

legal advocates receiving Federal funds from talking to their clients about assisted suicide.

Mr. DORGAN. H.R. 1003 prohibits the use of Federal funds for legal or other assistance for the purpose of causing an assisted suicide; compelling any other person or institution from providing or funding services to cause an assisted suicide, or advocating a legal right to cause or assist in causing an assisted suicide.

However, the bill does not impose any kind of gag rule on legal services or other attorneys receiving Federal funding to provide legal services. An advocacy program could provide factual answers to a client's questions about a State law on assisting suicide, since that alone would not be providing assistance to facilitate an assisted suicide. Similarly, the bill does not prohibit such programs from counseling clients about alternatives to assisted suicide, such as pain management, mental health care, and community-based services for people with disabilities.

In addition, the bill is not intended to have the effect of defunding an entire program, such as a legal services program or other legal or advocacy program, simply because some State or privately funded portion of that program may advocate for or file suit to compel funding of services for assisted suicide. The bill is intended only to restrict Federal Funds from being used for such activities.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, inasmuch as there are no Members wishing to speak on the pending legislation, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes as if in morning business.

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

#### A MESSAGE TO THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise to ask if someone at the Federal Reserve Board might be willing to spend a quarter and buy the Washington Post and read the article on the front page above the fold on the left side. If they are unwilling to do that, I will at least read the headline for them: "Consumer Prices Nearly Flat in March."

Why is this headline important? Because the most recent tax increase imposed in Washington, DC, was imposed by Mr. Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and his Board of Governors, who, meeting weeks ago, in a frenzy decided that the problem in our country is that our economy is growing too rapidly, there are too many people working and too few people unemployed and our economy is moving too rapidly. Their solution: In-

crease interest rates, impose a higher interest rate charge on every single American for every purpose. Of course, that is, in effect, imposing a tax on everybody, isn't it? The difference is, if somebody were to propose a new tax, it would have to be done here in the open, in debate. But in this dinosaur we call the Federal Reserve Board, it is done behind closed doors, in secret, outside of the view of the public, by a bunch of folks in gray suits, coming from their banking backgrounds, or as economists, peer through their glasses and try and see what the future holds. The future is no clearer to them than it was to the augurs in Roman times when practicing the rites called augury. These high priests would read the entrails of birds, the entrails of cattle, observe the flights of fowl in order to portend the future.

Well, we now have economists who, of course, practice the study of economics. I sometimes refer to it as "psychology pumped up with a little helium." The economists now tell us what the future will hold. What does the future hold for us? The economists at the Federal Reserve Board, believed by the Board of Governors, say that our country is moving too fast. It is like that Simon and Garfunkel tune, "Feeling Groovy," although I doubt that they would play that there. It says, "Slow down, you're moving too fast \* \* \*" The country is moving too fast, they say —2½, 3 percent economic growth. Lord, what is going to happen if we have 3 percent sustainable economic growth? You can't do that because the Fed wants to put the brakes on. They want people to pay higher interest rates to slow our country down.

You know, the Federal Reserve Board had told us forever that if unemployment dropped below 6 percent, what would happen? A new wave of inflation would come. Unemployment has been below 6 percent for 30 months; inflation is going down. The Consumer Price Index is nearly flat. In fact, Mr. Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, says to us, "I think the Consumer Price Index overstates the rate of inflation by probably 1 full percent and maybe a percent and a half." If that's the case, there is no inflation in our country. If there is no inflation in our country, why did those folks go behind the closed doors, lock it up, do their banking business in secret, and come out and announce to us that they were imposing a new tax on every American in the form of a higher interest rate?

I ask the Fed today to buy a paper, read the story, convene a meeting and put interest rates where they ought to be. Your Federal funds rate is a full one-half of 1 percent, and now, after your last action, nearly three-quarters of 1 percent above where it ought to be, given the rate of inflation. What does that mean? It is a premium imposed on the American people—a tax in the form of higher interest. It is imposed on every American, without public debate.

I urge the Federal Reserve Board to meet again with the new information

and understand what some of us have been talking about for some long while: Your models are wrong. The world has changed. We don't have upward pressures on wages in our country; we have downward pressures on wages in our country. That is why you don't see consumer prices spiking up. We now exist in a global economy in which American workers are asked to compete against workers elsewhere around the world. It is not unusual for American workers to produce a product, to go into a department store to compete against a product produced in a foreign country by a 14-year-old child being paid 14 cents an hour, working 14 hours a day in an unsafe factory. It is a global economy. Unfair? Yes. But it is a global economy that now puts downward pressure on American wages. That is why consumer prices are not spiking up. That is why the Federal Reserve Board is wrong.

The Federal Reserve Board ought to countenance more economic growth in this country. It can be done without reigniting the fires of inflation. It should be done by a Federal Reserve Board that cares more about all of the American people and economic growth and opportunity all across this country than it does about the interest of its constituents, the big money center banks.

I did not intend to speak about this today, but when I bought the paper and saw the story, it occurred to me that someone ought to stand up and say to the Federal Reserve Board: You were wrong a couple of weeks ago. You ought to admit it. We don't accept your remedy. The American people know you are wrong because they understand what is happening in our economy. Our economy isn't growing too fast. If anything, the economic growth is too slow. We need fewer people unemployed and more people employed. We need more economic growth and more opportunity. I hope one day the Federal Reserve Board will adopt policies that will understand that.

Now, we have a couple of vacancies coming at the Federal Reserve Board, and I expect that the Federal Reserve Board will fill the positions with people who essentially look the same, act the same, talk the same, and behave the same as all the other folks there. Take a look at who is at the Fed. In fact, I have brought for my colleagues to the floor a giant chart with pictures of the Board of Governors and regional Federal bank presidents, indicating where they are from, where they were educated, their salaries. I don't want them to be anonymous. I want the people to see who is making the decisions that affect all of their lives.

Now we will have a couple of new people appointed to the Fed. Congress will have a little something to say about that. But the fact is, the nominations will be sent to us. I have said,

and I say again, that I would recommend my Uncle Joe. The reason I recommend Uncle Joe is the Federal Reserve Board doesn't have anybody serving on the board like my Uncle Joe. My Uncle Joe actually has made a lot of things in his life. He fixed generators and starters on cars. He has a lot of common sense, understands what it is to start a business, borrow some money, make a product, sell a product. So I recommended my Uncle Joe. I have been doing that for a number of years and Joe hasn't gotten a call yet. So I expect that the Federal Reserve Board will not be blessed by the membership of my Uncle Joe.

I say this because I would like to see some new blood at the Fed, some new energy and new direction that doesn't just buy into this mantra that what we need is more unemployment and slower economic growth, and somehow that represents the future of our country. The Fed is wrong. The numbers demonstrate that the Fed is wrong. I hope as we go down the road talking about this, as well as filling the positions at the Fed that are going to be open, we can have a broader discussion. I wanted to at least acknowledge today that this new information exists. I encourage the Fed to buy the morning paper.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### ASSISTED SUICIDE FUNDING RESTRICTION ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I rise in support of the legislation pending before us, a bill to prohibit Federal funds being used to assist in suicides.

I wish to compliment my colleague, Senator ASHCROFT, and also my colleague, Senator DORGAN, for their leadership. I am happy to cosponsor this legislation. I think it is important that we pass this legislation today. I am pleased that the House passed it overwhelmingly by a vote of 398 to 16. It is not often that we find such an overwhelming vote.

Frankly, I can't see how anyone would vote against this legislation. This legislation makes sense. It is needed. Some may ask, "Why is it needed?"

You might be aware of the fact that the Supreme Court held hearings earlier this year on whether or not there is a legal right for assisted suicide. I have read the Constitution many times. I don't find that right in there. That doesn't mean the Supreme Court might not, nor does it mean that some other judge might say yes, you have a

constitutional right for assisted suicide, and someone else say yes, that is a constitutional right; therefore, it should be covered by Medicare or Medicaid, and, therefore, be paid for by the Federal Government.

So maybe this is a preemptive strike. It is unfortunate to think it might even be needed. But it is needed. We want to make sure it doesn't happen. We want to make sure that we don't have more Dr. Kevorkians running around the country saying, "You have a legal right to kill yourself, and therefore, we will help you; and, oh, yes, we want the taxpayers to pay for it." We don't want the taxpayers to pay for it. We want to send a signal to Dr. Kevorkian that we don't agree with him.

Dr. Kevorkian made a statement which was reported in the New York Times on April 5 talking about the fact that he publicly burned a cease and desist order from the State. He said, "If you want to stop something, pass a law."

That is what we are trying to do today. We are trying to make it very clear that the Congress of the United States overwhelmingly believes that you should not use Federal funds to assist in something like suicides, something that is as deadly as suicide.

This would clarify the law. If assisted suicide is legalized by the Supreme Court, or in any individual State, all it would take is one district court judge to rule that assisted suicide fits under the Medicare statute's guidelines. On January 8, 1997, the Supreme Court heard oral arguments in two cases in which the Federal courts of appeals have declared a constitutional right to assisted suicide.

Mr. President I think we want to send a very clear signal. I might mention that this Congress has already passed a ban. In 1995, I offered legislation banning the use of Medicaid and Medicare funds for assisted suicide in the balanced budget amendment which passed this Congress. Unfortunately, President Clinton vetoed the legislation. But he didn't veto the legislation because of this.

An amicus brief, filed by the American Medical Association, to the Supreme Court on November 12, 1996, contends that assisted suicide "will create profound danger for many ill persons with undiagnosed depression and inadequately treated pain for whom assisted suicide rather than good palliative care could become the norm. At greatest risk would be those with the least access to palliative care—the poor, the elderly, and members of minority groups."

Acting Solicitor Gen. Walter Dellinger recently said in opposing the idea of a right to assisted suicide, "The systemic dangers are dramatic . . . the least costly treatment for any illness is lethal medication." That is reported in the New York Times on January 9 of this year.

We are a nation built on the principle that human life is sacred, to be hon-

ored and cherished. As public servants, we deal with issues that affect the lives of people every day. Caring for people is the underlying aspect of nearly every piece of legislation dealt with in this Senate.

Dr. Joanne Lynn, board member of the American Geriatrics Society, and director of the Center to Improve Care of the Dying at George Washington University, said, "No one needs to be alone or in pain or beg a doctor to put an end to misery. Good care is possible."

Cardinal Joseph Bernardin, while dying last November, took the time to write the Supreme Court on assisted suicide, saying,

There can be no such thing as a "right to assisted suicide" because there can be no legal and moral order which tolerates the killing of innocent human life, even if the agent of death is self-administered. Creating a new "right" to assisted suicide will endanger society and send a false signal that a less than "perfect" life is not worth living.

There are a lot of groups and a lot of individuals who have endorsed this legislation.

The American Medical Association said,

The power to assist in intentionally taking the life of a patient is antithetical to the central mission of healing that guides physicians. The AMA continues to stand by its ethical principle that physician-assisted suicide is fundamentally incompatible with the physician's role as healer and that physicians must instead aggressively respond to the needs of patients at the end of life.

That was signed by John Seward, executive vice president of the AMA, on April 15.

Mr. President, this legislation is endorsed by not only the American Medical Association but also the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, American Academy of Hospice and Palliative Medicine, American Geriatrics Society, Christian Coalition, Family Research Council, Free Congress, National Right to Life, Physicians for Compassionate Care, and the Traditional Values Coalition.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent that letters be printed in the RECORD at this point from the Catholic Health Association and also the Christian Coalition in support of this legislation.

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

CHRISTIAN COALITION,  
CAPITOL HILL OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, April 16, 1997.

DEAR SENATOR: As of this morning, the Majority Leader was trying to work out an agreement to bring up the Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act for a vote this afternoon.

On behalf of the members and supporters of the Christian Coalition, we urge you to vote for the Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act. This legislation overwhelmingly passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 398-16.

The Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act restricts the use of tax dollars for the purpose of assisted suicide, euthanasia, or mercy killing. The overwhelming majority of American taxpayers oppose the use of tax