

a Nike tour in Lakeland, Florida. So this man is eminently well-qualified to play professional golf.

I am disappointed—I am sorely disappointed—in the PGA Tour's failure to reach an agreement with Casey, to come to some kind of an accommodation that would allow him to compete and earn his living being a professional golfer.

As I understand it, the sticking point here is the PGA Tour's tradition and rule of no carts. Well, Mr. President, I believe there are values to upholding traditions and rules, but there is no merit in rigidly standing on tradition simply because of outmoded assumptions.

Over the years, all kinds of traditions have scuttled the aspirations and limited the possibilities of millions of Americans with disabilities. People with disabilities just didn't do certain things. I always tell the story about my brother who I grew up with who had a disability. He became deaf at an early age. He was sent away to the Iowa School for the Deaf and Dumb—that is what it was called in those days, the School for the Deaf and Dumb. The Presiding Officer sitting in the Chair may be a few years younger than I am, but I remember when I was younger, that is what they called deaf people, they were deaf and dumb. As my brother said to me, "I may be deaf, but I am not dumb." So we have done away with that tradition. We don't refer to people as deaf and dumb, and we don't have deaf and dumb schools any longer either.

But when he went to that school, they told him he could be one of three things: He could be a baker, a shoe cobbler or a printer's assistant. That was it. There was nothing else he could do. "That is it, you can pick one of those three things."

He said, "I don't want to be any one of them."

They said, "Fine, you are going to be a baker then."

Tradition and rules had it that deaf people could only do certain things. That has all gone by the wayside. We see deaf Americans now doing everything. Why, we even have a person who is deaf who is the president of a college. So we have done away with a lot of these old traditions, and the ADA is helping to change the old traditions. It is asking us to rethink our assumptions about people with disabilities and what they can do. It is asking us to look at reasonable modifications that would permit them, as I said, to pursue their American dream.

The ADA is intended to include people in the mainstream of American life. It requires entities to make—and I quote from the law—"reasonable modifications" to "policies, practices and procedures" so long as those modifications do not create a "fundamental alteration" to the program or activity.

So, Mr. President, rules and traditions that create barriers for people with disabilities are rules and traditions that must be changed.

I am reminded of a recent incident here in the Senate, where we were asked to make a reasonable modification to a Senate policy. A staff person with a vision impairment was precluded from coming on to the Senate floor with her guide dog because we had a no-animals rule on the floor. Certainly, it sounded like a very reasonable rule and tradition. We don't want animals running all over the floor of the Senate. You don't want me bringing my pet dog on to the Senate floor. Well, that was a rule and tradition.

So we had a debate about whether we should change the rule to accommodate the needs of the staff person. We talked about the history, the traditions of the Senate. Ultimately, we did the right thing. We made a reasonable modification to that rule and that tradition so the staff person could do her job and bring her dog on to the Senate floor.

Allowing Casey Martin to use a golf cart is a reasonable modification under the Americans with Disabilities Act. The cart will help level the playing field a little on which Casey Martin competes without giving him an undo advantage. What we are talking about here goes to the heart of the principles and the foundation of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

The PGA Tour can say all they want, that a cart somehow alters the fundamental operation of the golf game. Yet, if that is so, then why do they allow carts to be used on the Senior Tour? Why do they allow carts to be used in the qualifying rounds for the younger people?

When the court enjoined the PGA Tour and said, yes, the Tour must allow Casey to use a cart, and he used a cart, the Tour said, "We will let everybody use carts." I am told that out of 168 golfers, only 15 decided to use a golf cart. I thought to myself, if a golf cart gives players that much of an advantage, why wouldn't everyone use them?

So I consulted some of my golfing friends. I am not a golfer, but I have friends who are avid golfers. One individual told me, "Well, there is nothing like walking a golf course, because when you walk, you feel the wind and you see how often it gusts and you know what direction it is blowing in. You get a feel for the lay of the fairway, and you can think about your next shot and what went wrong on the last one. You get in a golf cart and you lose all that feel."

I have tested this hypothesis with other golfers, and they say, "Yes, that is true."

Allowing Casey Martin to use a golf cart will not give him any advantage at all in the PGA Tour. In fact, it may very well present a disadvantage. So, again, I just think this is one of those old rules and traditions that needs a reasonable modification under the ADA so that Casey Martin can compete in professional golf.

Lastly, Mr. President, Casey Martin may not fit the stereotype of what the

PGA considers a competitive golfer, but millions of Americans who don't fit the typical image of a golfer have now taken up the game. It has moved from an exclusive sport played at private country clubs to an inclusive sport played by a cross-section of Americans.

When I was growing up in my State of Iowa, I bet I could count on one hand the number of golf courses in the State of Iowa, all at private country clubs, exclusively played by those people who belonged to those clubs. We have 99 counties in Iowa, Mr. President. I bet you every one has a golf course now. Some of them have more than one. Farmers out in the field get off the tractor and come in and play a game of golf. So it is no longer this sort of exclusive game it once was. Everyone is playing golf. Barriers to the sport have come down.

As I said earlier, barriers and traditions that prevent people with disabilities from fully participating are barriers and traditions that must come down. Holding up a barrier for Casey Martin sends exactly the wrong message not only to Americans with disabilities but to each and every one of us.

I am sorry that the PGA Tour saw fit to take this to court. They first tried to argue that they weren't even covered by the ADA, when the law was plain on its face they were covered. They went to court and, of course, the court threw that out and said, "Of course, you are covered." Now they are back in court again to drag this thing out.

I wish they hadn't done it, because that very action alone tends to create a chilling effect. A lot of Americans will say, "Well, I may have a disability, but if I want to do something and there is a rule or tradition against it, do you mean I have to go to court? Do you mean I have to hire lawyers? I have to go through all that just to get my rights?"

That is the message the PGA Tour, by going to court, is sending to Americans all over this country.

Mr. President, people with disabilities get up every morning, and they have a tough day ahead of them. They have to prepare for that day, many times with the aid of an assistant, perhaps they have to use a wheelchair or get in a special bus to go to work. It takes a lot of effort, a lot of time. They don't have the time and they don't want to go to court, but they want the Americans with Disabilities Act to work. People with disabilities want entities like the PGA Tour to use some common sense and some common decency to make reasonable modifications so that people like Casey Martin can pursue their American dreams.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 1:13 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:16 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. FIRST).

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

WE CAN DO BETTER

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I speak from the floor of the Senate as a Democrat but really to all of my colleagues, and to the President, as well.

I think that President Clinton's State of the Union Address was, indeed, an important step forward for our country in some of the initiatives that he outlined. When the President talked about education and talked about child care and talked about health care, I think what he said resonated with people throughout the country. I think it has a lot to do with the fact that people are less interested in denunciation and more interested in enunciation. They really want to know what it is we stand for and whether or not we are thinking seriously, all of us, even if we have disagreement on some of these issues, about where our country needs to be.

In that sense, what the President talked about was an important step forward. First, a response to what some of my colleagues had to say on the floor of the Senate, and then a response to some of the President's initiatives and to Democrats. On the Republican side, I think the argument that has been made, that I have heard colleagues make on the floor of Senate—and I summarize what any number of different Republican colleagues have said—in many ways amounts to the argument that when it comes to the most pressing issues of people's lives, there is nothing the Government really can or should do. This is not an appropriate role for the Government to play—to assure that there is affordable child care for working families, to assure that there is affordable health care, to invest in more teachers in our schools, reducing class size, and so forth. Quite frankly, that argument is a great argument for people who own their own large corporations or are wealthy, but it doesn't work for most of the people in the country. Most of the people in Minnesota and most of the people in the country are very focused, as I have said on the floor of Senate, as to how they can earn a decent living and how they can raise their children successfully.

The President's proposals speak to that, at least part of the way. But what concerns me about what the President said, and I give credit where credit is due, what concerns me about the way in which Democrats are speaking about these proposals, is I think that we can do much better. This is our oppor-

tunity. The business cycle is up. We all talk about economic performance. This is the time where we can really make some of these critical investments.

Mr. President, what I worry about is that we give the speeches, there is a lot of hype. We talk about the importance of early childhood development, we talk about the importance of education, we talk about health care, but we do not invest enough resources to put this on a scale where it is really going to make a significant difference. If we don't do that, if we have such a downsized politics and policy that we only reach a tiny fraction of those people that we are talking about, those children, those working families, then I think it invites mutiny because it becomes just symbolic politics.

Let me give a few examples. Mr. President, as far as I can determine when we talk about child care, without going into all the statistics, and we think about families with incomes of \$35,000 a year and under, we will probably reach, with the amount of resources the President has talked about investing in early childhood development, about 2 out of 10 children who could benefit—2 out of 10 children. If it is so compelling, and if the evidence is irreducible and irrefutable that we have to get it right for these children by age 3 otherwise many of them will never do well in school and will never be prepared for life, then why are we only investing in 2 out of 10 children?

After-school program. Again, an important initiative, but as I look at the number of children who could benefit from this, and I think about my travel in some of our inner-city communities and rural communities, much less the suburbs, we will be reaching, with the President's proposal, about 1 out of 10 young people or children that are eligible. If it is important to have good positive things going on for young people in our communities after school, why is it only important to reach 1 out of 10 young people or children that would be eligible?

Now I know what I am saying is counterintuitive because in a way I'm in the tiny minority on this, but I think we can do much better. I will introduce child care legislation and I will talk about 5 out of 10 children, that we can at least reach half the children that really deserve to have nurturing child care, that deserve to have the highest quality child care. Why are we only talking about affordable child care that is only affordable for about 20 percent of the families that need the assistance? Why are we not making sure that every child in the United States of America, when he or she goes to kindergarten, knows how to spell her name, knows the alphabet, knows colors, shapes and sizes? Why can't we make sure that we make the investment in the public sector, private sector and volunteers and communities, that every single child comes to kindergarten, ready to learn? The President's proposal is a step in the right di-

rection but we can do much better. We can do much better.

A second example, health care. Mr. President, I'm all for expanding Medicare, but the current proposal that the President has outlined makes it impossible for most citizens between the ages of 55 and 65 to be able to afford the premium. Most won't benefit. Second of all, I don't know why—I guess I speak more to Democrats, my party—why have we abandoned the idea of comprehensive health care reform, universal health care coverage? Why are we not talking about a strategy for our country whereby the next century, next millennium, each and every citizen will be able to benefit from dignified, humane, affordable health care? Why, Democrats, have we backed away from this?

I'm going to introduce legislation that will have a national progressive framework, a defined package of benefits. Remember, colleagues, remember what we talked about a few short years ago, that every citizen should have health care at least as good as what Senators and Representatives get? I believe that. I think all of us should believe that. It will also make sure that States agree that it will be affordable and it will also have strong consumer protection, but then it leaves it up to States as to how to get there. There will be Federal grants for each and every State that agrees to reach, within the next 5 years, universal coverage. Different states can do it different ways. We can decentralize it. But we ought not to give up on the goal of humane, affordable, dignified health care for each and every citizen in our country. The American people believe in that. It might be that the insurance industry, which has so much clout here, doesn't believe in it, but the majority of people in our country do, and Democrats and Republicans, we ought to be on their side. We ought to be on their side.

The third example, Mr. President, which is near and dear to my heart, call it counterintuitive politics because we don't talk about it very much but I think we should. I have traveled all across the country. I have had a chance to meet with a lot of people in poor communities. I want to raise the minimum wage. I think we should do that. It is a matter of elementary simple justice. I am proud to join Senator KENNEDY in this fight. We will raise the minimum wage 50 cents a year for the next 3 years and then index it. If people work full time 52 weeks a year 40 hours a week they ought not to be poor in America. If you had health care and child care, you really would be making a difference in terms of family income.

Mr. President, I also visited communities, be they rural or urban, where there are no jobs, even with the economy being where it is, even with official unemployment at record low levels. I go to inner-city Baltimore or inner-city Chicago or Minneapolis, I can go to Appalachia, rural Appalachia, I can go to rural Minnesota, and