Snowbasin area would be beneficial to the people of the state of Utah;

Whereas the recent awarding of the 2002 Olympics to Salt Lake City increases the ski and recreational opportunities of the Snowbasin area;

Whereas Snowbasin has been designated as the site of several 2002 Winter Olympic event, with pre-olympic events scheduled for 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001;

Whereas these olympic and pre-olympic events add to the urgency to develop the Snowbasin area;

Whereas approximately 55 years ago, 4,300 acres of land in the Snowbasin area was transferred with little monetary consideration from private ownership to the United States Forest Service under the leadership of the Ogden Chamber of Commerce to stop overgrazing and to develop a year-round recreation area;

Whereas the Ogden-Weber Chamber of Commerce and many civic leaders now favor the transfer of 1,320 acres of this same land at Snowbasin to the Sun Valley Company for the purpose of developing a year-round recreational resort;

Whereas the Sun Valley Company has agreed to acquire and transfer into the public domain property of comparable value as selected by the United States Forest Service in exchange for the 1,320 acres received in the Snowbasin area;

Whereas Earl Holding, developer of world famous Sun Valley Resort, has established a proven track record as a developer of high-quality recreational resort facilities;

Whereas the proper development of the Snowbasin area would increase tourism in the state of Utah and would be extremely beneficial to the residents of northern Utah by creating numerous jobs and business opportunities;

Whereas the state of Utah has expended an excess of $14,000,000 to construct the Trappers Loop Highway for the purpose of servicing the Snowbasin/Upper Ogden Valley area;

Whereas the delay in facilitating the exchange of the number of areas requested by the Sun Valley Company could hamper the state's hosting of several olympic and international alpine skiing events and may make the development of a year-round resort economically infeasible;

Whereas the exchange of property to the Sun Valley Company would allow the United States Forest Service to acquire additional property as an exchange that, if property selected, would open up large areas of the public domain and better suit the Forest Service's objective of preserving the public land for public use than the retention of the proposed transfer property;

Whereas the intended use of the property in question when it was transferred into Forest Service supervision was to develop a ski and recreational area; and

Whereas The United States Congress is currently considering legislation that would complete the Snowbasin land exchange and enable the timely construction of facilities at Snowbasin needed for olympic and pre-olympic events: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Legislature of the state of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, the United States Forest Service, the United States Congress and President William J. Clinton to enact Snowbasin Land Exchange legislation for the purpose of preparing Snowbasin for olympic and pre-olympic events, and for developing Snowbasin as a multi-use, four season recreational resort area. Be it further

Resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to the Sun Valley Company, the United States Forest Service, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the members of Utah's congressional delegation, and President Clinton.

GAYLE FITZGERALD CORY, A TRIBUTE

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of my fellow Senators, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to a dedicated Senate worker, a courageous woman and a wonderful person. Gayle Fitzgerald Cory worked in the Senate for 35 years, serving in many capacities. She was indispensable to the late Senator Muskie for 22 years, holding positions from receptionist to executive assistant and making the transition to the State Department with him in 1980. She was also a valued member of Senator George Mitchell's staff as his personal assistant.

A person who has filled these roles can't help but accumulate a tremendous amount of knowledge on the workings of the Senate. Gayle Fitzgerald Cory was exceptionally qualified to take on the position of postmaster in 1989.

Up until her retirement in 1995, Mrs. Cory worked hard for the U.S. Senate, she was experienced, organized and capable of handling any task or crisis that came her way. Most of all, she was a great person. The post office employees—indeed, everyone with whom she came in contact—appreciated her warmth and her sense of fairness. An extremely professional woman, she had an almost uncanny understanding of the special needs of the Senate, and she was instrumental in making it work.

My condolences go out to her husband, Don, her three daughters, Laurie, Melissa, and Carol, and all the members of her large and loving family. She was a courageous, strong person and we will all miss her.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

WHITE HOUSE TRAVEL OFFICE LEGISLATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 2937, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2937) for the reimbursement of attorney fees and costs incurred by former employees of the White House Travel Office with respect to the termination of their employment in that office on May 19, 1993.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Dole amendment No. 3952, in the nature of a substitute.

Dole amendment No. 3953 (to amendment No. 3952), to provide for an effective date for the settlement of certain claims against the United States.

Dole amendment No. 3954 (to amendment No. 3953), to provide for an effective date for the settlement of certain claims against the United States.

Dole motion to refer the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report back forthwith.

Dole amendment No. 3955 (to the instructions to the motion to refer), to provide for an effective date for the settlement of certain claims against the United States.

Dole amendment No. 3956 (to amendment No. 3955), to provide for an effective date for the settlement of certain claims against the United States.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the bill that is before us—the bill to reimburse the people that were harmed in the unfair firing at the White House in January 1993, the bill that is for reimbursement to the people that are called the Travelgate 17.

Mr. President, I think it is very obvious that when politics stands in the way of resolving a right or wrong issue, politics always gets trampled. Right means that politics has to be put to the side. Some examples come to mind: The civil rights laws of the 1960's; the end of the defense buildup in the 1980's; the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, which I sponsored.

This bill before us falls into that category. It is to reimburse the Travelgate 7. Now, obviously, it is much less in scope than all of these other major pieces of legislation I mentioned over the last 30 years. However, let me make it very clear that it is a microcosm of the same reality. It is a right and wrong issue. And politics is standing in its way. But I predict that politics will stand in its way only temporarily. Travelgate is the story of an arrogant White House trampling all over the rights of seven dedicated public servants.

The purpose behind the abuse was so that cronies of the President could win the spoils of political gain for themselves.

One of these people was a rich Hollywood producer, friend of Bill, high-dollar campaign contributor, buddy and crony by the name of Harry Thomason. The other was a distant cousin of the President's, Catherine Cornelius.

The White House, apparently including the President and First Lady, unleashed the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Department of Justice to harass these seven citizens. As if that were not enough, the White House also used its authority and its access to the media to conduct a public smear campaign against the seven innocent people. Following something that is too customary in this town, they used leaks, innuendoes, and falsities to continue their public harassment even after their primary target, Billy Dale, was acquitted by a jury, and it only took the jury less than 2 hours of deliberation to declare his innocence.

The net effect of all of this harassment took a real toll—these are real people—not only on the seven employees but maybe even more so on their families as well. These innocent people

had their reputations, their dignity, and their psychological well-being suffer at the hands of an irresponsible White House. This is a White House that to this very day refuses to accept its wrongdoing. No one takes responsibility for their firings of these seven people.

What do we get out of the White House? All you get is finger pointing. All you get is passing the buck. By the way, the harassment continues. But now it is not harassment from the White House; it is legislative harassment as we have legislation here trying to right this wrong. So the legislation that has just been laid down for today's discussion, the bill we have before us is to make these seven innocent people economically whole.

Well, maybe you cannot do that, but at least pay for their legal expenses. I do not know how you can right the wrongs that have been committed, but at least there is precedent for legislation to pay for legal expenses, legal expenses for people who were innocent, declared innocent by a jury of their peers.

So activity moves from the finger pointing at the White House to activity up here on the Hill in the legislative process, but the White House is still involved, fanning out its lieutenants to sabotage this bill in the dark of night. The objective of the White House and the opponents of this legislation, the people who are not willing to admit a wrong in the firing of seven innocent people, is to bring this bill down so that the President is spared the embarrassment of signing a bill, the only reason for the existence of which in the first place is that the White House fired seven innocent people. In other words, I might add, the same President who passed the buck in the first place in not taking responsibility for the firings at the White House is behind this effort to sabotage this legislation on the Hill to right this wrong.

The legislative harassment strategy began with Democrat Senators putting a hold on the bill. For those watching who maybe do not understand how Congress works, a hold is a way that any Senator can prevent a bill from being considered, and the instigator of any hold does not have to identify himself. He can do it in the secrecy of the Cloakroom out of the public's eye. But last week the people with the hold were smoked out. The rock was lifted. And the instigators of the hold went scurrying for cover of darkness once again. Having retreated from the back room, they are now positioned at the next line of defense, out on the floor of the Senate to use a legislative roadblock. It is called muddying the waters, or in this case you might say the ''whitewaters.''

This strategy goes like this: how can we as opponents bog down the bill on a technicality or some counter argument that sounds reasonable but gives us sufficient cover so that we can filibuster the underlying legislation, the Travelgate bill, that pays the legal expenses of seven innocent people who were fired within the first month that the Clintons came to office.

So the White House, getting their lieutenants on the Hill to take all this activity against this simple little bill, comes up with a counterargument: If the Travelgate seven are going to get reimbursed, why not reimburse everyone associated with the Whitewater investigation? And they also came up with a technicality. They say we just want to use this bill as a vehicle for other items that are on our agenda. They would argue it is our right as minority Members of this body.

So here we are, Mr. President, with politics getting in the way of a right and wrong issue, where right ought to win out, but politics, if it is played correctly and sophisticated enough, can win. If we cannot deal with apples, let us just throw in some oranges. Put it into the mix. Confuse the situation. So now in this Chamber to fool the public we are dealing with apples and oranges legislation generated by the other side of the aisle because they want to protect the President not having to veto this legislation.

However, political barriers to correcting a wrong will not stand. Ultimately, public opinion will weigh in against the Democrats and the White House on this issue. All the harassment strategies to save the President from embarrassment will only make the final embarrassment bigger and worse. It is inevitable. It is predictable. It will happen. You cannot forever cover up wrong in our open society.

There is a moral to this story: Nothing is politically right which is morally wrong. I wish to repeat the moral of the story: Nothing is politically right that is morally wrong.

That is why all this political maneuvering is destined to fail. The public will not tolerate political interference with righting a wrong. Frankly, it is time that the President of the United States, the occupant of the White House, take responsibility for his actions in firing these seven dedicated public servants. What do we get instead? He continues the campaign to prevent his own embarrassment over the firings. The truth is if the firings and the circumstances were not wrong, there would be no embarrassment. But the obvious fact is the firings were wrong.

Why should we expect the President of the United States to accept responsibility for his actions? First of all, because he is the President of the United States. In that position, he is the moral leader of our Nation. A leader is expected to take responsibility for his actions or for those who act in his stead. That includes both good actions and bad actions.

Furthermore, I think the President himself has spoken out very loudly and clearly about responsibility and, in his saying this, implied that he saw the Office of the Presidency as one for moral leadership and he was going to assume that moral leadership because of things that he said when he was a candidate. While running for office in 1992, he said the following: ''Responsibility starts at the top. That's what the New Covenant is all about.''

In a further quote, and this was criticizing, in 1992, then-President Bush, candidate Clinton had this to say: ''The buck doesn't stop with George Bush; it doesn't even slow down there.''

I think it is fair to say that on this issue, the buck does not even slow down with the President. In fact, I have rarely seen a buck change hands so many times. From the perspective of the Office of the President and its occupant being moral leader for our Nation, what kind of example does that set for the American people? What kind of moral leadership is that? Each time that a leader fails to take responsibility for his actions, he undercuts his moral authority to lead. Over time, a leader like that loses the confidence of those he is leading, the people of our country.

So, more so than anything else that deals with this issue, dollars and cents aside, righting wrongs aside, that is the issue here, that is the reality of whether moral leadership is going to be the example at the White House. The bill is all about Congress taking the initiative to right a wrong, and those trying to block it are conspiring against the President taking responsibility for his mistakes. But the issue is moral leadership of the White House, a President saying when he is wrong that he is wrong.

So I urge my colleagues on the other side to save the President any more embarrassment. Stop legislative shenanigans. Work with us to do what little we can to repair what was unjustly done to seven dedicated public servants, innocent by a determination of the jury, unfairly fired within just a matter of days of a new President being sworn in.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, again, speaking about the bill that is before us, the bill to reimburse Mr. Dale for his legal expenses that were attributed to him in his defense when the jury found him innocent of the wrongdoing he was charged with supposedly at the running of the White House Travel Office and his firing by the White House, I want to continue my discussion of this legislation by referring to one of the evening news shows. I believe it is NBC that has a segment called ''In Their Own Words,''

that lets real people tell a story in their own words without the filter of a journalist's slant on that story. I would like to do my own version of ''In Their Words.''

On January 24 of this year, a hearing was held in the other body by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. The witnesses included the seven fired from the White House Travel Office. I want my colleagues to know firsthand of the indignity suffered by these seven at the hands of our leaders in the White House. So, for the RECORD, I will quote these seven employees in their own words from their own testimony, their own prepared statements before the House committee.

The first statement—and I am not going to quote the whole statement, just portions of it—the first statement is by Billy Dale, the person that the legislation before us involves. He was former director of the White House Travel Office. These are a couple paragraphs from his statement:

It was not easy for me or my family. We were subjected to the most intense intrusions and harassment you can imagine. We were sustained during those very difficult times by our faith and the many friends and professional colleagues who stood by our side.

I had hoped that after the jury found me not guilty so quickly, we could return to the very quiet and simple life we used to live. However, since the release of David Watkins' memorandum describing how he was supposedly pressured to fire the entire staff at the White House Travel Office, I have been subjected to false attacks at least as vicious as the ones I was tried and acquitted. This time, however, there is no trial pending.

To further quote at another point in Mr. Dale's testimony:

What matters to me is that fancy lawyers and others who speak for the White House not be allowed to get away with the lie that my colleagues and I were involved in other kinds of wrongdoing. It also matters to me that people not be allowed to spread the equally vicious lie that I was willing to plead guilty to embezzlement before trial. And, finally, it matters to me that these same people not be allowed to tell the public that the Travel Office was cleaned up and is now managed better.

A further quote from Mr. Dale at another point in his testimony:

All these facts lead us to conclude that the financial mismanagement that the White House says is the reason we were fired is just a convenient excuse. If the President or the First Lady or anyone else wanted us out in order to give the business to their friends and supporters, that was their privilege. But why can't they just admit that that is what they wanted to do, rather than continue to make up accusations to hide that fact?

Another person who testified before the House Government Operations Committee is Barney Brasseux, and I quote from his testimony:

For me, the 19th of May, 1993 was the beginning of a difficult time and the first of several eventful days that turned my life upside down. I was fired, told to vacate the premises within 2 hours, driven out of the White House in the back of a cargo van with no seats, implicated by the White House in criminal wrongdoing and placed under investigation by the United States Justice Department, even though I had no financial responsibility whatsoever in the office.

Many questions and concerns have been raised in these reports regarding the handling of our termination. The manner of our dismissal, the damage to our reputations, the impact of this action on our families, the possible involvement of the First Lady of the United States, and the role of the Federal Bureau of Investigation are just a few. All of these issues are very important to me and I trust to you as well.

A further quote from John P. McSweeney. The title of his position at the White House was assistant to the director, White House Travel Office:

Although I have been a registered Democrat for 44 years, it was not a political but a civil service appointment. This came to an abrupt halt while I was on leave in Ireland when my son Jim called to inform me that the evening news shows had just announced that the entire staff of our office had been fired and that the FBI was starting an investigation for possible criminal activity.

Continuing to quote Mr. McSweeney:

Although the White House recognized that not all of us had any financial authority, for the next 30 months we all became part of a full-blown Department of Justice investigation with Billy Dale as their target. For myself, it involved FBI agents interviewing my neighbors, two grand jury appearances, two Justice Department and FBI interviews, and one meeting with the IRS, along with legal fees of over $65,000 of my retirement funds.

Over time, where before I had been intimidated, it now turned to complete frustration as the White House had free reign with the media in putting out its story while we were muzzled by the Justice Department. They presented me with a letter that stated that I was not a subject or target of their investigation at the present time, which meant that anything I said could be used against me.

Again, from Mr. McSweeney, he had this to say:

We were already described as no more than glorified bellmen for the press. I would only quote the President at his press conference of last week when he said, ''an allegation is not the same thing as a fact'' and also that [quoting the President] ''the American people are fundamentally fair-minded.'' [End of quote of the President.]

Mr. McSweeney goes on to say.

I would hope that he [meaning the President] would repeat his statement to some of his spokesmen.

Along these same lines, during your hearings of last week, a new so-what, who-cares attitude seemed to be the new theme for some in this room. During a recent First Lady interview, Mrs. Clinton expressed, as would any parent, how concerned she was and the effort she had made to help her daughter cope with hearing the many negative comments being made about her mother.

Blanche Dale, unfortunately, was not able to do so for her daughters over the past 30 months. She had to sit and watch as her daughter Kim who, 2 days after returning from her honeymoon, had to report to the Department of Justice and show how she had paid for her wedding, her reception, her honeymoon, and, since we were present at her reception, answer questions about any discussions we may have had.

Her daughter Vickie, when interviewed by the Justice Department, in explaining that she was giving her cash car payments to her father so that he could deposit them in the White House Credit Union for her, was asked if she was not uncomfortable with giving her cash to someone who was stealing money from the Travel Office.

To those who say so what, you should remember that the American people may have a gray area on legalese, but they know right from wrong.

That is the end of quoting from the House document.

The American people do know right from wrong. That is why a jury of peers of Mr. Dale acquitted him. That is why this legislation is before us, because the American people do know right from wrong. But the White House has not admitted right from wrong yet.

So, Madam President, I want to conclude by saying something that Shakespeare had to say in the play ''Othello,'' because the character of Iago in that play seemed to sum up nicely what each of these seven employees and their families went through. I will quote from Shakespeare.

Who steals my purse steals trash. But he that filches from me my good name, robs me of that which not enriches him, and makes me poor indeed.

That is what we are talking about here, Madam President. And this bill before us does not even begin to address what really makes these citizens poor. Money alone cannot do it, but this bill is a start. So I urge my colleagues to help make a start for them on their road to recovery.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRASSLEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I want to make a few comments about this Billy Dale bill.

As everybody knows, Billy Dale was unjustly persecuted. His colleagues were mistreated. The costs to them are unfair. You would think everybody in the Senate would want to immediately rectify all of those wrongs. I hope that our colleagues on the other side will not filibuster this because of their concerns about other legislation that they will have an opportunity to bring up.

This is very, very important legislation. It is fair. It will establish a decent resolution to what really has been awful. Let me just give the time line of some of the Travel Office events so that everybody understands, at least to a certain degree, what happened here.

On May 19, 1993, the White House fired all seven Travel Office employees. At least two of those individuals first learned about their dismissals on the evening news. Talk about a crass way of doing it. The White House first stated that the firings came as a result of an internal audit revealing financial irregularities in the office.

Several months of independent review and oversight hearings uncovered

the actual motivation for the firings. Certain people, hoping to advance their own financial interests, attempted to destroy the reputations of the Travel Office employees and take over the Travel Office business of the White House, and, I might add, some indication of the whole Government. These same persons used White House staff members to initiate a baseless criminal investigation by the FBI. It was one of the low ebbs in criminal law enforcement in this country.

According to the congressional investigation, certain individuals were responsible for the firings—Catherine Cornelius, a cousin of the President employed at the White House; Harry Thomason, a close personal friend of the President and First Lady; Darnell Martins, Mr. Thomason's business partner; and David Watkins, assistant to the President for management and administration. These were the people primarily responsible for the firings.

In December 1992, discussions took place between Ms. Cornelius and World Wide Travel, the agency that served the Clinton-Gore campaign, about the eventual takeover of the White House Travel Office business.

In January 1993, Watkins hired Ms. Cornelius. Soon thereafter, the Travel Office began taking calls from Ms. Cornelius as the new head of the Travel Office.

In February 1993, Ms. Cornelius provided Watkins with a proposal that would make her a co-director of the White House Travel Office and would hire World Wide Travel as the outside travel specialist.

In April and May 1993, Ms. Cornelius began to focus on the Travel Office and with Harry Thomason claimed that there were allegations of corruption within the office. During this time, Ms. Cornelius and Mr. Thomason pushed to have World Wide take over the Travel Office business.

In May 1993, employees of the White House counsel's office, Ms. Cornelius, and others met with the FBI regarding the Travel Office. Although the FBI was unsure that enough evidence existed to warrant a criminal investigation, William Kennedy of the White House counsel's office, former partner of the First Lady, informed Bureau agents that a request for an FBI evaluation came from the highest levels. At this time, it was determined that the accounting firm of Peat Marwick would be asked to perform an audit of the Travel Office.

On May 14, Peat Marwick's management consultants made their first trip to the White House.

On May 17, Mr. Watkins and Mr. McLarty decided to fire the Travel Office staff. Although Mr. Dale offered to retire, Mr. Watkins told him to wait until the review was complete.

On May 19, Patsy Thomasson informed Mr. Kennedy that a decision had been made to fire the travel office workers. Kennedy informed the FBI, who warned him that the firings could interfere with their criminal investigation. Kennedy informed the Bureau that the firings would go ahead anyway.

That same day, before the bodies were even cold, Mr. Martens called a friend from Air Advantage to have her arrange the Presidential press charters. Meanwhile, Mr. Kennedy instructed Mr. Watkins to delete any reference to the FBI investigation from talking points on the firings.

At 10 a.m. that same morning, Watkins informed the travel office employees that they were being fired because a review revealed gross mismanagement in the office. They were initially told that they had 2 hours to pack up, clean out their desks, and leave. Watkins learned that press secretary Dee Dee Myers had publicly disclosed existence of the FBI investigation as well as the Peat Marwick review. Later that same day, Myers gave another press briefing in which she denied that an FBI investigation had taken place. She claimed that the firings were based on the Peat Marwick review.

Interestingly, the Peat Marwick review was not finalized until May 21, 1993, 2 days after the firings. The report was dated on May 17, however. The report gave no assurances as to either its completeness or its accuracy. In any event, while the report found certain accounting irregularities, it found no evidence of fraud.

In May 1994, the General Accounting Office reported to Congress that while the White House claimed the terminations were based on ''findings of serious financial mismanagement weaknesses, we noted that individuals who had personal and business interests in the travel office created the momentum that ultimately led to the examination of the travel office operations.'' GAO, the General Accounting Office, further noted that ''the public acknowledgment of the criminal investigation had the effect of tarnishing the employees' reputations, and the existence of the criminal investigation caused the employees to retain legal counsel, reportedly at considerable expense.''

Of course, as everyone in this body knows, Mr. Dale was the only travel office employee to be indicted. And it took a jury only 2 days to acquit Mr. Dale after a 13-day trial.

There was no reason to indict Mr. Dale. There was no reason to tarnish the reputation of these White House Travel Office employees. There was no reason to brutalize these people the way they were brutalized. And there is no reason for us in this body not to pass this legislation unanimously and to resolve this manner in an honorable, compassionate, reasonable, honest, and decent way. That is what this is all about. This is to right a wrong, or a series of wrongs.

It may never fully resolve the tarnishing of the reputations of these people. It may never do that. But at least we can do what we can do at this late date, because of the injustices that were committed at the White House by certain White House employees and whoever those were who were referred to as those at the top of the heap, at ''the highest levels of the White House.''

Frankly, whoever they were, they ought to be ashamed of themselves because in all honesty, these poor people, whose situation we are trying to resolve today, have been very badly damaged.

I do not know what it means, by ''the highest levels of the White House,'' but I have carefully stayed away from some of the characterizations that others have given, where there are some facts that would indicate who are at the highest levels of the White House and who were at that particular time.

Just so everybody knows about what is going on here, this legislation provides for payment of the legal expenses incurred by Billy Dale, Barney Brasseux, John Dreylinger, Ralph Maughan, John McSweeney, and Gary Wright. The legal expenses are in connection with the wrongful criminal investigation launched against these seven people subsequent to their firings.

Though Mr. Dale suffered the greatest financial loss, half a million dollars, the remaining six employees collectively incurred about $200,000 in their own defense. The appropriations bill for the Department of Transportation for fiscal 1994 provided approximately $150,000 in reimbursement of legal fees. This bill would provide the balance.

This bill would not provide for compensation of all expenses associated with the investigation into the Travel Office matter, such as legal costs incurred in preparation for appearing before Congress. But it would provide for attorney's fees and costs that resulted from these seven defending themselves against criminal charges.

The Travel Office employees will have 120 days after this legislation is enacted make a claim for legal expenses. All legal bills submitted will be reviewed for their appropriateness and any reimbursement will be reduced according to prior Department of Transportation reimbursements.

According to independent counsel statutes, attorneys' fees may be reimbursed to individuals confronted with the unique circumstance of being subject to the scrutiny of a Federal investigation. This is not something that the ordinary U.S. citizen is subject to. In the case of the White House Travel Office firings, the staff of the Travel office was investigated by the Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Internal Revenue Service. But for the fact that they were Federal employees, who were fired by the White House, these individuals would not have been investigated by these agencies. The White House was able to bring the power of Federal law enforcement to bear on otherwise

blameless individuals. And people know that they are blameless.

Reimbursement of legal fees under independent counsel statutes was designed, at least partially, because of the potential for political abuse of the investigative power of the independent counsel. The White House has the authority to wield tremendous power with respect to Federal investigations. None of the Travel Office employees held prominent posts in the White House, but they became a target of a Federal criminal investigation. These public servants never should have been scrutinized in this way and forced to defend themselves in this manner.

Hamilton Jordan, who worked for the Carter administration, is an example of a case in which attorney's fees were reimbursed. Mr. Hamilton Jordan was investigated for charges of cocaine use. After an independent counsel was appointed and the evidence was examined, all charges were dropped. I felt that was a low point in our country's history. In defending himself through this ordeal, Mr. Jordan spent thousands of dollars in legal fees. Since the charges were baseless, Congress provided reimbursement of his legal expenses and related costs. His legal fees were reimbursed, in part, because he was a Federal employee and would not, under ordinary circumstances, be subject to an independent counsel investigation. The circumstances of the Travel Office employees are similar in this respect.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues on the other side are not going to delay this bill. I hope that, as serious and as deeply as they feel about other matters, that they will recognize the injustices that have occurred here and we will all vote 100 to zip to rectify these wrongs that have occurred to these White House people, former White House people.

Like I say, we may never be able to make it up to them because of the tarnishing of their reputations that occurred through this process. But we ought to do the best we can, and that is what this bill is all about. It is the right thing to do. It is the appropriate thing to do. It is the compassionate thing to do. And I think it is a long overdue thing to do.

I do not know anybody on the other side who would vote against this. I do not know anybody on the other side who would differ with what we are trying to do here.

This has been a bipartisan effort. Like I say, 350 Members of the House voted for it, only 43 against it. I think it is time for us to do what is right here, and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the floor will help us get this done today.

I see my colleague would like to speak. I have some other things I want to say on another matter. Is it on this matter?

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Utah will allow me, I would like to make a few comments and maybe engage the Senator in a couple of questions, if that is permissible.

Mr. HATCH. That is fine. I will be happy to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. I thank the Chair for recognizing me, and I also thank the distinguished Senator from Utah, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for allowing me to make a few comments and observations, plus ask a couple of questions.

First, the distinguished Senator from Utah, Mr. President, just said that the proposal to appropriate or to allocate some $487,000 to pay the legal fees for Mr. Billy Dale is to right a wrong. I think this body wants to right a wrong, and I think this body, if there has been a wrong committed in the Billy Dale matter, will support the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

However, before we do that, I think we need to really ask ourselves what we are doing here.

First, to right this wrong, as the distinguished chairman has mentioned, we are going to be overlooking a very, very large number of individuals who have been wronged. Now, are we going to apply this same test and this same standard, are we then going to try to right this wrong for many, many people who have come to testify before the Special Watergate Committee, who have testified before Kenneth Starr's grand jury and before the trial in Little Rock, AR? What sort of a standard are we going to adopt for these individuals?

For example, Maggie Williams is the secretary to Mrs. Clinton at the White House. Today, she is not a target. Today, she does not expect, I assume, to be indicted. Today, there is no one who stands at the gate with shackles or leg irons to take Maggie Williams off to jail, but today she owes over $200,000 in legal bills. This is not someone who makes a great sum of money, relatively speaking, Mr. President. This is someone who, basically, was doing her job as she saw fit, along with many other people who are involved in the White House and who have been called before the special committee and before Mr. Starr.

We have had 45 hearings and 5 public meetings. This committee has met 250 hours. The committee has heard testimony from 123 individuals. They have taken depositions from 213 individuals. Some of these witnesses have testified and have been deposed two and three times. These numbers do not include the hundreds of other citizens who have been deposed and appeared as witnesses before committees in the House of Representatives, the independent counsel, the RTC, and the FDIC.

Mr. President, I ask my friend from Utah, is there not some degree of sentiment or concern for these individuals? Perhaps I can pose that question to my friend.

Mr. HATCH. This is considerably different from Whitewater. I have to say the Whitewater investigation is not completed. As a member of the Whitewater Committee, I have to say that there is an awful lot of undercurrent, an awful lot that is wrong with what went on in that area. There are a lot of unanswered questions. There are documents still to be delivered. There are questions concerning each of the witnesses who have appeared. I think until that is resolved, as was Billy Dale's, I do not think we can make a determination as to whether we should get involved with attorney's fees.

Let us assume there is a tremendous injustice at the end of the Whitewater matter. I think you are going to have a rough time making that case with all of what some would call the sleaze factor throughout the Whitewater hearings and proceedings. But let us assume that it turns out to be the same as Billy Dale's and the White House Travel Office employees' acquittal or even a clear-cut set of facts that there really was nothing wrong and nobody did anything wrong. I personally believe that is going to be a hard conclusion to reach after having listened and watched the Whitewater proceedings now for a long time. But let us assume that happens. Yes, I would be interested in righting that wrong as well.

In this case, we have come to a conclusion. I think the effective conclusion was when Billy Dale had to go through the litigation and the courtroom proceedings, having been accused of criminal activity, having been indicted and having gone through a jury trial and having a jury of his peers conclude that Billy Dale was an honest man. I think the facts showed he was an honest man throughout this process.

I think that is completely distinguishable, at least at this time. Now, if at the end of Whitewater there are those who have been unjustly treated in the same manner who had the same clear vindication that Mr. Dale and his colleagues have, yes, this Senator would want to do what is right there as well.

Until it is concluded, I do not see how you can argue that is the same situation. Although I have to tell you, I really believe there is far too much of this stuff going on, these counteraccusations back and forth, and far too many things that are done on a political basis.

Frankly, one last thing, since Whitewater—let me just make that point a little bit better, too. I think there is far too much politics played on both sides from time to time. But just to make the point on the Whitewater, I have to say, the subject of Whitewater is the subject of an independent counsel investigation, which Billy Dale's was not, and subjects of an independent counsel investigation will have a right to be compensated for attorney's fees, assuming there is no

wrong, if there is no indictment handed down, and that is the way the law is. So there is a protection built in on the Whitewater matter that is not built in on the Billy Dale matter.

Be that as it may, my colleague has been a friend of mine for a long time. He knows me, and I know him, and he is my friend. He knows if I think there is an injustice, I do not care about the politics, I am going to try to right that wrong. In this case, I do not think anybody denies there was an injustice. I do not think anybody denies there was a series of wrongs. I do not think anybody denies his reputation and those of his colleagues were besmirched and tarnished by inappropriate action by certain people at the White House and others. I do not think he would deny at all there is no other way to get them reimbursed for this travesty which happened to them other than our doing the right thing and compassionately standing up and saying we are going to reimburse them.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I think it is time to set the record straight. The distinguished Senator from Utah has stated if Billy Dale, who has been indicted and now we are about to pay his attorney's fees—if there is an indictment by the special counsel, by Kenneth Starr, or any other special counsel, if that indictment ever comes forth, then the attorney's fees are not automatically paid, they are not reimbursed if there is an indictment by the special counsel.

We are carving out a very special, new area here, Mr. President, and I think we ought to all know what we are doing.

Mr. HATCH. Let us make it clear. If Maggie Williams, to use the distinguished Senator's illustration, is not indicted, she is entitled to attorney's fees reimbursement. If she is indicted, she is not.

If she is indicted and she is tried in a court of law—and I do not mean to pick on Maggie. The Senator used the illustration. Let us use just a hypothetical. Let us say ''A'' is indicted. They go to the criminal trial, and ''A'' is convicted. We are not going to pay the attorney fees in that situation. But let us say ''A'' is acquitted, then I think it is an appropriate thing for us to come at that time and see what we can do to right the wrongs that were there.

Mr. PRYOR. I think once again, Mr. President, we are setting out Mr. Dale as a very special individual. This is special legislation to benefit him. Others do not have the benefit of this special legislation. I am simply saying that if we are going to do this for one, I do not understand why we do not do it for others.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator would yield. I do not think we should do it prospectively. I think if we see wrongs, we can right them on the floor. I do not see any reason to have any problem righting this wrong. If there are wrongs that need to be righted in the future, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee I am going to do my best to right them. My colleague knows that is so. I do not care about the politics and who is on whose side. If I think it is wrong, we ought to do it. But I do not think we should do it prospectively for a blanket righting of wrongs without knowing what case it is.

This is special legislation, there is no question about it. But, Mr. Dale, Billy Dale, is a special case. He was singled out by the White House for an unjust prosecution, frankly, very unjustly so, wrongly so. I think, since my friend is from Arkansas and is the strongest supporter of the President here, that he would give credibility to even the President's comments that he thinks this ought to be righted, these wrongs ought to be resolved.

Mr. PRYOR. Once again, I think, Mr. President, we need to set the record straight. The White House did not prosecute Mr. Dale. The White House did not prosecute Mr. Dale. The Justice Department prosecuted Mr. Dale. He was indicted by a grand jury. He was acquitted. Maybe that is good. I am not here to argue that. I may very well support this, but what I would say——

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield? The Justice Department leaked his plea arrangements. The Attorney General is appointed by the White House. I am not blaming her. The White House has a certain element of control there. White House officials brought in FBI people. They directed the FBI to investigate this.

Frankly, without the White House, this travesty would never have occurred. It was people in the White House who absolutely were wrong. Everybody knows today who brought this about. I have to say, Billy Dale went down the drain financially and reputationwise because of people down at the White House, some of whom have greed on their minds with outside people, who did not care about Billy Dale, did not care who they tramped on. They did not care about this poor little guy who served eight Presidents, and his colleagues, and put them through an untold amount of misery, that he still is suffering from, and has broken them without any justification whatsoever, not any. Even Peat Marwick agrees with that.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Utah made an impassioned plea for justice, an impassioned plea to, so-called, right a wrong. I hope the Senator from Utah will apply that same passionate plea for justice to my sense-of-the-Senate resolution. I hope that the Senator from Utah will allow me, this Senator from Arkansas, to call up amendment No. 3959 to this Travelgate proposal and allow a sense-of-the-Senate resolution to go forth.

If I might ask the distinguished Senator, has the Senator filled up the tree or is an amendment possible?

Mr. HATCH. The tree is filled up.

Mr. PRYOR. Is there any reason why we cannot amend this bill? I want to know that.

Mr. HATCH. What is the sense-of-the-Senate resolution?

Mr. PRYOR. I am glad the Senator asks.

Sense of the Senate for the reimbursement to certain individuals for legal expenses relating to the Whitewater Development Corporation investigation.

FINDINGS. The Senate finds that—

(1) The Senate Special Committee to Investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters . . . has required depositions from 213 individuals and testimony before the committee from 123 individuals;

(2) many public servants and other citizens have incurred considerable legal expenses responding to requests of the Committee;

(3) many of these public servants and other citizens were not involved with the Whitewater Development Corporation or related matters under investigation;

And here, I say to my friend:

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) a legal expense fund should be established to compensate individuals for legal expenses incurred responding to requests by the Committee; and [finally]

(2) only those individuals who have not been named, targeted, or convicted in the investigation of the Independent Counsel relating to the Whitewater Development Corporation should be eligible for reimbursement from the fund.

If they are indicted, they do not get any compensation for their attorneys. If they are not, if they are not named, if they are not a target—how in the world can we keep bringing these people up here, arraigning them before the committee, making them pay their own expenses, making them absorb all these legal fees? How can we do it? I hope you will allow me to introduce and present this sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

Mr. HATCH. Of course, we cannot do that. First of all, there would be somebody in here on every congressional hearing. So we cannot allow that. That is way too broad. Second, you know, our bill does not cover congressional hearings. This Billy Dale hearing does not cover congressional hearings. I am talking about the bipartisan bill of both sides. It does not cover congressional hearings. They are not going to be reimbursed for their attorney fees for that. They are reimbursed for their attorney fees to protect themselves from criminal charges.

Frankly, this is not going to reimburse Mr. Dale for everything he has incurred. It certainly is never going to get his reputation back, although I think everybody who knows him and knows what happened probably respects him even more today for having gone through what he did.

Let me just make a point here. Even some of the most partisan people in the House were in favor of this bill. A person I have a lot of respect for as one of the more intelligent Democrats in the House is BARNEY FRANK of Massachusetts. This is right out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the House debate. He said this:

Mr. Speaker, the Congress retains always not the right but the responsibility to make

judgments case by case. I think the gentleman from New Mexico has fairly pointed out, should some other individuals come before the Congress and be able to make claims that Congress finds similarly meritorious, they may benefit. I do have to differ a little bit with the argument that says, ''Well, we should not do it for anybody if we cannot do it for everybody.''

Then he goes on to say:

Mr. Speaker, we unfortunately rarely can do justice for everyone. I have myself, because I served on the Administrative Law Subcommittee, which dealt with claims on the Immigration Subcommittee, been part of bringing to this floor legislation that made some people whole when other people similarly situated were not made whole. We can never do it all. And I think it would be a mistake to say either we do all of it or we do none of it.

Then he goes on to say:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico, who I think stated it the best way we can. This neither sets a precedent nor precludes someone. Any new case will be judged on the same merits.

There is one of the leading Democrats on the Judiciary Committee in the House, one of the brightest people in the House of Representatives, a person I have worked with ever since he has been here, I have to say, someone who is known as a very intelligent, aggressive, and effective partisan in the Democratic Party, and someone whose liberal credentials I think would match anybody's over here. He made it clear that you just cannot solve every case with one bill.

I will just say this to my dear friend from Arkansas. I feel for people who are called before congressional hearings. I do. I wish we never had to call anybody, except to enlighten us and help us pass better legislation. I do think independent counsel are used far too often. I also think that far too often people do have to hire attorneys around here just to make sure they are protected and they have some protection for themselves.

I understand that personally. There were very unjust accusations against me where I had to hire attorneys that cost me over $300,000 just to make sure that nobody pulls any dirty tricks on you. Frankly, nobody understands that. Nobody reimbursed me, I have to say. I think there are many, many other Members who have had similar situations where they have been very unjustly treated and where they get stuck with attorney fees. I personally do not like it. I personally think it is wrong.

In Whitewater, I think we do have to wait until it is over, at least until we conclude the hearings, and then determine if people are indicted—if they are indicted; if they are not, they are not—and then determine which cases are those where there has been injustice. It has to be on a case-by-case basis. That is my experience in the Judiciary Committee. Otherwise, we would be the fountain of all money here.

Now, with respect to your amendment, I note that, No. 1, the Whitewater investigation is not complete. When it is, we can consider whether or not we will compensate people for testifying regarding Whitewater. Your sense-of-the-Senate resolution would set a bad precedent to provide compensation even before the investigation is complete.

No. 2, our bill, unlike your sense-of-the-Senate resolution, does not provide compensation, any compensation, for those who might testify before the Congress. It provides compensation in this case for what are legitimate reasons, what are compassionate reasons, what are honest and just reasons, that I think virtually everybody, except 43 Members of the House, would agree with.

I think if my colleague would take my word for it, I certainly will try to rectify any injustices that come in the future, whether from Whitewater or others, and I think maybe by remedying some of these things, maybe we can get Members of Congress and other people who are so quick to smear people to not do so much because it will cost the taxpayer occasionally to rectify these wrongs.

Frankly, I would like to get rid of the smear tactics in the White House, and sometimes in the Congress, and get down to doing our jobs and doing them modestly, without trying to make political advantage, as some have done—I am not accusing the Senator from Arkansas of doing this—as some have done in times past.

I think this is a completely distinguishable thing from Whitewater, even though I understand the distinguished Senator has many friends who have been involved in the investigation and is concerned about them, as I would be if I was their Senator. I think, justly, he is raising these issues so we will be more sensitive about them in the future. I assure my colleagues I will be sensitive about them.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I think there is another injustice here, and that injustice is that we are bringing this measure to the floor of the Senate and we are being precluded from offering any amendments to it whatever. We cannot offer any amendments to it.

Now, I wonder how defensible that position is by the Senator from Utah, when all that I have here is a simple sense-of-the-Senate resolution. It does not require anything. It does not appropriate one dime. It merely says that a legal defense fund should be established to compensate individuals for legal expenses incurred, responding to requests by the committee, and only those individuals who have not been named, targeted, or convicted in the investigation of the independent counsel related to the Whitewater Development Corp. should be eligible for reimbursement from the fund.

Does the Senator from Utah say that he is going to preclude me from offering this amendment, this simple sense-of-the-Senate resolution?

Mr. HATCH. I am saying that the Senator is already precluded because the trees are filled up.

Second, we should just understand here, the reason why the trees were filled is because this is a noncontroversial, bipartisan-supported, I think, 100 to zip vote in the Senate, and some of our colleagues on the other side want to load it up with controversial partisan amendments.

Frankly, I would just like to pass the bill and find the right vehicle to bring up the partisan amendments. With regard to the Senator's sense-of-the-Senate resolution, which I think he would have to admit would not be binding on anybody, frankly, I think the Senator should take my word that if there are injustices with these people, we will work them out in the future. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I do not want any injustices there any more than I do in the case of Billy Dale. Until the investigation is complete, I think it is untoward for us to try to set up or even mention in a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that we should set up a general fund to take care of these things. We can take care of these things.

In the past when we have had injustices, we have come in with special bills like this to resolve them. That is the way they ought to be done. We have not resolved all injustices in the past. I know some that should have been but were not. In this case, this is one everyone admits ought to be adjusted, except for 43 Members of the House of Representatives. I think everybody in the Senate thinks it ought to be adjusted and resolved. I personally want to get this resolved. I hope my colleagues will let us do it. I think, of all the things to filibuster, this should not be it.

I can see other heavyweight bills where there is widespread political disagreement when a filibuster is legitimate. I would be the first to say you have every right to do it. On this bill, I think it is unseemly. It smacks of looking like you are trying to protect a White House when we just want to get it over with, or I want to get it over with and right this wrong. By dragging it out, you are saying you are not willing to right a wrong.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, there is not one Member on this side of the aisle of the U.S. Senate trying to slow this bill down. We are not trying to slow this bill down. We are trying to offer a simple sense-of-the-Senate resolution. We have been locked out. We are not going to be able to offer any amendments to this.

Now, another amendment that could slow this bill down—and I assume the Senator from Utah is not going to let this Senator offer that amendment, talking about ''to right a wrong''—and that is to deal with the GATT loophole, the GATT loophole as it relates to Glaxo and Zantac, forcing the seniors of America, forcing the consumers of America and the veterans of America to pay an unreasonable fee for Zantac and other drugs, $5 million a day—$5 million a day. I do not see the Senator

up here saying we have to right that wrong.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PRYOR. Would you permit me to offer an amendment relative to righting that wrong, to protect the consumers from these unfair drug prices?

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will yield, first of all, it is not a wrong. The Senate Judiciary Committee just passed a bill out to resolve that——

Mr. PRYOR. I want to talk about it.

Mr. HATCH. To resolve that matter, 10–7. That is the appropriate way to debate this. If the Senator disagrees with that bill, the Senator can do so.

I think it is telling here that we have a bill which passed the House 350 to 43 that the President said he would sign to right this wrong, that my friends on the other side of the aisle are attempting to derail.

Mr. PRYOR. We are not trying to derail anything.

Mr. HATCH. Sure you are, if you vote against cloture. Keep in mind, if we have cloture, any relevant amendment—this is amendable by any relevant amendment—if we get cloture, you can bring up any relevant amendment you want. Of course, the GATT amendment is not relevant. Any germane amendment, I should say.

I am really concerned that my colleagues on the other side are more concerned about partisanship than righting wrongs. Everybody knows that the GATT amendment which the distinguished Senator has tried to pass now for months and which is heartfelt on both sides, is certainly not germane to this bill. It is not relevant to this bill. It certainly would cloud this bill, as would any other amendment.

We want to pass a bill that rights this terrific wrong to Billy Dale and to his colleagues.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I hope my colleague will allow me to say something. No one knows more than the distinguished Senator from Utah that, under some conditions, relevancy does not matter as to an amendment in the Senate. It does in the House but not in Senate. So set that record straight.

Second, the Senator has mentioned that the Judiciary Committee on Thursday, 10 to 7, passed out the solution to the Glaxo amendment.

Mr. President, what this did, this particular measure, I say in all respect to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Judiciary Committee's proposal to correct the Glaxo issue made matters worse for the generic drug companies by adding 20 more months of patent protection for Glaxo and for a handful of drug companies that are reaping a $5-million-a-day windfall from our error. That is what the bill did. This bill that came from the Judiciary Committee on Thursday added additional obstacles. It added months and perhaps years of court litigation.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 has arrived.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for another 30 seconds for each of us.

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

Mr. HATCH. What in the world does the Glaxo thing or the Zantac thing have to do with Billy Dale and getting compensation to Billy Dale? Tell me, what in the world does it have to do with this bill that everybody agrees ought to be passed, including the President?

Mr. PRYOR. Because it is based upon the same principle the Senator from Utah enunciated when he got up to speak. This is to right a wrong. The GATT issue is to right a wrong. I subscribe to that same issue.

Mr. HATCH. Well, there are two sides to that issue. Thus far, the Judiciary Committee has taken a side that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas does not agree with. The fact is, there is a time to debate that bill. Let us bring the bill up and have a full-fledged debate, and I think everybody will realize there is much merit as to what the Judiciary Committee did.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. BREAUX. I ask unanimous consent that the time before the recesses be extended for 4 minutes.

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

REAL WELFARE REFORM

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, while the discussion has been interesting, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article on Sunday with reference to the President's statement on welfare reform, which I think is very significant. While the Congress tries to come together on a welfare reform plan, it is very clear that the administration is trying to move forward on its own to get things done which are real reform. He said—and I totally agree—''We have to make it clear that a baby doesn't give you a right, and won't give you the money, to leave home and drop out of school.'' The President said that in his weekly radio address.

The Executive order that followed up on that statement, I think, is real welfare reform. What it does is simply require, through Executive order, without waiting on the Congress, that States require that teen mothers, who are having children, stay at home or live at home in adult supervision, or go to school, and that if they do neither, their welfare benefits would no longer be allowed to continue.

With this executive action, all 50 States will now be required to keep teen mothers, who are on welfare and who have children, in school; and that for the first time, the administration will now be able to—and intends to—audit all of those States to make sure that, in fact, they are doing that.

In addition, all 50 States will now be able to provide what are, in essence, rewards to encourage those who do stay in school, but also sanctions for those who do not. Teen mothers in all 50 States, who have dropped out of school, will now have to sign personal responsibility plans requiring them to get a job or go to school.

The whole idea behind this is self-sufficiency. It is clear that the whole system has not worked. In addition, all 50 States will be encouraged to require minor mothers to live at home, or with a responsible adult, in order to receive assistance.

Mr. President, it is clear, and we all know that about half of all welfare recipients in our country have their first child as a teenager. If we are really talking about true welfare reform, we have to encourage good behavior, staying in school, or living with an adult family, a mother and father, or a mother, or adult supervisor, to help provide the training for that person.

This action by the President is part of an ongoing effort to try and reform welfare. The administration has given welfare waivers to allow States to be creative to 37 of our 50 States, allowing them to impose tough time limits and tough, new work requirements. The whole idea is to be tough on work but good for children. It is high time that the Congress enact real welfare reform so that we do not have to continue to do it from an administrative standpoint.

But this was a very significant decision. I applaud the administration and President for taking it. Last, I think we are making some real progress in putting the welfare system back on the right track so that people will no longer have to be dependent on it.

It is clear, the President said once again, that having a child does not give you a right; it really gives you additional responsibility. This step on the part of the President will ensure that that responsibility on the part of teen mothers, working with adult supervision and going to school, is going to bring about real welfare reform.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 2:14 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:35 p.m., recessed until 2:14 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SANTORUM).

WHITE HOUSE TRAVEL OFFICE LEGISLATION

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule