use. In other words, you could not have taxpayer-supported travel and then have a rebate apply for that individual.

So the purpose of my amendment, like the purpose of the underlying Ford amendment, is to save taxpayer money.

Now, the use of frequent traveler programs is to reduce the cost of official travel, not to accrue to the personal benefit of somebody.

Last year's legislation on this subject contained three key provisions. First, guidelines must be issued to ensure that Federal agencies promote and facilitate the use of frequent traveler programs for the purpose of realizing cost savings for official travel.

Under my amendment, such guidelines would be issued for the Senate by the Senate Rules Committee, for the House of Representatives by the Committee on House Oversight, and for each congressional instrumentality by the head of the instrumentality.

Second, last year's law states that frequent traveler awards accrued through official travel shall be used only for official travel, not personal travel. My amendment would clarify that this principle applies not only to the executive branch but also to the legislative branch of Government.

Third, like last year's law, my amendment would require the head of each congressional instrumentality to report to Congress on efforts to promote the use of frequent traveler programs.

The bill before the Senate, Mr. President, S. 2 is called the Congressional Accountability Act. Nothing could be a more critical part of congressional accountability than this amendment. It would require us to abide by the same principles that we have enacted last year in the act to ensure that Members and staff will not convert our frequent flier awards to personal use and will instead use these awards to reduce the costs to the taxpayer.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to enter into the RECORD at the end of my statement the provision in the procurement act of last year which I send to the desk. Section 6008 of the procurement bill of last year, entitled "Cost Savings for Official Travel" is a short section. It describes exactly how the administration, the executive branch will "issue guidelines to ensure that agencies promote, encourage, and facilitate the use of frequent traveler practice programs offered by airlines, hotels, and car rental vendors by Federal employees who engage in official air travel, for the purpose of realizing to the maximum extent practicable cost savings for official travel."

It is difficult for me how to see anyone can oppose that, but opposition we have had all during the consideration here in the Chamber. I am sorry to see that because I think this is something that needs to be done to restore confidence, particularly in the House of Representatives where they do not follow the same rules that we do in the Senate. I send that to the desk and ask that it be printed at the end of my statement.

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

**SEC. 6008. COST SAVINGS FOR OFFICIAL TRAVEL.**

(a) GUIDELINES.—The Administrator of the General Services Administration shall issue guidelines to ensure that agencies promote, encourage, and facilitate the use of frequent traveler programs offered by airlines, hotels, and car rental vendors by Federal employees who engage in official air travel, for the purpose of realizing to the maximum extent practicable cost savings for official travel.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—Any awards granted under such a frequent traveler program accrued through official travel shall be used only for official travel.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall report to Congress on efforts to promote the use of frequent traveler programs by Federal employees.

**SEC. 6009. PROMPT RESOLUTION OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS.**

Federal agencies shall resolve or take corrective action on all Office of Inspector General audit report findings within a maximum of six months after their issuance, or, in the case of audits performed by non-Federal auditors, six months after receipt of the report by the Federal Government.

Mr. GLENN. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the first vote that we had today, and it was the first vote this afternoon, we voted 55 to 44 for the McConnell second-degree amendment to the Ford amendment.

I suppose there are several reasons we voted that way, but the argument that was used very successfully in debate yesterday by Senator MCCONNELL of Kentucky was comity between the House and Senate whereas through this legislation and this amendment we should not be as a body of the Senate making rules for the House of Representatives. They have the constitu-

tional right and power to adopt their own rules. They generally do not attempt to tell the Senate how we should fulfill our constitutional responsibility in setting up the rules of the Senate. I do not find any fault with the goal that either Senator FORD or Senator GLENN are trying to accomplish through their respective amendments. The McConnell amendment has modified the Ford amendment so it just applies to the Senate.

Even though there is a different approach by Senator GLENN, the end result is exactly the same; that if the Glenn amendment is adopted, even though it does not mention the House of Representatives, the practical impact is, for the Senate to tell the House of Representatives what they can do in their rulemaking on the subject of frequent flier miles.

As I indicated, as a body, we decided earlier this afternoon, 55 to 44, not to do that. I hope we will stand by the same decision we made earlier this afternoon and that we will defeat Senator Glenn's amendment. I think that for the benefit of the public the House of Representatives has made a determined effort to assure the public that they are going to make a decision on their frequent flier miles situation later on this year. We should defer to their judgment, as we would hope they would defer to our judgment and not tell us how to run the U.S. Senate.

So I hope that as people come to vote on this amendment in a short period of time, they realize that this is a rerun of the McConnell substitute to the Ford Amendment and, likewise, this substitute should be defeated.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I understand the reasoning—I do not accept it—for defeating this amendment. We are not talking about a House rule or a Senate rule. We are talking about law. We will have in the law a restriction of the Senate and no restriction of the House.

The Senate, some years ago, decided that when the taxpayers were paying your air fare and you were a frequent flier—and most of us are—and you accumulated those frequent flier miles, and that belonged to your office. As the rules say, it is Government money, but it applies to your office, so you could use those frequent flier miles to reduce the cost to your office and therefore reduce the cost to the taxpayer.

In the House, they have allowed the Congressmen to use the frequent flier mileage for personal use. So they were receiving a personal perk at the expense of the taxpayer dollar. All we are saying here is that we ought to be treated alike, and that the House should not, by rule, as my distinguished colleague from Iowa has said, change. But it is not a matter of law, unless they put it into a piece of legislation. It will be statutory. So if you make a rule, you change a rule.

So what I think we need to do is to listen to Senator GLENN. As he says, let us see if we cannot, by the very fact of reducing the cost of our tickets to our district or to our State, because we would not receive the so-called frequent flier mileage—and then our tickets would be reduced and it would be the same. He is not asking that we do it. As I understand it, he is asking that we have a study and make a recommendation, and then the Rules Committee will make the rule that will apply, which would be statutory.

And so, Mr. President, it is all right if you use the theory that the House does not tell us how to run our business and we should not tell them how to run theirs. But the House has told us how to run our business on more than one occasion. We are just coming out of the way we keep our books, because it was imposed upon us by the House. It was not done by the Senate, it was done by the House.

If we are going to let this one slide and all those on the other side are going to be opposed to restricting the use of taxpayer dollars for personal perks, then I think the more things change around here, the more they stay the same. If those new Senators that come into this body after they ran their campaign on trying to say we are going to straighten the place out and we are going to try to take the Congressmen and Senators' hands out of your pocket, regulations off your back, and our hands out of your pocket, here is one glowing way you can say, "I am keeping my campaign pledge" or, "No, I am not, I am going to let them go ahead and take this perk off the taxpayers."

So the streets of hell are paved with good intentions. What if they put it into a bill, a rules change, or make it statutory, and it is a bill that does not pass the Senate. They keep on building up these frequent flier miles and can use them personally. There are a lot of things.

As the majority leader said—and I take him at his word—if this bill passes the Senate as it is—and apparently all the amendments to it are going to be tabled or defeated—then the House will accept this legislation without a conference, pass it, and send it to the President for signature. So we have missed a grand and glorious chance of doing what is right.

If the House, as they say, is going to do it anyhow, why should they object? Why should they object to putting it in this bill that they are going to pass and send on to the President? I do not think it is very good cover saying that we want the House to make their own decision and the Senate to make their own, when over the years we have both made decisions that applied to each body. Some were far more significant than this, but has no more imagery, no more moral underpinning than this one amendment.

So we are going to apply it to the Senate statutorily, and the House

eventually will get around to a rules change, or maybe put it into a piece of legislation. So I have to say to you that my dad always told me, "Son, never underestimate the insignificant." Never underestimate the insignificant. This is an insignificant, little amendment. But it says a volume. It says a volume. Are we going to stop the use of taxpayer money for personal use? No. We will for ourselves, but no-body else. And so if the House is going to do it, why not do it here?

Mr. President, it is hard for me to understand. Just this week, or last week, we voted that we did not want to have lobbyist reform or gift ban proposals here. And those that were vehemently for lobbyist reform and gift bans came out and said, "We do not want Democrats setting the agenda for us. We want to put in our own bill." If that is cover not to vote for lobbyist reform or gift ban, that is still a weak reed. So that is No. 2 this week. That is No. 2 that we have had to vote on. You have looked back, and never underestimate the insignificant. Pretty soon, the insignificant is going to be three, and it is going to be four, and it is going to be five. And we have just started. We are not 10 days old and already that pledge out there and beating of the chest and coming back here and saying what you are going to do—working all night on the House side—is going to be for naught.

I am for this. I think it is the right thing to do. I was for it a long time ago. Unfunded mandates I offered to you 6 years ago at \$50 million, the same figures. Did I get any takers? No. Five years ago, did I get any takers? No. Now it is one of the big deals. Unfunded mandates. I have been a Governor, and I understand how this egg is never going to be put back together once we scramble it and give the States unfunded mandates. It goes on and on, and it is going to eat us all up, and we are going to be back here trying to reconsider that, because I have had to endure under what Congress does. We pass a bill here and the bureaucrats do not speak. They then legislate it.

We are going to have a balanced budget amendment. That is going to pass, but then we, after it passes, will pass legislation to implement it. What is going to be an emergency? I think we are moving too fast and there ought to be some thought given to the fabric that we are weaving here that is going to be a tremendous problem down the pike.

So we have had two votes, and there may be a third one before the day is over. There may be a fourth one. But let me remind my friends, never underestimate the insignificant. This is insignificant, and you are going to have to pay for it one of these days when you do not want to do what is right. I hope my colleagues will reconsider this. This is the right thing to do. It is not the wrong thing to do. The only excuse is that we want the House to set their own rules. And this is not a rule;

this is statutory. When you put it into the statutes, then you have to take it out. A rule is a lot easier to change.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to reconsider their position and look at what Senator GLENN offered here. It makes a great deal of sense.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I do not accept it that this is all just a House matter for this reason: I, as a U.S. Senator from Ohio, have to vote on appropriations for the House. Every Senator here has to do that. I vote those appropriations now, knowing full well that part of their cost of transportation back and forth comes back in the form of frequent flier miles, and that does not come back to the Government; it does not inure to the Government or accrue to the Government's benefit, as in the Senate and in the executive branch. It comes back to the individuals. So we appropriate more money here to let the House have their freebies to take families on vacations, fly wherever on their use of frequent flier miles, bought and paid for with taxpayer dollars.

I think we ought to remember around here, when all else fails, that a vote on just plain what is right or wrong is in order. The way they are doing it over there now is wrong. This is a smoke-screen that it does not make a difference to the Senate. It does, because we have to appropriate the dollars to help them have their freebies. If I rose here and said I am putting in an amendment here that says I want freebies for everybody, not just the House, let us expand it and put the Senate back on the freebies, and the executive branch, and run several million dollars of additional expense through appropriations to accommodate all this so we can take our families everywhere the House is able to take theirs. People would think I was nuts, and they would be right.

But yet we try to do the opposite and say we are trying to save taxpayers' money, and we get ridiculed and voted down repeatedly. So I do not mind bringing this up for another vote.

We see rebates not only on the airlines with frequent flier miles, we see these things once in a while that if you stay 5 days or 4 days in a certain hotel, I saw advertised in New York, you get a free weekend—Friday, Saturday—with you and your wife and family, whatever. So we have those rebates.

We have some of the rental car companies where, if you rent so many days in a row, you get a freebie or two. Why should that not come back in cash? If we are getting back frequent flier miles and using them ourselves, why should we not say if Hertz gives a Government discount, why do I not pay the full fare and we want a kickback in cash? That would be a kickback we would never condone, and we should not.

So I think, when it comes down to it, it is just a matter to me of what is right and what is wrong. And the way the House is doing their business on this right now is just flatout wrong.

Mr. President, I do not know whether anyone else wishes to speak, but I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, might I inquire of the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Ohio whether or not they intend to take a vote on this amendment right now. If not, I would like to go ahead with an amendment. I have been waiting on the floor for a number of hours. If so, I wonder if I could ask unanimous consent that after the vote, my amendment be then up on the floor.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I might respond to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota that I am ready to vote right now. I do not think anybody else is prepared to speak. I am prepared to vote right now.

Mr. BINGAMAN. May I just ask the Senator from Ohio a question when the Senator from Minnesota has completed his question?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, if it is OK with my colleagues—as the Senator from Iowa knows, I have been trying to move things along—I ask unanimous consent that, after the vote, I be able to then offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, if I may just ask the Senator from Ohio, as to this whole issue of frequent flier miles and all, I have difficulty understanding the disagreement that exists. As I understand it, you are talking about a public property here, which is these so-called frequent flier miles that have been accumulated with taxpayers' dollars being converted to personal use. I always thought that was against the law to take public property and convert it to personal use.

I do not understand why we are having to pass laws on this issue. I did not realize that it was just a question of which rule you wanted to adopt. I always thought it was against the law to take public property and convert it to private use.

Am I missing something?

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator is missing anything. We are trying to correct that loophole in the law with this amendment and with the underlying amendment by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD]. This would close that loophole so the House could not misuse what I view,

just as the Senator from New Mexico says, as public property.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] to table the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN]. The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll. Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 10 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Abraham	Gorton	McCain
Ashcroft	Gramm	McConnell
Bennett	Grams	Murkowski
Bond	Grassley	Nickles
Brown	Gregg	Packwood
Burns	Hatch	Pressler
Chafee	Hatfield	Roth
Coats	Helms	Santorum
Cochran	Hutchison	Shelby
Cohen	Inhofe	Simpson
Coverdell	Jeffords	Smith
Craig	Kassebaum	Snowe
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Specter
DeWine	Kyl	Stevens
Dole	Lieberman	Thomas
Domenici	Lott	Thompson
Faircloth	Lugar	Thurmond
Frist	Mack	Warner

NAYS—45

Akaka	Exon	Lautenberg
Baucus	Feingold	Leahy
Biden	Feinstein	Levin
Bingaman	Ford	Mikulski
Boxer	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bradley	Graham	Moynihhan
Breaux	Harkin	Murray
Bryan	Heflin	Nunn
Bumpers	Hollings	Pell
Byrd	Inouye	Pryor
Campbell	Johnston	Reid
Conrad	Kennedy	Robb
Daschle	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kerry	Simon
Dorgan	Kohl	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 13) was agreed to.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. FORD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I understand that the unanimous-consent agreement was given to the Senator from Minnesota and that his amend-

ment would be brought up right after this particular vote.

It is my understanding now it will not be necessary to have a recorded vote on my amendment. The Senator from Minnesota is willing to allow us to proceed, provided he will be the next one up. If that is agreeable to the leadership, we will proceed in that manner.

Mr. DOLE. If the Senator will yield. Mr. FORD. I will be glad to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I indicated to the Senator from Minnesota that we have no desire to quickly move to table the amendment. We would like to do the nomination of Robert Rubin, if we could, this evening.

We would like to accommodate both the Senator from Minnesota and the Secretary-to-be Rubin. So hopefully we can work it out and still be out of here by 7 o'clock.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of Senator WELLSTONE be set aside and that the Ford amendment be considered by a voice vote or by unanimous consent, and at the end of that then we go back and recognize the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4, the Ford amendment, as amended.

The amendment (No. 4), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order of the Senate, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will be pleased to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, just to clarify and help people in scheduling, I believe there are two amendments left that might require votes—those of Senator WELLSTONE and Senator LAUTENBERG. I do not know how long it will take. Those are the only amendments left, just for the guidance of Members.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, before I offer the amendment, could I ask for order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please come to order. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, first of all, let me thank the majority leader for his willingness to work closely with us on the floor. I say to the majority leader that there are some other Senators who would like to speak that are with me, and I would like to get to those Senators right

away. We will try to not take up many hours, but we consider this to be an important amendment, and we will try to do it within whatever timeframe the majority leader talked about.

Mr. President, let me for my colleagues just briefly describe this amendment. Then there are several Senators that are with me, certainly the Senator from Connecticut, Senator DODD, who is going to have to leave, and I would like him to open up with some of our remarks.

This amendment is twofold. First of all, it reads:

It is the sense of Congress that Congress should not enact or adopt any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless.

I would like to repeat that, if I may, for the Chair and for my colleagues. The amendment reads as follows:

It is the sense of Congress that Congress should not enact or adopt any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless.

Mr. President, the second part of this amendment has to do with the duties of congressional committees. What this amendment says is that each committee, as it considers any bill that affects children, will have an accompanying report which will deal with the impact of that legislation on children.

This is very consistent with some of the direction in which we are going in the U.S. Senate. If we are going to talk about the impact that legislation has on State governments or on county governments or on corporations or businesses, then surely, Mr. President, we can also talk about the impact that this legislation has on children within our country.

I want to just give a few examples. Today, in Minnesota, there were about 150 people, many of them children, many of them Head Start mothers, I say to the Senator from Connecticut, a number of different organizations, and the Children's Defense Fund, looking to the year 2002 and understanding what might very well happen in this country—that is to say, that the cuts we make go the path of least resistance—which spelled out what they are worried about.

As they looked at some of the projected cuts, they talked about Minnesota 2002: 29,150 babies, preschoolers, and pregnant women would lose infant formula and other WIC nutrition supplements; 31,350 children would lose food stamps; 154,600 children would lose free or subsidized school lunch programs; 93,000 children would lose Medicaid coverage.

Mr. President, I can go on, but the point I simply want to make before yielding the floor to Senator DODD is I come from a State that has had a number of great Senators. I hope that if I work hard, I can maybe just be a little bit as good as Hubert Humphrey. Seventeen years ago, Hubert Humphrey said the test of a Government and the test of a society is the way we treat people in the dawn of life—children—

the way we treat people in the twilight of their life—the elderly—and the way we treat people in the shadow of their lives—those that are struggling with an illness, those that are struggling with a disability, and those that are poor or those that are needy.

I believe that this Contract With America takes us precisely in the opposite direction. Surely there is a way that we can continue with deficit reduction and not ride roughshod over children. Surely, we can go on record in the U.S. Senate today, making it clear that it is the sense of the Congress that we will not enact any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless. And surely today in this amendment, we can make it clear that we will do child impact of our legislation to make sure that whatever we do does not make more children homeless, does not make more children hungry; that whatever we do supports our future, which is to support children in this country.

I have much more to say about this amendment. I hope that the U.S. Senate will go on record and support this amendment. But I would like to yield the floor to Senator DODD from Connecticut, who has been such a leader in the U.S. Senate on children's issues.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, first let me commend our colleague from Minnesota, with whom I have the pleasure and honor of serving with on the Labor and Human Resources Committee, and who has been a tireless advocate on behalf of children as a member of that committee. Let me again point out and restate what the Senator from Minnesota is attempting to do here.

This is an amendment that merely says that for those who are arguably the most vulnerable in our society, those on whom we depend for the success and future of this Nation, that as we consider all of the financial implications of budgets and tax proposals, that we be ever so mindful of these children. They have no other choices and no other alternatives for their own success and survival than our willingness to appreciate how vulnerable they are and our willingness to be supportive of them.

There are a staggering number of statistics that indicate the problems that younger Americans face in our society today. The child poverty rate fell throughout the 1960's, falling from approximately 26 percent in 1960 to 13.8 percent in 1969. It is worthy to note that the rate began rising again, to more than 20 percent, where it is today. The trend lines are pointing in all the wrong directions. We are told that if the current trends continue, almost 28 percent of children in the United States will be living in poverty by the year 2010.

Now, you do not need to be a Ph.D. in sociology to appreciate what the impli-

cations of that are for the generation coming along that have to be the best-educated, best-prepared generation this Nation has ever produced. We are going to be living in the most competitive global environment that the world has ever seen, and we need to do everything we possibly can to see to it that those younger Americans at least have the opportunity to be well prepared.

Anyone will tell you as they look at these issues that a child who lacks the proper nutrition in the earliest years of their development, that is not getting the kind of care and start they need as they begin those lives, then the likelihood they are going to be productive citizens, good parents, independent people capable of taking care of themselves and contributing to our society diminishes dramatically.

This amendment is not a Draconian amendment. It says that we should at least consider these matters. I am tremendously sympathetic and a supporter, I might add, of the unfunded mandate proposal. I think there is a lot of value in that, looking at the implications in our communities and in our States of the decisions we make.

In fact, in this very Chamber a year ago I offered an amendment which required that we meet at least 30 percent of the obligation we promised 20 years ago for special education needs in this country. We only do it to the tune of 7 percent today. And yet we made the commitment back in the 1970's we meet at least 40 percent of that obligation. It is a tremendous burden for our communities.

That amendment failed. Well, there is some hope with the unfunded mandate approach, if we handle it properly, that we will be able to step in and make a contribution to lessen the burden at the local and State level. Can we not also say, at least for this one constituency, for the children of our country, that we are going to examine the implications of our decisions when it comes to basic things like education, like nutrition, like child support?

It seems to me that is not a great deal to ask. If we are going to examine the implications on a business from a regulatory scheme that we adopt here, I think that is an appropriate and proper question to ask. It should not take a great deal to at least come up with some rough determination of what the implications are in a business. Is it too much to ask, with the children of this country, the children of this society, that we are going to consider as well what the implications are for you?

I realize there is a wave afoot here and that we are all sort of in lockstep in terms of how people are approaching amendments. This does not mandate in a draconian or violent way at all. It just says that Republicans and Democrats in this Chamber as we begin this new Congress regardless of our ideology, regardless of our political persuasion, understand the price we will pay as a Nation in this society if we do not take into account what happens to the most vulnerable in our society.

So, Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Minnesota for proposing this idea. I hope that people at least look at it and consider it. I think it shows balance here, as we look at all these other issues, to certainly take into consideration what happens to America's children. Someday we are going to be held accountable as a generation as to what we did, not in the face of ignorance but in the face of awareness and knowledge of what was happening to a staggering number of our young people.

The issue will be raised and the question asked: Well, you knew that. What did you do? Did you at least try to take into account their needs on the basic issues, on the basic issues of food and education, decent housing, decent support for these young families and these young children?

I hope, with the adoption of this kind of an amendment we can say at least we tried to take that into account. There is no guarantee you are going to do it. It does not say you have to. It just says that you are going to be aware of it and you are going to listen to what the implications are for these younger people.

So, Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the Wellstone amendment. I think it would speak well for this body in the opening days of January that for these children, particularly the children of these working families out there that are struggling every day to make ends meet, we are going to take into account their needs as well as in looking at the implications on governmental bodies and on businesses, children also, particularly the most vulnerable, will be considered as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I wish to yield the floor in a moment to the Senator from Arkansas.

First of all, let me thank the Senator from Connecticut.

As we speak about this amendment, I wish to try to talk some about the state of children within our country because I think that is part of the context of this amendment. Later on, I also want to talk about this budget debate and what has been taken off the table and why it is that so many people around the country are so frightened that in fact what we are about to do is really cut children, the most vulnerable citizens.

But please understand, I say to my colleagues, that every 5 seconds in the United States of America a child drops out of school; every 30 seconds a child is born into poverty; every 2 minutes a child is born to a woman who had no prenatal care; every 2 minutes a child is born severely underweight; every 4 minutes a child is arrested in an alcohol-related arrest; I think every 6 minutes a child is arrested in a drug-related arrest; every 2 hours a child is

murdered in our country, and every 4 hours—this is devastating to me as a grandfather and father—a child takes his or her life.

Mr. President, we cannot abandon children, and as a matter of fact I think the ultimate indictment is when we do so. Either we invest in children when they are young or we pay the price later.

I will have some very specific figures on hunger of children in the United States of America a little later on as we go forward with this debate, and I will also have some statistics on the fastest growing homeless population, which are children. But I say to my colleagues the arithmetic of what we could very well be doing with this contract on America is very harsh; it is very mean spirited. We know what has been taken off the table. Military contractors are not asked to make cuts. Oil companies are not asked to make cuts. Coal companies are not asked to make cuts. A whole lot of other corporations are not asked to sacrifice at all. But we are going to cut nutrition programs for children. We are going to cut programs that provide children with some assistance so that they can have an opportunity.

Now, some of my colleagues say, no, we are not going to do that. This is just simply trying to get people to panic. Senator WELLSTONE or Senator BUMPERS or Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN or Senator DODD are just exaggerating.

Mr. President, we can put all of that concern to rest, and we can go on record tonight in the Senate that it is the sense of the Congress we should not enact or adopt any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless. We should be able to vote "yes" for that.

Mr. President, we can also adopt an amendment that says if we are going to call for impact statements on legislation that affects corporations and State governments and county governments, surely as we move forward we can call for company reports that issue impact statements as to how this affects children.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I see the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, first of all, I commend the author of this amendment, my good friend, Senator WELLSTONE, for the thoughtfulness of his amendment. It may not be perfectly worded. Oftentimes, we understand the thrust of amendments that come up in the Chamber at times like this, even though they are not worded quite precisely. What we ought to do now is to vote for this amendment because we know what the intention is and what the thrust is. We can worry about the precise language in conference.

Mr. President, shortly we are going to be taking up the unfunded mandates bill. I have very serious reservations

about that bill. I do not want to debate it. I think the thrust of that bill is probably good. But I think it needs a lot of work.

We have been voting today largely along party lines. Virtually every vote has been a motion to table voted for by the Republicans and, for the most part, voted against by Democrats. That is understandable. But if there is one amendment on this bill that Republicans and Democrats ought to join hands on it is this one.

The Senator from Minnesota proposes that if we are going to pay the cities and the counties and the States for any obligation we put on them, surely we must also agree not to enact legislation, the effect of which is going to increase the number of homeless and poor children in this country. Surely, we can all agree nobody in this body wants that.

Mr. President, everybody in this Chamber has his own view as to what happened on November 8—not a happy day for the people on this side of the aisle. Not to offend my colleagues on the other side, I could give a half dozen reasons that I think are very legitimate on why people voted against Democrats, not for Republicans.

I do not believe there is a person in America who believes Government is too big, too unwieldy, and too expensive, due to food stamps for hungry people. I take the position that food stamps, aid for dependent children, maternal and child health, Medicaid, medical leave are valuable programs. Some people would have you believe that these programs were enacted by the Congress willy-nilly. They were not. They were debated. Committees considered those proposals thoughtfully.

The Chamber of Commerce and Rotary Club back home did not want me to vote for a medical leave bill. But I happen to have spent 6 weeks with my daughter in Boston Children's Hospital, 2,000 miles from my home. Betty and I talk about it a lot. We were not wealthy, but what if we had been poor? We would not have been in Boston. I do not know. I might have robbed a bank to get my daughter there. We were so fortunate because all I had to do was go back home and open my law office, a one-man, solo practice in a town of 1,500 people and start practicing law again. If I had been out on the assembly line, I would not have had a job to go home to. I daresay that while an awful lot of people in this country took strong exception to the family and medical leave bill, there are not 10 people in this Chamber who would undo this law right now.

This country decided years ago we did not want a single one of our children to go hungry, and that is the reason we have food stamps. We decided we did not want a poor child to suffer for lack of medical attention. That is why we have Medicaid. We decided we did not want poor women having premature or disabled babies who require costly treatment and frequently do not

survive. That is why we provide prenatal care. And we provide school lunches for children from poor families. Who here would undo that?

I was president of the school board in my city for 12 years. That was the only thing I was ever elected to before I was elected Governor of my State. I must say, I ran for Governor to get off the school board. That is the worst job I ever had. I know how important school lunches are. The school board struggled with that and tried to raise a little money to improve the nutritional quality of those lunches.

The American people have every right to be mad, upset, disenchanted, and to distrust Congress. It is trendy to do so. But I am telling you that the people of this country do not want us to undo the programs I've described. They do not want us giving the States block grants if the effect is to increase hunger among our children.

In 1950, 27 percent of the people of this Nation over 65 years of age lived below the poverty line. Since then we have reduced the poverty rate among senior citizens to below 12 percent. We can pat ourselves on the back and say Social Security and Medicare did it. Today, you talk about Social Security and you talk about the third rail of politics. Nobody would dare suggest cutting Social Security and Medicare. Why? Because there are 40 million votes out there. You do not have to be a rocket scientist to figure that one out either.

So how about our children? In 1950, the poverty rate among children was 14 percent. At the same time we were reducing poverty among our older citizens, the rate for children was growing dramatically to its current level of 23 percent. Senator DODD says it will be 28 percent by the year 2010. Are we going to stand idly by and allow that figure to come true? If we do not adopt an amendment like this, we could very well see it. Everybody favors welfare reform. But when you get down to the specifics of it, it gets very tenuous indeed.

Mr. President, I do not believe people want welfare reform in order to make cuts that would devastate the most vulnerable among us, namely our children. Here is a good opportunity for Republicans and Democrats to show the American people that when it gets to some basic values, we can indeed join hands and agree on something.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. I never yielded the floor. Do I retain the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). The Senator cannot hold the floor after having yielded to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair. I wonder whether the Senator will grant me a moment to thank the Senator from Arkansas. I just say to my colleague from Arkansas that I deeply appreciate his remarks, and I think, one more time, that this amendment is

really an amendment that will attract and should attract bipartisan support. This is an extremely important message that we can convey today on the floor of the Senate. I thank the Chair.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I want to begin by congratulating and commending the Senator from Minnesota for this initiative. I think that it is a classical initiative, one that is certainly in keeping with the tradition of this body because really, stripped to its essentials, this sense-of-the-Senate amendment simply says that we in the Senate will do no harm. That is really, I think, our fundamental mandate and fundamental charge as Members of this great body.

As we discuss the change—the revolution, some have called it—the reform that has come to the hill, I think we have to also be mindful, as we speculate about the political ramifications, of why it happened and what all is going on and what all this means. I think we have to be mindful of the realities. We must never lose sight of the realities—what is going on, putting aside the slogans and the politicization of these issues, the reality. The fact is, as the Senator from Minnesota pointed out, the most vulnerable Americans are really at this point the most frightened, because the rhetoric seems to suggest that their realities will be ignored in this debate, and that they will not be factored in the decisionmaking as we rush headlong to begin to get some fiscal discipline to balance the budget and as we address issues having to do with the unfunded mandates, and the like.

The statistics cited by the Senator from Minnesota paint a grim, but a very viable reality, and one that I think we must not lose sight of, and one certainly that underscores the need for his sense-of-the-Senate resolution. His back stop, the back stop this resolution suggests is that we will do no harm to children, the most vulnerable people in our society.

Mr. President, I am a supporter of the balanced budget amendment. In fact, my senior Senator from Illinois, Senator SIMON proposed a balanced budget amendment—and I add parenthetically, since we have talked about politics, that a Democrat suggested the balanced budget amendment. When I campaigned for this office, I supported the balanced budget amendment. I am also a supporter, with Senators GLENN and KEMPTHORNE, of the initiative having to do with unfunded mandates, coming out of State and local government. I, frankly, resist the notion that fiscal responsibility and responsibility in these areas is mean spirited or has to be mean spirited, or that it will put at risk the neediest people in our society and especially our children. I think we can have

fiscal responsibility, and I think we can and must achieve a balanced budget. We must begin to address the whole issue of unfunded mandates and the burden that puts on State and local governments, but that we can do that in a way that elevates and does not diminish the status of children in our society. That is the bottom line of the resolution of the Senator from Minnesota.

So I support fiscal responsibility, and I suppose these initiatives for the balanced budget and for the unfunded mandates proposition. I also am a strong supporter of this amendment. I believe they are logically consistent and that they are mutually compatible. I believe we can do both.

I want to share with you for a moment—and I will not be much longer, Senator SIMON. I kind of jotted down a few notes I wanted to share with my colleagues. I first ran for the Senate—and my colleagues on the entitlement commission have heard this story, but it is significant to me and to this debate. My decision to run for this office came in large part based on a conversation I had with my son who was then 15 years old. Matthew, after we discussed the great issues of our time, said to me, “You know, Mom, your generation has left this world and country worse off than you found it.” Well, that was like a dagger to the heart, the notion that my generation had not kept faith and done what we were supposed to do in our stewardship of the affairs of this country. So it was for that reason that I have supported efforts to get on an even keel, to put our fiscal House in order, to be responsible in terms of the allocation of responsibilities between State and local government.

I believe that this issue is so important, and so important a statement for us to make who are supportive of fiscal responsibility, precisely because we are talking about what really comes down, and if you look at the numbers and the realities again as opposed to the emotional hot button, they tell us that we are talking about less than 1 percent of our budget.

We really are not talking about an awful lot of money, if you will, in the grand scheme of things. If we are talking about entitlement spending, discretionary spending, really, over all, the amount that is allocated and devoted to children and children's needs is not all that great.

And so the question comes: Why can we not make a strong statement that we believe we are going to not only protect our children's future, but we are also going to protect our children's present; that the children now will not have to worry about what is going to happen as a result of our move to make all of these changes, all of these reforms, and all of the different initiatives that are pending before this new Congress.

Mr. President, I want to close by saying that it is my concern for children that actually got me to stand up here

and make a speech without notes and on behalf of the initiative of the Senator from Minnesota, because I believe it is absolutely imperative that we underscore our efforts for fiscal responsibility, underscore our efforts with regard to the pending legislation with the statement that we will do no harm to the neediest in our community, we will do no harm to our children, and that we are concerned about the realities that all the children of this great country face, and that we have the capacity and the ability and the foresight to state at this point that we will be mindful of their needs as we go forward with these different legislative initiatives.

So I want to thank and commend the Senator from Minnesota for taking this initiative, for taking this step. I congratulate him for it. I certainly rise in strong support of his sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will take 30 seconds, because I know my colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois, is anxious to speak.

I wish to thank the Senator from Illinois, Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN, for her remarks. I do not think she really needed to go with prepared remarks, because I think the Senator knows the issues so well and has such a commitment to them. I wanted to just simply thank the Senator for being here out on the floor.

I wanted to emphasize one point, which is that we might want to call this amendment, if we had to title it, the "Children's Right to Have Their Congress Know," because part of this amendment, again, says it is the sense of the Congress that Congress should not enact or adopt any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless. Surely, we can go on record on that.

But the other part, I say to the Senator from Illinois, really is an important impact that we require, which we really should do in this rush to pass this agenda—and I want to talk more about the economics of this a little later on. We owe it to the children of this country—do we not always want to have photo opportunities next to children?—we owe it to the children of this country that we do an analysis of the impact of the legislation that we pass out of committee. We should do that. That is the right thing to do. It is the policy thing to do, it is the justice thing to do, and it is certainly the right thing to do for the children in this country.

So this is an amendment that is meant to be part of the law of the Nation. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

I thank the senior Senator for his patience.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Illinois also for her

comments. And since she mentioned her son Matthew, let me just add, he is a young man who is going to serve his community and country well in the future and CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN ought to be a very proud mother of that son.

I think what Senator WELLSTONE has proposed here is important. Let me just give you one simple fact. Twenty-three percent of the children of this Nation live in poverty. No other industrial nation has anything like that figure; no 23 percent in Great Britain or Canada or France or Germany or Italy or Japan or Norway or Denmark or Sweden or the other countries you could mention. Why, why do 23 percent of the children in this country live in poverty?

This is not an act of God. There is no divine intervention that says the children in Iowa and the children in Missouri and the children in Illinois ought to be living in poverty more than children in other countries. It is not the result of a divine intervention; it is not an act of God. It is a result of flawed policies.

It starts in this room, my friends, in this Hall where we meet.

Will the Wellstone amendment, if it is passed, result in changed policy? No one can know for sure. Even the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, for whom I have such a high regard, cannot know for sure whether this will have any significant result in moving us in the right direction. But it might.

At least when we are talking about welfare reform, we are going to be looking at things. And I hear everybody wants welfare reform, including the people on welfare. But I think there are a lot of people who think we can do welfare reform on the cheap. There can be no real welfare reform without a jobs program. And you are going to hear me saying this over and over again.

And I am pleased my colleague from Illinois mentioned the balanced budget amendment. It is very interesting. This year, we will now spend 10 times as much on interest as we will on education. We will spend almost twice as much on interest as all the poverty programs put together.

I ask the Presiding Officer, who is a distinguished former governor of Missouri, if the people of Missouri had a choice of spending less money on interest and more to help poor people, which would they prefer? You know the answer and I know the answer.

But we have just kind of backed into this without thinking. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota says: Let us think about it. Let us pay attention. Let us at least look at what we are doing to our children.

Again, I simply ask you: Why is the United States alone among the Western industrial nations in having 23 percent of its children in poverty? It grows out of this room, and in this room we can change that policy and give a brighter future to our children.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I was not on the floor for most of the comments by the Senator from Minnesota regarding his proposed amendment. I have just read it. It would provide that it is the sense of the Congress that we should not enact legislation to increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless. And then, if I might direct a question to the Senator from Minnesota, the amendment also states that any bill or joint resolution coming before the Senate or the House should contain an analysis of the probable impact of the bill or resolution on children, including the impact on the number of children who are hungry or homeless.

Let me just be sure I understand this amendment. What the Senator is saying in his amendment is, prior to any bill coming here, that there ought to be a report filed with it detailing, or outlining, I should say, its probable impact regarding whether it would increase the number of children who are either hungry or homeless or both.

Mr. WELLSTONE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. You know, a lot of times, we mandate reports concerning bills here as to their impact on the budget. We have that requirement.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. The accompanying report that would come out of committee would actually deal with the impact on children, not just on hunger or just on homelessness, but its impact on children, more broadly defined.

Mr. HARKIN. In other words, if the bill enhanced the well-being of children, that report would point that out, too?

Mr. WELLSTONE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. So it is not just an amendment dealing with measures that could be detrimental to children. It is also saying, how might a bill help them? So if a bill came up, and the question arose: How can we help children, make sure they have an adequate breakfast or a school lunch? That report could also detail that, too.

I just wanted to make sure that was the case.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for making, I think, an important point, which is actually that this accompanying report is a valuable tool for us as we try to make the best possible policy, for two reasons. In the negative, if you will, it tells us if we are about to pass a piece of legislation that will in fact be harmful to children in America. But it also tells us in the positive, when we pass legislation, this is in fact the contribution of this legislation to the lives of children in America. That is the purpose.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, if I may reclaim my time on the floor, I thank the Senator and I compliment him for this amendment. I think it is appropriate that we have this amendment at the beginning of the year; that before we rush to judgment on a lot of bills and measures that will be coming before us that may sound nice, we ought to stop and think about what their impact will be on children in this country.

Mr. President, I have here a study that was done by the Food Research and Action Center, [FRAC]. They talked about the Personal Responsibility Act, which is the legislation developed to implement the House Republican Contract With America. The report goes on to show this act contains a proposal to block grant current Federal nutrition programs, to remove their entitlement status and reduce their funding levels.

FRAC's analysis shows that the Personal Responsibility Act's nutrition block grant program would result in a reduction of funding for food assistance of over \$30 billion, about 14 percent, by fiscal year 2000, with a funding loss of \$5 billion, 12.7 percent, in fiscal year 1996 alone. Further, under the Personal Responsibility Act's nutrition block grant, all but nine States would experience reductions in funding for food assistance in fiscal year 1996. Fifteen States, including Texas, Ohio, Georgia, Kentucky, and Michigan, would lose 20 percent or more of their funding in fiscal year 1996. Five States—Texas, Louisiana, Washington, Delaware, and Maryland—and the District of Columbia would lose 30 percent or more of their food assistance funding in fiscal year 1996 if the so-called Personal Responsibility Act is passed. The FRAC analysis finds that if the so-called Personal Responsibility Act is passed, the nutrition block grants will have a devastating impact on individual programs such as the Food Stamp Program. In order to achieve savings in this program, States will have to reduce the number of participants by more than 6 million people, or cut benefits by 14 percent in the first year alone. Estimates indicate that if States choose to cut participation levels, over half of all States would have to cut their caseloads by 20 percent or more to meet the lower funding levels. Further, over a quarter of the States would have to reduce case loads by 30 percent or more, and 10 States would have to reduce food stamp case loads by more than 40 percent just to meet the cuts made in the block grant program.

So, Mr. President, this is a pretty drastic approach. For those of us who make a decent income and eat in the Senate dining room every day, or have lobbyists take us to one of these really nice restaurants around the Hill for lunch, it may come as a surprise to know that there are hungry kids in America. There are a lot of children out there who do not get a good break-

fast. They may get a good lunch, and it may be their only good meal of the day, because of the free and reduced price lunch program. And they go home and have an inadequate dinner that evening.

There have been a number of studies that have shown in the recent past that we have a lot of hungry kids in America. Take the school breakfast program, one that I have been a strong proponent and advocate of for many years now.

At the outset, let me just say to my friend from Minnesota that he comes from a strong heritage of advocates of a strong and sound nutrition program for our kids in America. I refer to his predecessor, Senator Hubert Humphrey. Also to former Senator Mondale, who fought long and hard for these nutrition programs, and was successful in getting them implemented.

The School Lunch Program was enacted in 1946. It has probably done more to increase the productivity of America than any other single program we have adopted except perhaps the GI bill of rights. We sent our GI's to college. The school lunch program provided for millions of American kids then, as it does today, the only nutritionally sound and adequate meal that they have during the day.

But then studies began to show that kids come to school in the morning and they have not had a breakfast, and they become disruptive and unruly. They cannot study, they cannot focus. So we started the School Breakfast Program. The school breakfast program right now is only available, I think, in fewer than half the Nation's schools that offer the lunch program. So it is not accessible to many children who need it. Many of the schools do not offer it.

Studies have shown that children who participated in the school breakfast program were found to have significantly higher standardized achievement test scores than eligible non-participants. Children getting school breakfast also had significantly reduced absence and tardiness rates.

Now, we know that from a number of studies. We also know from a number of studies that children who have adequate nutrition, who have a breakfast and a lunch program, who have the benefit of prenatal and early childhood nutrition, have higher IQ levels. Now, we have seen recent arguments that perhaps IQ levels are linked to ethnic background, or racial background, and all those kind of claims. That is being argued. But there is one thing that is clear.

Mr. DOLE. Will the Senator yield for a procedural question? I do not want to interrupt the Senator's train of thought.

We would like to see if we could set a time for a vote on a motion to table. I understand the Senator from Minnesota needs about 20 minutes. I do not know how much time the Senator from Iowa needs.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, 10 minutes. I am on a roll. I just want to go through a couple of items here.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask that I might have at least 2 or 3 minutes before I move to table because it is something I am very interested in.

I have been on the nutrition committees. I have gotten awards from FRAC, and I do not think this amendment belongs here. I want to make a brief record.

So, maybe we could agree to vote at 6:10. That gives the Senator from Minnesota 20 minutes and the Senator from Iowa 10 minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. I just have a few more points.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, we can vote at 6:10.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Knowing the Senator from Iowa well, I wonder if we could plan on 6:15.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at 6:15 we vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOLE. I would just like to have 2 or 3 minutes.

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

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader. The Senator has been a strong supporter of nutrition programs, and I can attest to that personally. I wish he would support this amendment. I am sure he will have something to say about that.

Mr. President, as I was saying, one thing that is unassailable and incontrovertible is that kids who do not have an adequate diet do suffer lower IQ. A study reported in the Washington Post found that children suffering persistent poverty in their first 5 years of life have IQs 9 points lower at age 5 than children who did not experience poverty. And we all know that poverty is closely tied to inadequate diet, and inadequate food for kids in their early years.

We know, for example, from a study done by GAO, the cost effectiveness of our WIC programs. Every dollar invested in WIC prenatal assistance saves anywhere from \$1.92 to \$4.21 in Medicaid costs. These are studies that have been done, and which document the value of sound nutrition for children.

In another study, GAO estimated the initial investment of \$296 million in WIC prenatal assistance in 1990 would save over \$1 billion in health and education expenditures over 18 years compared to the costs for children who did not get this assistance. So we know children in poverty, children who do not get an adequate diet, who do not get the school breakfast program, they have lower IQ's, they have lower attendance records at school, they are more disruptive, and they do not learn properly.

We are going in the opposite direction with this so-called Personal Responsibility Act in terms of putting the nutrition programs into a block grant

and then cutting it. If 5 States, Texas, Louisiana, Washington, Delaware, and Maryland, plus the District of Columbia, lose 30 percent of their food assistance next year, how will they make it up? Who will they cut? Well, they will cut the school breakfast program and other basic nutrition programs for children. We are already hearing about cutting the school lunch program and making kids pay more and that kind of thing. I will have more to say about that as the year progresses. Talk about a noncost-effective approach. I say this is a so-called Personal Responsibility Act because it is our responsibility here in Congress to make sure that kids are not denied adequate nutrition in our country. It has been a responsibility of the Federal Government since 1946 when we enacted the school lunch program and subsequently enacted school breakfast programs, WIC programs, and other nutrition programs, because we recognize a child who is poor and malnourished in Tennessee is not just a responsibility of that State. That child who grows up ill-educated with a lower IQ will not just be a burden on Tennessee but that child could move to Iowa or Illinois, Minnesota or California. And in any event, the loss of that child's potential is a loss for our entire Nation. So the nutrition of our children is really a problem for all of us as a Nation. We have looked upon it that way since the school lunch program was enacted in 1946.

Personal responsibility? Yes, we have a responsibility in this Congress to make sure that all children have a good start in life. That means a good, solid WIC Program, prenatal programs, that we have a good breakfast program for our kids in school, and a school lunch program, and a food stamp program—which is in fact a major child nutrition program.

Now, are there ways of streamlining and of cutting out waste, fraud and abuse? Sure there are. I think it has been about 17 years ago, as a Member of the other body, that this Senator advocated that we issue food stamp recipients an ID card along with food stamps so that they could not just go out and barter and sell food stamps on the streets for drugs or whatever else. I advocated that in 1977. I was told there was a problem with that idea and we could not do it then. We can do it today. If there are ways of streamlining the program, making people more accountable, making the programs more cost-effective, that is fine.

Just to say that we will lump it all in a block grant, send it to the States and then cut it, I think is the height of foolishness. I think that would be more properly called the Personal Irresponsibility Act, if that is what we are about.

So I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota. He is right on target.

As I said, I know the majority leader has been a strong supporter of nutrition programs in the past. I would hope that he would not move to table this

amendment. I wish we had accepted it in the spirit it was offered, that is to make sure that we do no harm to these children who need this kind of help and assistance.

Really, it is not just the children we are talking about. I think it is in our own best interest to ensure that our children have adequate nutrition. We can look at it selfishly. We want a more productive America. We want to be able to compete in the world markets. We want to have a better-educated populace. Then we certainly want to make sure our kids have an adequate diet early on in life.

I believe that is what the Senator from Minnesota is saying in his amendment. Let us take care in the legislation that comes before us that it does not impact adversely upon these kids. If we take away these feeding programs for our poor kids in America today, it is like eating our seed corn.

I cannot think of a better analogy than that. These kids are our future, and we better have the personal responsibility to understand that the Federal Government has a role to play here and not abdicate that responsibility.

So, again, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his amendment. I support it, and I certainly hope it will be adopted because I think it is in the best interest of this country.

I thank the Senator. I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

AMENDMENT NO. 14

(Purpose: To improve legislative accountability for the impact of legislation on children)

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, let me thank the Senator from Iowa. There is no Senator who knows these issues better. There is no Senator who is a stronger advocate for children. It is my honor to have him out on the floor speaking in behalf of this amendment.

Mr. President, first of all, let me now send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] proposes an amendment numbered 14.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following new title:

TITLE —IMPACT OF LEGISLATION ON CHILDREN

SEC. 1. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress should not enact or adopt any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless.

SEC. 2. LEGISLATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPACT ON CHILDREN.

(a) DUTIES OF CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The report accompanying each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by any committee of the Senate or of the House of Representatives shall contain a detailed analysis of the probable impact of the bill or resolution on children, including the impact on the number of children who are hungry or homeless.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) SENATE.—It shall not be in order for the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution described in subsection (a) that is reported by any committee of the Senate if the report of the committee on the bill or resolution does not comply with the provisions of subsection (a) on the objection of any Senator.

(2) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—It shall not be in order for the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of subsection (a) to a bill or joint resolution described in subsection (a) that is reported by any committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator just yield for about 2 minutes without losing his right to the floor?

I want to make one other point. There is so often the assertion some of these programs designed to attack poverty and hunger actually make the problems worse. For the record, I am looking here at figures showing that in 1960, the percent of American children below the age of 18 living in poverty was 26.9 percent. By 1969, after the enactment of a number of the programs addressing child poverty, that percentage went down to 14 percent. It stayed down in the teens until 1983 when it went back up to 22.3 percent. The percentage stayed in the twenties and, at least as of the last year cited in this report, 1991, it was still at 21.8 percent. These figures are all contained in a report titled *Two Americas: Alternative Futures for Child Poverty in the United States*, published by the Center on Hunger, Poverty, and Nutrition Policy at Tufts University, and I ask unanimous consent that appendix 1 of that report be printed in the RECORD.

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

APPENDIX 1.—NUMBER AND PERCENT OF AMERICAN CHILDREN IN POVERTY ALL CHILDREN BELOW AGE 18: 1960–1991

Year	(1000's)	Percent
1960	17,634	26.9
1961	16,909	25.6
1962	16,963	25.0
1963	16,003	23.1
1964	16,051	23.0
1965	14,676	21.0
1966	12,389	17.6
1967	11,656	16.6
1968	10,954	15.6
1969	9,691	14.0
1970	10,440	15.1
1971	10,551	15.3
1972	10,284	15.1
1973	9,642	14.4
1974	10,156	15.4
1975	11,104	17.1
1976	10,273	16.0
1977	10,288	16.3
1978	9,931	15.9
1979	10,377	16.4
1980	11,543	18.3
1981	12,505	20.0
1982	13,647	21.9
1983	13,911	22.3
1984	13,420	21.5

APPENDIX 1.—NUMBER AND PERCENT OF AMERICAN CHILDREN IN POVERTY ALL CHILDREN BELOW AGE 18: 1960-1991—Continued

Year	(1000's)	Percent
1985 .....	13,010	20.7
1986 .....	12,876	20.5
1987 .....	12,843	20.3
1988 .....	12,455	19.5
1989 .....	12,590	19.6
1990 .....	13,431	20.6
1991 .....	14,341	21.8

Source: Statistical Abstracts of the U.S.:1989; Table No. 738, p. 454. U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Current Population Reports," series P-60, No. 161, and earlier reports. Data for 1988 and 1989 are from "Current Population Reports," Series P-60, No. 170-RD, and No. 169-RD, respectively. Data for 1991 are from "Current Population Reports," Series P-60, No. 181.

Mr. HARKIN. So do not tell me these programs to help children do not have an effect. They have an effect and have a good effect of helping move kids out of poverty. I just wanted to make that point for the RECORD. I thank the Senator for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the following organizations that support this amendment be printed in the RECORD: The NAACP, Children's Defense Fund, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, Food Research and Action Center, the National Council of Churches, and the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism. I ask that their names and the statements of these different organizations be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF RABBI DAVID SAPERSTEIN, DIRECTOR, RELIGIOUS ACTION CENTER OF REFORM JUDAISM

The ultimate judgment of a nation—of its values, its honor, its basic decency—rests upon how it treats its children, for those children are its future. A nation that neglects its children, that allows children to go hungry or homeless, that fails adequately to educate its children, is a nation that short-changes its future. For this reason, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, representing 850 synagogues and 1.5 million Reform Jews, strongly supports the proposed Sense of the Congress Resolution that Congress not approve any legislation that will increase the number of children who are homeless and hungry, and that requires a child impact statement before Congress passes new legislation.

In the zeal to reform government and to change the way Congress works, members of Congress must not forget how many of the actions they are now considering—how many of the bills they work to pass, budgets they wish to cut, programs they seek to eliminate—affect American children, and, thus, our future. America already has too many homeless children huddled and shivering against winter's chill without adequate shelter, too many children whose young stomachs know too well the empty pain of hunger, too many inadequately educated children whose bright minds daily grow dull. Those who would cut budgets in ways that harm children will cite the financial benefits of their cuts, will claim that by reducing the national deficit they are securing our future. But by reducing that deficit by penalizing children—by making the weakest and the least among us bear the burden of reform—they only weaken that future.

However much we may all disagree over the best solutions to the problems America

confronts, on this, at least, let us find common ground: that our children—more than all our industries combined, more than all our raw materials, more than all our science and ingenuity—our children are our most valuable and precious resource, and we must treat them accordingly. We must protect our children from an indiscriminate budget ax as resolutely as we would protect them from violence. We must scrutinize cuts in programs for children as carefully as we scrutinize cuts in defense spending, for even the mightiest military will be useless if our nation's children have no hope. Our children are meant to walk with us the road to peace and freedom and prosperity; we dare not walk that road to a better tomorrow while leaving them trapped in a bleak, a cruel, today.

Each child's today is thousands of our tomorrows; nurture these todays and you build those tomorrows; darken these todays and you destroy those tomorrows.

So we urge all senators, regardless of political leanings, to support this amendment and to abide by its principles; to keep the children of America always in their minds; and to recognize that short-changing children for short term financial gain is to make a Faustian bargain that will cost this nation dearly down the road.

Our children reposit our dreams; we must not allow their lives to be nightmares.

The Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism is the Washington office of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and represents 1.5 million Reform Jews in 850 congregations throughout the United States and Canada.

STATEMENT OF MARY ANDERSON COOPER, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON OFFICE, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A.

We are pleased to support the efforts of the Senators who have introduced legislation to require that Congress not approve any legislation which will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless. This commitment to the well-being of the nation's children is consistent with the belief of the churches in our constituency that all people have a right to food and shelter, and that we cannot relax our vigilance when there is the prospect that children will be allowed to go hungry and unprotected.

We are grateful for the initiative being undertaken today, and we urge the Congress to enact this measure assuring that no action undertaken by the House or Senate will increase the number of hungry and homeless children in this nation.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT J. FERSH, PRESIDENT, FOOD RESEARCH & ACTION CENTER

I am pleased to support the resolution that Senator Wellstone will introduce today to protect children from hunger and homelessness. This resolution is timely because there now are serious proposals before Congress that could add dramatically to the numbers of children who experience hunger and homelessness in this country.

FRAC is considered the leading national organization advocating for more effective public policies to end hunger in this country. Our analysis of H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act introduced in the House of Representatives, leads us to believe that millions of American children could lose essential school lunch, school breakfast, WIC and food stamp benefits if the bill is enacted.

The most fundamental threat to our children's well-being is the proposal to replace the highly effective and successful nutrition programs we have today with a block grant at sharply reduced funding. This will lead

not only to immediate pain and suffering, but virtually guarantees that the responsiveness to hunger and undernutrition will diminish in years ahead.

We need a continuing Federal commitment to nutrition programs that assures adequate funding and benefit levels. We need programs that provide predictable funding levels and assure that no matter where one lives in the United States, there will be a safety net to prevent hunger.

We cannot have a situation where school administrators never know how much support they will receive and opt out of school feeding programs because of inconsistent funding. We cannot have a situation where needy people in a State cannot get help when they lose their jobs because their State has too many people in need and too little money to serve them.

There are reforms and improvements that can be made to improve the delivery of food assistance to vulnerable citizens and to preserve the integrity of the programs.

But a drive to save Federal dollars and reinvent government roles should not have as a consequence more hungry and homeless children. Before this rush to chaos is approved, Congress should take a careful look at our Nation's nutrition programs. They have a highly successful track record of improving the nutritional status of our most vulnerable citizens. Failure to preserve these programs will exact a high monetary and social cost from our society.

I offer our thanks to Senator Wellstone for introducing this measure to assure that Congress has made a careful study of the potential impact of its decisions on our most vulnerable children.

CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND,  
January 10, 1995.

Hon. PAUL WELLSTONE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC

DEAR SENATOR WELLSTONE: I applaud your efforts to make sure that the members of Congress are informed about the probable consequences to children of legislation they are considering.

Like you, I am very concerned that some of the actions the Congress will be considering in the days ahead will, instead of helping children, actually result in more children being left behind—more hungry, more homeless, more without health insurance, more who are poor. I believe that members of Congress, if informed that an action they are contemplating will actually hurt children, will not take such an action.

Your amendment ensures that members of Congress have the official information upon which to base that determination. This is, effectively, "a children's right to have their Congresspeople know" amendment. Too often, the needs of children, who don't vote or speak for themselves, are invisible in the legislative process. At the very least, children should be able to expect that Senators and Representatives know the impact of their decisions upon children before they act.

This is an amendment which every member of the Congress should support. Thank you again for your leadership on this very important issue for children.

Sincerely yours,

MARIAN WRIGHT EDELMAN.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a statement of Women Academics Concerned About Welfare be printed in the RECORD.

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

## STATEMENT OF WOMEN ACADEMICS CONCERNED ABOUT WELFARE

(This statement was written and signed in response to the Administration welfare "reform" bill introduced in the summer of 1994. Spurred by this proposal Republicans are now championing much worse barbarisms. We should not let ourselves be driven into supporting the bad in the hopes of fending off the worse. We stand against policies which deprive poor children and scapegoat poor mothers. A politics of blaming the poor fosters a downward cycle of impoverishment, stigmatization, and despair.—Linda Gordon, Frances Fox Piven, Louise Trubek, January 1995)

As women scholars who have studied welfare programs in the United States and other democracies, and who share a concern for poor women and children, we feel a responsibility to speak out in opposition to the Clinton administration welfare reform proposal.

The most publicized feature of the proposal is a two-year lifetime limit on cash assistance from AFDC. The limit shreds precisely that portion of our social safety net on which poor women and children rely. Yet the evidence shows that the majority of recipients do not stay on "welfare" very long at one time, but turn to AFDC when they are forced to by work of family emergencies. Many women also turn to welfare to escape from domestic violence. A two-year limit would destroy that lifeline.

The Bush administration began freely granting waivers allowing the states to "experiment with reforms," and the Clinton administration is continuing this practice. Few of these waivers concern true experiments or reforms. Instead, reminiscent of the 19th century when welfare was a system of disciplinary tutelage, they usually cut welfare grants which are already everywhere below the poverty level. Some states are reducing family benefits if a child is truant or if an additional child is born. From the beginning of AFDC in 1935, the federal government provided some protection against the arbitrary ill-treatment of recipients by states and counties. That protection should not be forfeited.

The effort to present a "revenue-neutral" welfare reform has resulted in the ludicrous prospect of severe cutbacks in programs that serve some of the poor in order to pay for programs that will ostensibly help others of the poor. Clearly this makes little moral or programmatic sense.

Just as troublesome as these programmatic initiatives is the vilification of welfare recipients for lacking the values of work and responsibility which has characterized the Administration's talk about reform. This rhetoric undermines respect for the hard and vital work that all women do as parents. It is particularly egregious when directed against poor single mothers who confront the triple burdens of heading households, parenting, and eking out a livelihood. Given the popular misimpression that welfare recipients are overwhelmingly minority women, this pillorying of poor women also contributes to racist stereotypes.

While women have always been consigned to low wage jobs, the situation of working women trying to support children has worsened dramatically in the last two decades as wage levels plummeted. The Administration proposal is silent about that problem.

Real welfare reform should be directed to ending poverty, not welfare. We should strive for widely available day care, medical insurance, and education, and for improvements in working conditions and wages. At the same time we should preserve the programs of social support—variously called social security or welfare—that have been vital to

the safety, health and morale of millions of women, men, and children in the U.S.

## WOMEN ACADEMICS CONCERNED ABOUT WELFARE REFORM

Emily K. Abel, UCLA; Mimi Abramovitz, CUNY; Martha Ackelsberg, Smith; Mona Acker, U Regina; Julia Adams, U Mich; Randy Albelda, U Mass Boston; Nedda C. Allbray, CUNY; Rebecca Alpert, Temple; Christa Altenstetter, CUNY; Ann Rosegrant Alvarez, Wayne State; Nancy Amidei, U Wash; Teresa Amott, Bucknell U; Susan Amussen, Union Institute; Margaret Anderson, U Delaware; Elizabeth S. Anderson, U Mich; Karen Anderson, U Arizona; Karin J. Anderson, New School; Melissa Anderson; Molly Andrews, Temple; Fran Ansley, U Tenn.

Rita Arditti, Union Institute; Clarissa Atkinson, Harvard; Nina Auerbach, U of Penn; Dr. Harriet Baber, U San Diego; Regina Bannan, Temple; Lois W. Banner, USC; Carol Barash, Rutgers; Lucy Barber, Brown; Nancy Barnes, New School; Dana Barron, U of Penn; Pauline B. Bart, U Illinois, Chicago; Rosalyn Fraad Baxandall, SUNY; Gail Bederman, Notre Dame; Leslie Bender, Syracuse; Trude Bennett, U North Carolina; Betty Ann Bergland, U Wisconsin, River Falls; Barbara R. Bergmann, American U; Sharon Berlin, U Chicago; Sally A. Bermanzohn, CUNY; Elaine Bernard, Harvard; Beth Berne, Woods Hole; Kim Blankenship, Yale.

Marcia Bok, U Conn; Janet K. Boles, Marquette; Annette Borchorst, Wellesley; Eileen Boris, Howard; Marti Bombyk, Fordham; Judith R. Botwin, Woods Hole; Cynthia Bowman, Northwestern; Ruth A. Brandwein, SUNY; Rachel Bratt; Winifred Breines, Northeastern; Vicki Breitbart, Columbia U; Johanna Brenner, Portland State; Stephanie Bressler, King's College; Mary Bricker-Jenkins, Western Kentucky; Eleanor Brilliant, Rutgers; Frances L. Brisbane, SUNY; Sherri Broder, U Mass, Medford; Evelyn A. Brodtkin, U Chicago; Mary Ann Bromley, Rhode Island College; Elsa Barkley Brown, U Mich; Susan Taylor Brown, Syracuse; Irene Browne, Emory U; Lisa D. Brush, U Pittsburgh; Darcy Buerkle, Claremont U.

Sandy Butler, U Maine; Joan Callahan, U Kentucky; Ann Nichols-Casebolt, Virginia Commonwealth U; Susan Kerr Chandler, U Nevada; Alta Charo, U Wisconsin; Wendy Chavkin, Columbia; Roslyn H. Chernesky, Fordham; Norma Chinchilla, U Cal, Long Beach; Nancy Churchill, U Conn; Mary Ann Clawson, Wesleyan; Jewel P. Cobb, Cal State Fullerton; Dorothy Sue Cobble, Rutgers; Elizabeth Ann Cohen, NYU; Miriam J. Cohen, Vassar; Patty A. Coleman, U Maine; Blanche Wiesen Cook, CUNY; Kimberly J. Cook, Miss State U; Mary Coombs, U Miami; Lynn B. Cooper, Cal State Sacramento; Rhonda Copelon, CUNY; Nancy Cott, Yale.

Lois K. Cox, U Iowa; Kate Crehan, New School; Elizabeth Crispo, CUNY; Faye Crosby, Smith; Barbara R. Cruikshank, U Mass; Paisley Currah, CUNY; Deborah D'Amico, Consortium for Worker Ed; Jo Darlington, U Colorado; Margery Davies, Tufts; Jane Sherron De Hart, U Cal, Santa Barbara; Vasiliakie Demos, U Minn, Morris; Tracey Dewart, CUNY; Irene Diamond, U Oregon; Bonnie Thornton Dill, U Maryland; Estelle Disch, U Mass, Boston; Christine DiStefano, U Wash.

Elizabeth Douvan, U Mich; Nancy E. Dowd, U Florida; Daine M. Dujon, U Mass, Boston; Joan Levin Ecklein, U Mass, Boston; Susan Eckstein, Boston U; Kathryn Edin, Rutgers; Rebecca Edwards; Hester Eisenstein, SUNY; Margaret S. Elbow, Texas Tech U; Leslie C. Eliason, U Wash; Irene Elkin, U Chicago; Cynthia H. Enloe, MIT; Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, CUNY; Julia A. Erickson, Temple; Rebecca Faery, Harvard; Kathleen Coulborn

Faller, U Mich; Amy Farrell, Dickinson; Elizabeth Faue, Wayne State U; Constance Faulkner, Western Wash U; Elizabeth Fee, U Wisconsin; Susan Feiner; Shelley Feldman, Cornell; Ruth Feldstein, Brown.

Deb Figart, Eastern Mich U; Judith I Fiene, U Tenn; Michelle Fine, CUNY; Deborah K. Fitzgerald, MIT; Maureen Fitzgerald, U Arizona; Maureen A. Flanagan, Mich State; Cornelia Butler Flora, Iowa State; Nancy Folbre, U Mass, Amherst; Joyce Clark Follet, U Wisconsin; Alice Fothergill, U Colorado; Ruth Frager, McMaster U; Nancy Fraser, Northwestern; Sharon Freedberg, CUNY; Estelle Freedman, Stanford; Sandra French, Indiana U SE; Judith Friedlander, New School; Andrea Friedman, U Cal, Santa Cruz; Debra Friedman, U Wash; Jennifer Frost, U Wisconsin; Fran Froelich, U Mass, Boston; Ann Rubio Froines, U Mass, Boston.

Rachel G. Fuchs, Arizona State; Marsha Garrison, Brooklyn Law; Sarah Gehlert, U Chicago; Joyce Gelb, CUNY; Jane Gerhard, Brown; Jill Gerson, CUNY; Judith Gerson, Rutgers; Kathleen Gerson, NYU; Nancy Gewirtz, Rhode Island College; Melissa R. Gilbert, Georgia State; Glenda E. Gilmore, Yale; Lori Ginzberg, Penn State; Marilyn Gittell, CUNY; Naomi Gitterman, Mercy; Gertrude S. Goldberg, Adelphi; Joanne Goodwin, U Nevada, Las Vegas; Linda Gordon, U Wisconsin; Deborah Gorham, Carleton; Janet Gornick, CUNY; Naomi Gottlieb, U Wash; Peggotty Graham, Open U, UK; Margaret Groarke, CUNY; Elna Green, Sweet Briar; Julie Greene, U Colorado; Maxine Greene, Columbia; Rosalind Greenstein; Carol Groneman, CUNY; Emma R. Gross, U Utah; Atina Grossman, Columbia; Angela Gugliotta, Notre Dame; Lorraine Gutierrez, U Wash; Madelyn Gutwirth, U Penn; Jacquelyn Hall, U Wisconsin; Margaret Hallock, U Oregon.

Evelynn M. Hammonds, MIT; Linda Shafer Hancock, U Oregon; Julia E. Hanigsberg, Columbia; Donna Hardina, Cal State Fresno; Ann Hartman, Smith/Fordham; Susan M. Hartmann, Ohio State; Nancy Hartsock, U Wash; Sally Haslanger, U Mich; Victoria Hattam, New School; Rosemary Haughton; Mary Hawkesworth, U Louisville; Pam Hayden, La Salle; Sue Headlee, American U; Alice Hearst, Smith; Lisa Heldke, Gustavus Adolphus; Julia Henly, U Colorado; Barbara Herman, UCLA; Helga Hernes, Oslo; Mary Jo Hetzel, Springfield College; Nancy A. Hewitt, Duke; Barbara Heyns, NYU; Elizabeth Higginbotham, U Memphis; Marianne Hirsch, Dartmouth; Joan Hoffman, CUNY; Emily P. Hoffman, Western Michigan U; June Hopkins; Nancy R. Hooymann, U Wash; Ruth Hubbard, Harvard; Nancy A. Humphreys, U Conn; Irene Hurst, U Cal; Cheryl Hyde, Boston U; Sandy Ingraham, U Oklahoma; Katherine Irwin, U Colorado.

Joan Iversen, SUNY; Jean E. Jackson, MIT; Lynn Jacobsson, Cal State Fresno; Leanne Jaffe, New School; Dolores Janiewski, Victoria U; Toby Jayaratne, U Mich; Marty Jessup, U Cal San Francisco; Carole Joffe, U Cal Davis; Harriette Johnson, U Conn; Katherine D. Johnson; Jacqueline Jones, Brandeis; Jill B. Jones, U Tenn Knoxville; Cathleen Jordan, U Texas, Arlington; June Jordan, U Cal Berkeley; Barbara H. R. Joseph, SUNY; Peggy Kahn, U Mich, Flint; Hilda Kahne, Brandeis; Nancy Kaiser, U Wisconsin; Sheila B. Kamerman, Columbia; Carol Kaplan, Fordham; Temma Kaplan, SUNY; Kathie Friedman Kasaba, U Wash, Tacoma.

Barbara Kasper, SUNY; Joyce Rothchild, Virginia Tec; Barbara Katz Rothman, CUNY; Lily Kay, MIT; Alice B. Kehoe, Marquette; Evelyn Fox Keller, MIT; Karl Kelley, Texas Tech; Mary Kelley, Dartmouth; Susan M. Kellogg, U Houston; Marie Kennedy, U Mass, Boston; Linda K. Kerber, U Iowa; Alice

Kessler-Harris, Rutgers; Cynthia Harrison; Mary C. King, Portland State; Eva Kittay, SUNY; Janet E. Kodras, Florida State; Rosa Perez-Koenig, Fordham; Judy Kopp, U Wash; Felicia Kornbluh, Princeton; Sherrie A. Kossoudji, U Mich; Minna J. Kotkin, Brooklyn Law; Nancy J. Krieger, Kaiser Foundation Research Inst; Joan Irene Krohn, New Mexico Highlands U; Sarah Kuhn, U Mass, Lowell; Charlotte Kunkel, U Colorado; Regina G. Kunzel, Williams College; Demie Kurz, U Penn; Angel Kwolek-Folland, U Kansas; Marie Laberge, U Wisconsin; Molly Ladd-Taylor, York.

Joan Laird, Smith; Susan Lambert, Chicago; Gaynor Langs; Jane Elizabeth Larsen, Northwestern; Magali Sarfatti Larson, Temple; Rebecca Lash, Woods Hole; Barbara Laslett, U Minn; Marcie Lazzari, Colorado State; Suzanne Leahy, U Colorado; Judith W. Leavitt, U Wisconsin; Judith Lee, U Conn; Mary P. Lefkarites, CUNY; Gerda Lerner, U Wisconsin; Margaret Anne Levi, U Wash; Rhonda F. Levine, Colgate; Ellen Lewin, Stanford; Edith A. Lewis, U Mich; Jinguay Liao, New School; Eloise Limger, New School; Shirley Lindenbaum, CUNY; Karen T. Litfin, U Wash; Margaret Little, U Manitoba; Sharon Long, Urban Institute; Judith Lorber, CUNY; Shirley A. Lord, Buffalo State College; Tracy Luff, Viterbo College; Melani McAlister, Brown; Megan McClintock, U Wash.

Martha McCluskey, Columbia; Elizabeth McCulloch; Eileen McDonogh, Northeastern; Katie McDonough, New Mexico Highlands U; Brenda McGowan, Columbia; Alisa McKay, Glasgow Caledonian U; Vonnice McLoyd, U Mich; Sharon McQuaide, Fordham; Barbara Macktinger, Bloomfield College; Colleen Mack-Canty, U Oregon; Esther I. Madriz, CUNY; Betty Reid Mandell, Bridgewater State; Jeanne Marecek, Swarthmore; Jane Mauldon, UC Berkeley; Lynne Marks, U Victoria; Sylvia Marotta, George Wash U; Julie Matthaai, Wellesley; Elaine Tyler May, U Minn; Margit Mayer, Free U Berlin; Anne Mayhew, U Tenn, Knoxville; Paula Hooper Mayhew, Marymount Manhattan; Mary Jo Maynes, U Minn; Margaret L. Mead, Tufts; Carol H. Meyer, Columbia; Marcia K. Meyers, Syracuse; Sonya A. Michel, U Illinois, Urbana-Champaign; Ruth Milkman, UCLA.

Dorothy C. Miller, Wichita State; Susan Miller, U Cal Davis; Leslie Miller-Bernal, Wells College; Linda G. Mills, UCLA; Jenny Minier, U Wisconsin; Gwendolyn Mink, U Cal Santa Cruz; Lorraine C. Minniet, CUNY; Beth Mintz, U Vermont; Joya Misra, U Georgia; Renee Monson, U Wisconsin; Suzanne Morton, McGill; Wynne Moskop, Saint Louis U; Elizabeth Mueller, New School; Ann Marie Mumm, Rhode Island School of Social Work; Robyn Muncy, U Maryland; Victoria Munoz, Wells College; June Nash, CUNY; Nancy Naples, U Cal Irvine; Marysa Navarro, Dartmouth; Anne Nelson, Woods Hole; Barbetta Jo Neuberger, U Illinois, Chicago; Esther Newton, SUNY; Mae Ngai, Consortium for Worker Ed.

Sue Nissman, MIT; Jill Norgren, CUNY; Catherine O'Leary, New School; Clara Oleson, U Iowa; Stacey J. Olikier, U Wisconsin, Milwaukee; Paulette Olson, Wright State; Laura Oren, U Houston; Ann Orloff, U Wisconsin; Sherry Ortner, U Mich; Susan Ostrander, Tufts; Martha Ozawa, Wash U, St. Louis; Gul Ozyegin, Temple; Nell Painter, Princeton; Mary Brown Parlee, MIT; Eve Passerini, U Colorado; Carole Pateman, UCLA; Lisa Peattie, MIT; Rosa Maria Pegueros, U Rhode Island; Donna Penn, Brown; Ruth Perry, MIT; Rosalind Petchesky, CUNY; Jean Peterman, U Illinois, Chicago; Barbara Pine, U Conn; Frances Pox Piven, CUNY; Uta Poiger, Brown; Janet E. Poppendieck, CUNY; Christina Pratt, Dominican College; Arline

Prigoff, Cal State Sacramento; Laura M. Purdy, Wells College.

Lara E. Putnam, U Mich; Karen Pyke, USC; Mary Ann Quaranta, Fordham; Rayna Rapp, New School; Sarah Raskin, Trinity; Leslie J. Reagan, U Illinois, Urbana-Champaign; Sherrill Redmon, Smith College; Ellen Reese, UCLA; Pat Reeve, U Mass, Boston; RoseAnn Renteria, U Colorado; Margery Resnick, MIT; Catherine K. Riessman, Boston U; Alice Robbin, CUNY; Betty D. Robinson, U Southern Maine; Jeanne B. Robinson, U Chicago; Pamela A. Roby, U Cal Santa Cruz; Anna Rockhill, U Mich; Ruth Roemer, UCLA; Beth Rose, Vanderbilt.

Nancy E. Rose, Cal State San Bernardino; Sonya O. Rose, U Mich; Ruth Rosen, U Cal Davis; Beth Spenciner Rosenthal, CUNY; Joyce Rothschild, Virginia Polytechnic Institute; Hiasaura Rubenstein, U Tenn; Sara L. Ruddick, New School; Lois Rudnick, U Mass, Boston; Leila J. Rupp, The Ohio State; Mary P. Ryan, UC Berkeley; St. Ann Convent, East Harlem; Barbara J. Sabol; Susan Sandman, Wells College; Rosemary C. Sarri, U Mich; Wendy Sarvasy, UC Berkeley; Saskia Sassen, Columbia; Gwen Sayler, Wartburg Theological Seminary; Jane Sharp, Kings College, London; Eunice Shatz, U Tenn, Knoxville; Marilyn M. Schaub, Duquesne.

Elizabeth M. Schneider, Brooklyn Law; Brooke G. Schoepf, Woods Hole; Juliet Schor, Harvard; Barbara Schulman, Clark; Leslie Schwalm, U Iowa; Dorie Seavey, Wellesley; Gay Seidman, U Wisconsin; Carole Shammas, U Cal Riverside; Karen Sharma, New School; Kristin A. Sheradin, U Rochester; Mary T. Sheerin, Union Institute; Jessica Shubon, Brown; Barbara Sicherman, Trinity; Ruth Sidel, CUNY; Deborah Siegel, Rhode Island College; Helene Silverberg, U Cal Santa Barbara; Louise Simmons, U Conn; Barbara Levy Simon, Columbia; Andrea Y. Simpson, U Wash; Beverly R. Singer, Columbia; Louise Skolnick, Adelphi; Carol Smith CUNY; Judith E. Smith, U Mass, Boston; Susan L. Smith, U Alberta; Ann Snitow, New School; Sue Sohng, U Wash; Renee Solomon, Columbia; Rickie Solinger; Roberta Spalter-Roth, American U; Jane M. Spinak, Columbia; Judith Stacey, U Cal Davis; Barbara Stark, U Tenn, Knoxville; Rose Starr, CUNY.

Anne A. Statham, U Wisconsin, Parkside; Catherine A. Steele, Syracuse; Judith Stein, CUNY; Ronnie Steinberg, Temple; Vicky Steinitz, U Mass, Boston; Susan Sterett, U Denver; Joyce West Stevens, Boston U; Mary H. Stevenson, U Mass, Boston; Landon R.Y. Storrs, U Wisconsin; Diana L. Strassmann, Rice; Philippa Strum, CUNY; Jennifer Stucker, Eastern Wash U; Amy Swerdlow, Sarah Lawrence; Meredith Tax, PEN; Shelly Tenenbaum, Clark; Nancy M. Theriot, U Louisville; Margaret Susan Thompson, Syracuse; Sharon M. Thompson; Barrie Thorne, USC; Carolyn Tice, Ohio U; Kip Tierman, U Mass, Boston; Roberta Till-Retz, U Iowa; Shirley Tillotson, Dalhousie U; Louise A. Tilly, New School; Susan Traverso, U Wisconsin; Joan Tronto, CUNY; Louise Trubek, U Wisconsin; Sandra G. Turner, Fordham; Adrienne Valdez, U Hawaii, Manoa; Deborah M. Valenze, Barnard.

Dorothy Van Soest, Cahtolic U; Heidi Vickery, New School; Kamala Visweswaran, New School; Lise Vogel, Denison; Nancy R. Vosler, Wash U, St. Louis; Maureen Waller, Princeton; Elaine M. Walsh, CUNY; Joanna K. Weinberg, U Cal San Francisco; Helen Weingarten, U Mich; Marsha Weinraub, Temple; Nancy Weiss, Syracuse; Beth Weitzman, NYU; Dorothy E. Weitzman, Boston College; Carolyn Crosby Wells, Marquette; Janice Wood Wetzel, Adelphi; Marianne H. Whatley, U Wisconsin; Lora Wildenthal, Pitzer; Lucy A. Williams, Northeastern; Rhonda M. Wil-

liams, U Maryland; Ann Withorn, U Mass, Boston; Eleanor Wittруп, U Mass, Lowell; L. Mun Wong, CUNY; Nancy A. Worcester, U Wisconsin; Susan M. Yohn, Hofstra; Marilyn Young, NYU; June Zaccone, Hofstra; Mary K. Zimmerman, U Kansas; Paz Mendez-Bonita Zorita, Arizona State; Yvonne Zylan, NYU

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, one day in the life of American children, three children die from child abuse—this is the Children's Defense Fund report last year—nine murdered.

One day in the life of American children, 13 children die from guns; 27 children—a classroomful—die from poverty; 30 children are wounded by guns.

One day in the life of American children, 63 babies die before they are 1 month old.

One day in the life of American children, 101 babies die before their first birthday; 145 babies are born at very low birth weight; 202 children are arrested for drug offenses; 307 children are arrested for crimes of violence; 340 children are arrested for drinking or drunken driving; 636 babies are born to women who had late or no prenatal care.

One day in the life of American children, 801 babies are born at low birth weight; 1,234 children run away from home.

One day in the life of American children, 2,868 children are born into poverty.

One day in the life of American children, 7,945 children are reported abused or neglected.

One day in the life of American children, 100,000 children are homeless.

Mr. President, we had a rather amazing statement made by one of our colleagues in the House of Representatives that the reason there would be no precise figures on precise cuts before a balanced budget amendment is that Representatives and Senators, therefore, would not vote for that amendment. There is a reason for that.

By the most conservative Congressional Budget Office estimate, if you put Social Security in parentheses, if you do not cut the Pentagon, and if you have to pay the interest on the debt in order to get to where we are supposed to get to by the year 2002, we have to cut \$1.2 trillion.

I say conservative estimate, because we are now in a bidding war to raise the military budget, the Pentagon budget, to the tune of maybe \$50 billion over the next 5 years, and we are in a bidding war for more and more tax cuts. That is revenue lost. That just leaves certain areas of the budget where we can make the cuts. The arithmetic of this is very clear and it is very compelling.

I do not present today on the floor of the Senate a sophisticated econometric model. There are all sorts of different variables to consider. But I will tell you this: On present course—and we must change that course—when you look at outlays 2002, in terms of where we are heading, and then you subtract Social Security, which will not be cut, you subtract the Pentagon budget with

a given percentage of the overall budget, and you subtract interest on the debt and you look at a projected \$319 billion deficit reduction target, that \$319 billion is about one-third of what you have left to cut from.

So, Mr. President, we could be talking about, roughly speaking, 32-percent cuts. Maybe we will not have a 32-percent cut in veterans programs. Maybe we will not have a 32-percent cut in Medicare. In Minnesota, that would mean a cut of \$1 billion just in my State alone in Medicare. Maybe it will be more in child nutrition programs. Maybe it will be more in other children's programs.

I know that in Minnesota alone, by 2002 on present course, we can see \$145 million taken out of the following essential food assistance programs. This is not precise, but this is the direction we are going in: Food stamps, aid to women, infants, and children, and nutrition programs for the elderly, and the School Lunch Program.

I said it before and I am going to say it again. A Food Research and Action Council 1991 report, 5.5 million children under 12 years of age are hungry in the United States of America. U.S. Council of Mayors' status report on Hunger and Homelessness in American Cities 1994 estimates 26 percent that were homeless. The increase of the population, 26 percent, I believe, of the homeless population were children. National Academy of Sciences, 100,000 children are homeless each day in our country.

Mr. President, if we continue on the present course and say we are not going to cut the military contractors; no, we do not want to do that; they have a lot of power. Heaven forbid that we do anything about oil company subsidies or coal or gas or all sorts of other subsidies. Heaven forbid that as we think about how to contain health care costs, insurance companies and pharmaceutical companies are part of the sacrifice. All that is off the table.

Willie Sutton was asked, Why did you go rob the banks? He said, That's where the money was. In this Contract With America, we are going to make cuts that affect the most vulnerable among the citizens in our country, and they are children because they do not make the large contributions, they do not lobby every day, and they do not have the political power of some of these other interests.

Mr. President, again, today in Minnesota, 100 to 150 citizens, many of them children, at a press conference, a number of the organizations, Children's Defense Fund and others that have worked with children and have such credibility for their work, were making predictions on where we are going to be in 2002 with this Contract With America as it is implemented: 29,150 babies, preschoolers and pregnant women would lose infant formula and other WIC nutrition supplements; 31,000—actually, I think it is 51,500—children would lose food stamps; 154,600 children would lose free or subsidized school lunch programs.

Mr. President, I suggest that every Senator take a look at his or her State and ask the question: What exactly is going to happen here? If we are going to cut these programs that affect children in the country, either it becomes a shell game and our States then have to pick up the cost through a sales tax or a property tax, or the food shelves go bare, we see a rise in hunger, we see a rise in homelessness, and we see a rise in poverty among children in this country.

I said it once and I am going to say it again tonight before this vote: I come from a State, as the Senator from Iowa, Senator HARKIN said, with a rich tradition of care and commitment for and to children. Senator Hubert Humphrey personified that better than any other Senator could.

Senator Humphrey said the test of government and society is how we treat people in the dawn of life, and he meant the children; and in the twilight of life, and he meant the elderly; and in the shadow of their life, and he meant people struggling with an illness or struggling with a disability or those that were poor.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, one out of every four children in America are poor; one out of every two children of color are born into poverty today.

Mr. President, I heard the majority leader say two things, one with which I agree and one with which I am in profound disagreement. The first thing he said was that he has a history of concern and a history of commitment when it comes to nutritional programs and children in America, and he is absolutely correct. For that I pay him my greatest respect.

But, Mr. President, the second point that the majority leader made was that somehow the timing is not right, this is not the right time.

Now, I am not today going to do an analysis of the number of amendments that have been brought to the floor on different bills which may or may not have been a part of those bills by some sort of test of germaneness or relevancy. Believe me you, there have been many brought to this floor, and certainly by now the current majority party.

That is not my point. My point is that Senators bring amendments to the floor, just so that people who are watching this debate are clear, because of timing. If you think an amendment is important and you think that the timing of it is critical, that is when you do it.

Now, before we rush headlong into legislation that is going to hurt children in this country, why is the time not right for the Senate to go on record that it is the sense of the Congress that Congress should not enact or adopt any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless? Why is not the time right for the Senate to go on record that with our committees, when we report bills out, there will be reports accom-

panying those bills which will spell out the impact of that legislation on children in America?

Tomorrow and the next day the timing is not right, the majority leader says. Tomorrow, and the next day, and the next day, and I am not sure how many days afterwards we are going to be talking about unfunded mandates and we are going to be talking about precisely this; that when legislation comes out of committee there will be a cost-benefit analysis, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

Mr. President, if we can say that we ought to do an impact analysis of legislation on State governments and county governments and city governments and corporations or small businesses, can we not today at the beginning of the session before we get into this agenda and start passing legislation, especially legislation that is going to hurt children, pass a piece of legislation in the form of this amendment that says no, we are not going to do anything, we are not going to do anything that will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless?

Has it come to the point that the Senate is unwilling to go on record saying that? Is it not timely for us to say that today? I say to my colleagues in a nice way, I am sure that you listen to all your constituents. And since I am sure you do, you must realize that there are many people in this country who believe that we are about to go through some cuts that are going to hurt those citizens who are the most vulnerable in this country.

Now, I have had colleagues disagree with me, and they have said you are sounding an alarm but not based upon any serious problem. Mr. President, all you have to do, for those who have said no, we are not going to do that, I would say why then do you not support this amendment?

Mr. President, I have to say to the majority leader and my colleagues, I cannot believe that you are trying to make the argument that the timing is not right for this. Why is it not time for the Senate to make it clear we are not going to enact or adopt any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless? Why is it not time for us to make a commitment to children and make it clear that we will have a child impact statement which goes with legislation reported out of committee as to how that legislation will affect children?

I say to my colleagues that if you vote against this today, you certainly are sending a message loud and clear. And what you are saying to people around this country is, yes, you all have reason to be fearful and you have reason to worry and you have reason for some indignation that we are about to make some cuts that are going to hurt the most vulnerable citizens in the United States of America, children, because we are unwilling to go on record otherwise.

What do you mean the timing is not right today? When is the timing going

to be right? When is the timing going to be right? And I say to my colleagues, yes—I say this to the Senator from Iowa, because I so appreciate his grassroots approach to politics—populism is alive in America. People are in an anti-status-quo mood, and people voted for change.

But, Mr. President and my colleagues, there is a tremendous amount of goodness in the United States of America. People did not vote to cut nutrition programs for children. People did not vote for legislation that could increase the number of children who are hungry or the number of children who are homeless.

I say to my colleagues, if you do not think there is some compassion in this Nation, and you do not think there is some sense of fairness in this Nation, and you do not think there is some sense of justice in this Nation, then you are profoundly wrong.

I hope the majority leader does not come out here and move to table this amendment, which is all about congressional accountability. I want the Senate to go on record and be accountable that we will not enact or adopt any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless. But if the majority leader should come out and move to table, and we have a straight party-line vote, I sort of wonder when some of my colleagues—I know I have in the past not necessarily voted with leadership—are going to sort of vote exactly what they believe. I cannot believe there is not anybody on the majority side of the aisle who does not support this amendment on its merits.

But if it is voted down, then, Mr. President, I wish to say to my colleagues tonight I will bring this amendment up in the Senate over and over again. It will be up on the unfunded mandates bill and it will be up on every piece of legislation, because I am going to hold my colleagues accountable on this.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition? The minority manager of the bill.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I compliment him for bringing this up.

If people just look at the wording in this bill, it is not some wild-eyed thing. It is not something that requires us to do a great deal more work than we are otherwise going to have to do.

Let me read what the sense of the Congress is.

It is the sense of the Congress that Congress should not enact or adopt any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless.

Now, I cannot conceivably think that any Senator would take just the opposite view and say that it is the sense of the Congress that we should adopt legislation that would increase the number of children who are hungry or

homeless, and it would be ludicrous to think anybody would do that. So why something of this nature could not be supported I do not know. We would not even consider the opposite and say we will adopt legislation that will increase the hungry or homeless. All this says is that Congress has to be careful and not do something inadvertently that will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless.

Now, the second part of it:

Section 2. Accountability. Duties of Congressional committees.

Pretty simple really.

A report accompanying each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by any committee of the Senate or of the House of Representatives shall contain a detailed analysis of the probable impact of the bill or resolution on children, including the impact on the number of children who are hungry or homeless.

Now, I would say that with probably 90 percent or more of the legislation that goes through here, that requirement will mean practically no work at all for the committee. If you are on the Energy Committee or whatever other committee, it is going to be pretty simple to say no, there is no direct impact on hungry or homeless children.

But if, for those committees that deal with things where there is an impact, then at that time it would seem to me that we had better be looking at it, because we certainly do not want to add to the problems we already have with the number of children who are hungry or homeless. The rest is simple. It says that you cannot consider a bill, the same thing for the House, and so on, and the rest is very simple.

I think it would be difficult to vote against something that just says we will not adopt legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless. I do not see this as adding a big burden to our committee activity around here at all. There will be very few committees. Where some legislation is passed, it would definitely have a negative impact on the number of children who are hungry or homeless.

So I urge my colleagues to support the Senator from Minnesota, and I am glad to support him on this.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I do not know quite what this amendment does. Well, it does not do anything; that is what it does. I have been a member of the Nutrition Committee for years. I worked with Senator McGovern from South Dakota. We repealed the requirements of the food stamp law that require people to put up money, and things of that kind. It may have been a mistake. We thought we were doing the right thing. We worked a lot on the nutrition and school lunch programs and WIC programs. I do not know that we can pass laws here that say—I do not know who will count these people every day, or every week, or every

month. We do not know, if the law is passed, what the economy is going to be. This all ought to be discussed when we have the budget before us.

We are talking about dollars here, because there is no way we are going to be able to tell, if the law passes, whether somebody would be hungry in America or one more might be hungry. That is the import of this, even though it is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. It is not binding.

We are trying to cover Congress here with all the laws we inflict on everybody else in America. We have had a dozen amendments that have nothing to do with that at all. The American people want us to be an example, not part of the problem. We will be an example if we cover ourselves with laws that we inflict on small businessmen and women in Minnesota, Iowa, Ohio, Kansas, Vermont, Pennsylvania, or wherever it may be.

The House did this in 20 minutes, as I said. This is our 4th day on this bill because of all of these extraneous amendments. I understand that this is an opportunity to offer a lot of amendments and make the Republicans look heartless and cold, and all this. This is not going to work. The American people want us to cover ourselves. Every day we wait is another day it is not going to happen. I will be just, I hope, as diligent as the Senator from Minnesota when it comes to children's programs or nutrition programs. For that reason, I will move to table the amendment.

We want to finish this bill quickly. We have agreed that at 6:15, we could either vote up or down or on a motion in relation to the amendment.

Mr. President, I move to table the amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 11 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Abraham	Frist	Lieberman
Ashcroft	Gorton	Lott
Bennett	Gramm	Lugar
Bond	Grams	Mack
Brown	Grassley	McCain
Burns	Gregg	McConnell
Chafee	Hatch	Murkowski
Coats	Hatfield	Nickles
Cochran	Helms	Packwood
Cohen	Hollings	Pressler
Coverdell	Hutchison	Roth
Craig	Inhofe	Santorum
D'Amato	Jeffords	Shelby
DeWine	Kassebaum	Simpson
Dole	Kempthorne	Smith
Domenici	Kerrey	Snowe
Faircloth	Kyl	

Specter	Thomas	Thurmond
Stevens	Thompson	Warner
NAYS—43		
Akaka	Exon	Levin
Baucus	Feingold	Mikulski
Biden	Feinstein	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Ford	Moynihan
Boxer	Glenn	Murray
Bradley	Graham	Nunn
Breaux	Harkin	Pell
Bryan	Heflin	Pryor
Bumpers	Inouye	Reid
Byrd	Johnston	Robb
Campbell	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kerry	Simon
Daschle	Kohl	Wellstone
Dodd	Lautenberg	
Dorgan	Leahy	

NOT VOTING—1  
Rockefeller

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 14) was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for the Congressional Accountability Act. This legislation is very much needed and I would like to commend Senator GRASSLEY and the many others who have played a role in developing S. 2, for all the work they have done in assembling this bipartisan measure. I believe the support this bill has from both sides of the aisle is a testament to their work and to the desire of the American people to have the Congress live by the laws it creates.

I have long stated my belief that a government which governs best is closest to the people. Conversely, a government which begins to drift, and separate itself from those for whom it works is likely to forget the needs and wants of its citizens. For far too long we have seen the Congress drift in such a direction. S. 2 will help correct this situation and put us back on course.

Last spring, I joined several of my colleagues in Russia where we met with our legislative counterparts in the fledgling democracy. Do you know what two of the most prized documents in Russia are today? It is copies of the Constitution of the United States and the Federalist Papers.

In Federalist 57, James Madison—the father of our Constitution—warned that if the American people “tolerate a law not obligatory on the legislature as well as on the people, the people will be prepared to tolerate anything but liberty.” In essence, he was saying if the time comes when the people accept a legislature which does not live by the laws it passes, the people will have lost their freedom. The idea that the government shall not have rules which distinguishes it from the people, is the critical connection between the rulers and the ruled, and establishes a communion of understanding and sympathy.

Well, Mr. President, is it any wonder why public opinion ratings of Congress

are significantly low? The general public doesn't feel Congress is in touch with the issues which impact their daily lives. In living outside the limits of the same workplace laws it imposes on others, the Congress has lost touch.

Whenever I visit with Idaho business owners and operators, their frustrations with Federal workplace regulations quickly enter into the conversation. In fact, one of my first acts as a Member of this body was to help a small company in Boise which had been fined due to the overzealous and misguided application of Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations. I saw first-hand the problems small businesses face in trying to meet the demands of the Federal bureaucracy. I also came to better understand the frustration these same businessmen and women feel when they find Congress has conveniently exempted itself from those same rules.

The Congressional Accountability Act will correct this. By providing congressional employees—approximately 39,000 of whom will be impacted by the legislation—with the same protections which exist in the private sector, Congress no longer will be allowed to set the rules for others without setting them for themselves as well. This will place us squarely on track to follow the form of government intended by the Founding Fathers and which later generations fought so hard to preserve. This is the first step toward once again giving us a government which is “of the people, by the people, and for the people” rather than one which is over the people, at the people, and in spite of the people.

Some would argue that the estimated annual cost of the bill of between \$4 and \$5 million is reason enough to oppose this legislation. Yes, the additional cost of complying with the laws included in S. 2 is something we should keep in mind, but it is also something which should have been kept in mind when these laws were originally passed for the private sector. Either the expense of a law is too high for the public or private sector to justify enactment or it is not. We cannot, in good conscience, claim workplace laws are too expensive for the Congress while at the same time claiming they are sufficiently affordable for the Nation's business owners and entrepreneurs. It is my hope enactment of S. 2 will serve as an impetus for Members of Congress, in their own self-interest, to thoroughly examine the ramifications of any legislation we consider prior to passing it. In so doing, we will also gain a better understanding of what we are asking of others.

Mr. President, we have before us an opportunity to show the people we serve just how serious we are about reforming Congress. In passing the Congressional Accountability Act we will take solid action to show the American people that we are a part of the Nation, not a separate entity which is above the law. We can, in one easy step, take

a significant stride toward restoring public confidence in the legislative branch, opening the door to a more responsive and attentive government in the future.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this past year, I created a Small Business Advocacy Council in New Mexico. Its purpose was to advise me about the problems of small businesses and how, together, we might be able to resolve some of their critical concerns.

This council held seven meetings in six locations throughout the State of New Mexico, with more than 400 small businesses participating. They vented their concerns, and most of their issues centered on what appeared to them to be: First, an adversarial relationship between the Federal Government and business; and second, the lack of accountability of regulatory agencies and their work with business.

Underlying these two categories of problems, however, is the basic issue that we, in Congress, simply do not understand what is passed on to them in the way of laws and regulations.

To the people in my State of New Mexico, it appears that Congress—no matter how well-intentioned—simply passes the laws and exempts itself from their application. The public certainly has had a right to ask us: Why? If these laws are important, if they provide protections for an employee, if they provide benefits for an employee, why doesn't Congress think they are equally important and applicable to itself and to its employees?

Like any unfunded mandate, Congress passes along to others the responsibility of implementing the law; and, if the law is ignored or disobeyed, to pay the penalty.

These rules, regulations, and laws are good enough for everyone else, but it appears that Congress, itself, is too good for them.

The businesses in my State complain about the inefficiency, the loss of productivity, and the loss of revenue when they must implement hundreds of laws and regulations. They rightfully argue that if we subjected ourselves to the same requirements, we might understand more fully the implications of these mandates.

They are correct. When we pass a law to extend family and medical leave, for example, it is not just about an employee's absence and redistributing the workload, it is also about creation of a specific and precise set of office book-keeping programs and procedures.

This does not mean that a sick leave policy is a superfluous one. However, few of us recognize the underlying management issues that must be instituted—that it takes people to manage these systems and that it takes funds to do so. We never think about it because we do not have to worry about implementing the laws or paying a penalty if we fail to act.

Now, with passage of this bill, we are going to have an opportunity to assess the secondary effects of these laws. We,

too, will be subject to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Federal Labor Management Relations Act, the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act, and many others.

We will now better understand what many of our constituents have been complaining about—not the basic social good of these laws—but, rather, what it takes to carry them out and the resulting impacts on productivity, time, and costs. I suggest we may find that we have been imposing laws that are often inconvenient, impractical, and costly. Most important, we will recognize that the ability to carry on our work with creativity and flexibility will be sorely tested, if not severely inhibited.

We are going to be able to determine for ourselves if there are ways to bring about equitable conditions in the workplace while ensuring we do not impose unrealistic reporting responsibilities or inefficient methods of management. We will find out that we have been very fortunate, indeed, to occasionally sweep problems under the rug because we know there will be no enforcement of any penalty to pay for noncompliance. And, we will now understand the complaint that “form over substance” often becomes a priority for getting the job done.

Like many other conditions in life, we have to first look at our own house before we make demands on others. This bill will now make that oversight much more understandable, and, frankly, more equitable. I believe that we will have more empathy for those who have extended their legitimate complaints to us. And, I believe that we will now have the opportunity to reassess whether we can make reasonable changes that serve the interests of the workplace and its employees while lessening the costs and day-to-day burdens on the employer.

This measure is an important one. For many years the American public has asked us to “do unto ourselves what we do unto others.” Its time has come, and I am pleased to support this bill wholeheartedly.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise to express my strong support for the Congressional Accountability Act, which I am proud to cosponsor. This bill is about a simple principle: What is good enough for the American people ought to be good enough for Congress. There should be no double standard for elected officials in Washington.

The Congressional Accountability Act will begin to bring Congress under the jurisdiction of the laws it passes. Some of my colleagues who support this bill say that living under the laws we pass will discourage us from passing more laws because we will see how horrible they really are. I disagree with that view 100 percent.

I support the Congressional Accountability Act because I want my employees to enjoy the full protection of the laws of the United States of America.

Among other laws, this bill will make Congress subject to the Fair Labor Standards Act, which sets minimum wages and work standards for our employees. This bill brings Congress under the jurisdiction of the Occupational Safety and Health Act, which guarantees that our employees will not labor in unsafe conditions. It brings Congress under the jurisdiction of the Civil Rights Acts, so our employees will have protection from job discrimination on the basis of race, religion, and sex, and it will give them legal protection from sexual harassment.

This bill brings Congress under these laws and several others, including the Family and Medical Leave Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Rehabilitation Act.

Mr. President, congressional employees deserve better than to take their complaints of sexual harassment to congressionally-established bureaucracies. They deserve the right to press their complaints to the district court. This bill will give them that right.

Mr. President, the laws covered in this bill are good laws and I am glad that my employees will enjoy their full protection. When we pass this bill, Congress will no longer be the last plantation. We will no longer live by a different set of rules than the rest of the country.

While I support this bill strongly and will vote for its passage, I wish to take this opportunity to state my disappointment that several important reform measures were tabled by the Republican majority. In the past week, initiatives to restrict gifts to Members of Congress and to limit lobbyists' contributions to Federal candidates were defeated largely along party-line votes. Amendments to limit the personal use of campaign funds and to end the McCarthy-esque practice of subjecting congressional employees to political litmus tests also were defeated by our friends across the aisle. Each of these amendments would have strengthened this bill, and I am very disappointed they were dismissed so easily.

Despite this reservation, I am pleased that we are finally acting on congressional accountability legislation. Last year, when this bill was stalled by endless debate, I said:

The American people are demanding that Congress change the way it does business. They want reform now—not next session or next year. So let's move this bill forward and vote on it before the end of the year.

In my view, Mr. President, we are a few months late in acting on this important legislation, but there remains an urgent need to pass it. I urge my colleagues to respond to the American people's demands for change by passing this important bill.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, today I rise to voice my support for legislation that takes one more small step in reforming Congress. While words such as “accountability,” “responsibility,” and “restoration” are used to describe al-

most every legislative proposal, S. 2 offers us the real opportunity to restore accountability.

As you know, Mr. President, S. 2 will apply labor, civil rights, and workplace laws to Congress. I strongly believe that Congress should follow the laws it writes. Congressional coverage is a necessity. Congress is not above the laws that it passes for the rest of the Nation.

Mr. President, this is not the first time congressional coverage legislation has been proposed. In the 103d Congress, I supported S. 2071, which was sponsored by Senators LIEBERMAN and GRASSLEY. Unfortunately, the bill was blocked from floor consideration. In fact I have voted for similar congressional coverage on other occasions as well. In 1990 and 1992, during consideration of civil rights legislation, I supported extending many of these laws to Congress.

I am deeply disappointed, however, that the amendment regarding gifts to Members of Congress was defeated in a partisan vote. The gift amendment was designed to treat Congress like the executive branch of government; to remove any suspicion that Members of Congress are receiving special favors for legislative activities. That reform amendment would have truly made Congress more accountable to the public. Many say that the November election was about a revolution and that the public has demanded that Congress change the way it does business. We had an opportunity to make such an important change, and I believe we let the public down. I hope we will revisit this issue again this year, and that we will find the courage to adopt real gift reform legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 2, and any amendments that will strengthen S. 2 to make it even more true to the concept of accountability. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 2, the Congressional Accountability Act, which will require Congress to live by the same laws and regulations under which it requires businesses and individuals in the private sector to operate.

S. 2 is the first in a series of bills the Republican-led 104th Congress will take up to respond to the mandate the citizens of this country sent to Congress last November. That mandate calls for Congress to take action to make this institution more accountable to the people and to produce a smaller, less intrusive, and more efficient government.

Step one of this important mandate is S. 2, a bill to apply all the major labor, safety, and antidiscrimination laws to Congress. Making Congress live under the same laws it imposes on private sector businesses is simply a matter of fairness. Congress has exempted itself from these laws for over 50 years, but today, under new congressional leadership, this institution will no

longer apply one very different standard to itself and one to business and individuals.

Congressional employees will now have the same legal protections as employees in the private sector. Currently, congressional employees cannot bring suit in Federal district court. But, with passage of the Congressional Accountability Act congressional workers for the first time may bring a private action in Federal district court against Congress. Currently, House staff members have no rights of judicial review and Senate staffers can, after a lengthy internal process, take to the Federal circuit court of appeals complaints about decisions made by the Chamber's internal Office of Fair Employment Practices.

As I traveled the State over the past year, from Yuma to Flagstaff to Cottonwood, the subject of congressional accountability evoked strong reactions from the citizens of Arizona. Their message was clear: Congress currently operates above the very laws it imposes on the people and that must change. Arizonans want their congressional Representatives and Senators accountable. They not only want, they demand passage of the Congressional Accountability Act.

Grassroots support for congressional accountability certainly evolved, to some degree, out of a desire for fair treatment of the over 23,000 workers on the congressional payroll. But, by and large, what I have heard from small business owners and, yes, workers across Arizona is that Congress passes well-intentioned safety, labor, et cetera laws but they are often unrealistic and irrational. Business owners and workers believe Congress should feel the burden of these laws and regulations just as businesses across America feel the burden.

It is these regulations and laws that get in the way of business owners and workers carrying out their respective purposes and earning an honest living. For example, Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA] regulations require businesses to post employee injuries. A company faces a fine if a list is not posted, even if there have been no injuries. Businesses are also often required to fill out safety data sheets, which show how a company will handle various hazardous materials, for such simple substances as dishwashing liquid or even chalk. It is for violating these regulations that small businesses often face hefty fines from OSHA. Since Congress passed these laws and regulations, however, it should be subject to their implementation—to, for example, random OSHA site inspections that often result in unnecessary fines and burdensome paperwork. The Congressional Accountability Act will force Congress to adhere to the same regulations and pay the same fines, however unwise, as every other private business in America. Again, that is what is fair. And, that is what will give Members and

Senators a better practical understanding of the laws and regulations it passes—in the end, I believe, it is this forced compliance and practical understanding of our Nation's civil rights, labor and safety laws that will result in the repeal or modification of the ones that are burdensome, ill-drafted, or unnecessary to ensuring the safety and labor rights of our Nation's workers.

As John Motley of the National Federation of Independent Businesses stated so well in a recent letter to me

When Congress exempts itself from burdensome laws, it sets itself above the people it governs. A small business owner who fails to comply with these laws must face the full weight of the Federal Government. Congress will only understand the effect of the laws they impose on America's entrepreneurs and job creators if they are required to live under the very same laws.

Under S. 2, the 11 major safety and labor laws that are either completely or partially inapplicable now will apply to Congress. Those 11 laws are the Federal Labor Standards Act of 1964, and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans With Disabilities Act, the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, OSHA, the Federal Service Labor Management Relations Act, the Employee Protection Act, the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act and the Veterans Reemployment Act.

Congressional coverage will not be limited to those 11 laws. Under S. 2, all future legislation must include a report to describe how it applies to Congress or to describe why it does not. Consideration of a bill on the House or Senate floor would not be permitted if the bill report lacked such a statement. When the Congress knows that it must adhere to the provisions of whatever future legislation it passes, it will more likely pass legislation respecting the rights of individuals and businesses.

Mr. President, the Congressional Accountability Act will not only make the U.S. Congress a better employer, it will show the American people that we understand the unfairness of existing congressional exemptions. The old saying, "Do as I say, not as I do," will no longer apply to this institution because Congress will be living according to the same laws as others.

Passage of this bill completes an important first step up the ladder of change the American people have demanded. I am pleased to be a part of a national commitment to fundamentally changing the way business is conducted here in Washington, DC, and I urge my colleagues, without delay, to pass S. 2.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### NOMINATION OF ROBERT E. RUBIN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to go into execu-

tive session to consider the nomination of Mr. Robert E. Rubin to be Secretary of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Robert E. Rubin of New York to be Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I believe we are ready to vote.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I have known Bob Rubin for many years. He is a man of honesty and integrity who is certainly qualified to be Treasury Secretary.

Mr. Rubin has an excellent background as a lawyer, an investment banker, and most recently as the assistant to the President for economic policy.

His reputation on Wall Street, and more recently here in Washington, DC portrays a man who is not only hardworking and capable—but an effective consensus builder.

As we heard this morning in the Senate Finance Committee hearing, Bob Rubin is rare in that he has shown humility, and his self-effacing attitude toward getting things done has earned the respect of many of us on Capitol Hill.

If his frank and candid performance at the Senate Finance Committee is any indication of how he will serve as the Secretary of the Treasury, I believe that the U.S. Congress will have a Secretary who is not only capable, but will listen to us and engage in dialog that will be honest and fair.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this nomination.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in wholeheartedly supporting Robert E. Rubin for the position of Secretary of the Treasury. I have no doubt but that Bob will serve our country with a steadiness and honor similar to that evidenced by my old friend, and our former Senate colleague, outgoing Secretary Lloyd Bentsen.

I believe that Mr. Rubin has a full understanding and appreciation of the critical link between spiraling entitlement spending and the challenge of deficit reduction. I also believe that he shares my opinion that all tinkering at the margin of deficit reduction, such as eliminating Federal spending for a tsetse fly program, or Lawrence Welk's boyhood home, or even foreign aid, or eliminating "Waste, Fraud and Abuse," will do little to slow future deficit growth so long as entitlement spending remains unreformed.

This morning during Mr. Rubin's testimony before the Finance Committee, he assured the committee that deficit reduction was on the administration's