

light up when they saw the face of the Chaplain and how he was never in too much hurry not to stop and have a good word or two of greeting for each and every person.

He was truly a Chaplain not just for 100 Senators but for all of the broad Senate family and for those in some sudden need who were just here as visitors as well.

As he retires and leave us, my own remembrance, my own memory of him will be of a man who comes closer in character to what we read about when we read about the saints and the great religious leaders in history, that he partakes of more of those qualities than any other individual whom I have been privileged to know, not just during my career here but during my life.

Chaplain Halverson, at some different time and some different place, might well end up being nominated a saint because his character was and remains a saintly character, who brings joy and sustenance and strength and peace into the lives of all with whom he associates.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank both of my colleagues.

Mr. President, I also thank Senator DOLE, the majority leader, for his thoughtfulness in asking Senators to come to the floor today, to come to the Chamber and to be present when Dr. Halverson uttered his last prayer here in the Chamber. I think that was a very good thing to do, and I appreciate very much the majority leader's having done that, and told him so when he was here earlier.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period of morning business for not to extend beyond the hour of 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

DR. RICHARD C. HALVERSON

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I hope before the clock starts to tick that I can take 15 seconds to speak about Pastor Halverson, and to remind everybody that Pastor Halverson is just retiring as Chaplain for the U.S. Senate. He is not retiring from being a pastor for people. He is not retiring from being a servant for the Lord.

This morning, I asked him to pray for me, and as I have done for the last 14 years, I will continue to pray for his work daily because I know that work will continue.

CONCERNING PRESIDENTIAL ETHICS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, President Clinton was asked, at his most recent news conference, how he could explain the ethical controversies

surrounding his administration—and these are the words of an inquiring press—" * * * after [he] came into office promising the most ethical administration in history."

I wanted to take this opportunity to discuss how the President reacted to that inquiry at his news conference.

First, he responded to allegations about Roger Altman's ethical troubles. President Clinton stated that:

Roger Altman resigned even though he had violated no law and no rule of ethics.

There are two problems with that statement. First, Roger Altman resigned because bipartisan members of the Senate Banking Committee found that he misled Congress in sworn testimony. I hope that President Clinton did not mean to suggest that misleading Congress in sworn testimony is ethical.

And, second, Altman did not really resign. Several months later, he was still performing functions for the Treasury Department.

That is not the commitment to ethics that the President promised the American people.

President Clinton also mentioned former Agriculture Secretary Mike Espy. The President said that Secretary Espy's actions involved " * * * a few thousand dollars, all of which he has reimbursed."

I think Secretary Espy made a number of significant contributions as Agriculture Secretary. But, once again, I have to take issue with the President. The purity of the Nation's food supply is vital. Laws have been on the books for decades to prevent the Agriculture Department personnel from taking any payment that might influence their decisions regarding food product safety. And ethics is about the adherence to rules. The fact that amounts involved might have been petty may relate to appropriate punishments. But it does not relate to or excuse an ethics violation, if one occurred.

The President's comments that Mr. Espy is the only Cabinet Secretary to resign based on ethics challenges to actions taken while in office is technically true. But this is only because Commerce Secretary Ron Brown has not resigned. It is simply not true, as the President has repeatedly said, that the charges relating to Secretary Brown concern only his conduct prior to taking office. Significant ethical issues arise from the manner in which he reported various financial transactions on his ethics disclosure forms once he assumed office. Various conflicts of interest are alleged to have arisen after he became Secretary of Commerce as well.

I am also concerned that the President seems to think that somehow it is a matter of less concern that a person in his administration is accused of ethical conduct prior to joining his administration than afterward. What does that say about the vetting process that was followed?

Does the President suggest that the ethics of a person he chose for his administration matter only with respect to actions they took while in office? Remember, Vice President Agnew resigned because of actions he took prior to assuming that office.

I think that it is not asking too much of the President, who promised the toughest ethical standards in history, that his appointees be ethical in their current positions and that they have records of acting ethically.

However, the President said that we are "creating a climate here in which a lot of people will be reluctant to serve." Let me make crystal clear that, in fact, we are trying to create a climate in which people who are not ethical, including a number this President has appointed, are very reluctant to serve.

President Clinton also said that under the independent counsel law investigations cannot be controlled. The President said that if a certain number of Members of Congress ask for an independent counsel, then the prospect of a counsel is triggered. Mr. President, I am pleased to have supported the independent counsel law over many years in times of both Republican and Democrat Presidents. President Clinton made reauthorization of that statute a priority, so he should not complain about that law.

But we should be clear about the terms of the statute. A particular number of Senators cannot demand that an independent counsel be appointed. What Members of Congress can do is force the Attorney General to conduct an investigation and to make a decision. But the decision to ask for an independent counsel is the Attorney General's alone.

For instance, a majority of Republicans on the House Judiciary Committee wrote the Attorney General to ask that an independent counsel be appointed to prosecute Ira Magaziner on the contempt charges arising from the health care task force litigation that the Justice Department defended. Attorney General Reno conducted an investigation, but she decided not to ask for the appointment of an independent counsel. In the other instances in which an independent counsel was appointed, it was the President's own Attorney General who sought the appointment because the circumstances warranted it. Members of Congress cannot force an appointment.

President Clinton also said that with respect to his administration, "You would be hard pressed to cite examples that constitute abuse of authority." In fact, it is very easy in regard to the health care reform task force. A violation of the Federal Advisory Committee Act by the health care task force is one example. Failure to immediately put assets in a blind trust, as all other recent Presidents did, while those assets included a fund that shorted health care stocks, is a second example. A third example is Travelgate;

that was an abuse of authority. And, of course, there are many others.

Mr. President, the Olympic games include the high jump. The gold medal is awarded to the person who jumps the highest, not to the person who sets the bar the highest but fails to scale it. President Clinton may honestly believe that his administration has set the ethics bar the highest of any of his predecessors. But that is irrelevant because so many people he has appointed are not clearing that bar.

With ethics, it is not the standard that is set but the standard that is met that counts. The fact is that this administration is not practicing what it preaches in the area of ethics. And that fact is unfortunately reducing public trust in Government. When President Clinton is questioned about the ethical performances of his administration, as he was in a news conference, he should make amends, not excuses. He should make sure that his appointees live up to the standards he believes are so high. Until then, the questions will continue.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, as has already been announced, following the leader time, morning business will go until 11 o'clock with Senators allowed to speak not to exceed 5 minutes. In addition to the exception of 10 minutes for Senator GRASSLEY just being used, we also have 10 minutes for Senator ABRAHAM, 10 for Senator KOHL, and 15 minutes for Senator GRAHAM.

At 11 o'clock, we will resume consideration of H.R. 889, the supplemental appropriations bill. Cloture was filed last night on the Kassebaum striker replacement amendment. We hope to set that aside and set aside the pending Kassebaum amendment so we can consider other amendments. I urge my colleagues on the other side to allow that to happen, because this is an important supplemental appropriation.

We have already agreed that we will have a vote on Monday on the cloture motion, and we have other business that we can do on this bill. We should go forward with that this afternoon.

If consent is not given, the leader has indicated that he would expect full debate on the Kassebaum amendment throughout the day, and votes, therefore, would be possible throughout the day.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ABRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate.

TORT REFORM

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate our colleagues in the House for acting this week to bring our tort system under control. The bill passed by the House earlier this week imposes all attorneys fees on a party who turns down a settlement offer if the final judgment is not more favorable to the offeree than that which he turned down. It also would eliminate junk science from the courtroom and require courts to sanction attorneys who file frivolous claims.

The House action constitutes an important first step toward reforming our civil justice system.

I also would like to take a few moments to respond to the criticism recently leveled at attempts to reform our tort system.

President Clinton and his Attorney General have called the House reform bill "too extreme." His counsel Abner Mikva went even further, claiming that the bill would "tilt the legal playing field dramatically to the disadvantage of consumers and middle-class Americans."

Some of our colleagues and the American Trial Lawyer's Association, one of President Clinton's most generous and loyal contributors, would like this characterization to take hold.

Opponents of tort reform would like it if the American people were to see changes in our civil justice system as a boon to big corporations and the rich rather than a broad-based set of reforms that will help consumers, victims, and the general public at the expense only of a handful of individuals and lawyers who bring frivolous lawsuits.

To hear much of the public debate you would think that tort reform is a struggle between corporate fat cats who want to injure the public with impunity and legal barracudas who seek only to feed on small business and the tort victims who must entrust lawyers with their claims. But this heated rhetoric in my judgment, helps no one, in fact it keeps us from focusing on the issue at hand—making our tort system more just and fair.

I come to this debate, not to attack lawyers, but to help victims and consumers. I take exception to the charge that tort reform is anti-consumer, particularly given the faults in the system as it stands.

Is it really pro-consumer to have a system like the current one in which those who are injured—consumers of legal services—receive only 43 cents of every dollar in damages awarded?

Is it really pro-consumer to have a system in which, as reported in a recent Conference Board survey, 47 percent of firms withdraw products from the marketplace, 25 percent discontinue some form of research, and 8 percent lay off employees, all out of fear of lawsuits?

Does it really help consumers and the middle class to have a system in which,

according to a recent Gallup survey, one out of every five small businesses decides not to introduce a new product, or not to improve an existing one, out of fear of lawsuits?

Are we and our children better off when pharmaceutical companies stop producing helpful drugs like the DPT vaccine out of fear of lawsuits?

In this last case, that of DPT, two of the three companies making the vaccine stopped production in 1985 because they could not afford to deal with all the suits arising from the always highly suspect and now clearly disproved theory that it might in very rare instances cause brain damage. To conserve the limited supply remaining the Centers for Disease Control recommended that doctors no longer vaccinate children over age 1, leading to who knows how many illnesses in small children.

Is it really pro-consumer to have a system in which poor, unsophisticated clients in particular must hire lawyers, without fully knowing how much they will pay or what their options for legal services are?

Are our communities better off when the parents of Little Leaguers are afraid to have their kids play or organize games for fear of being sued?

Legal reform is in everyone's interest. The tort reform bill Senator MCCONNELL and I have introduced would lower prices, establish a legal consumer's right to know what he or she is purchasing and at what cost, promote early settlements, and reduce time and cost to injured parties, as well as often innocent defendants.

Our bill would curb windfall profits in lawsuits—thus reducing the price ultimately paid for goods by the consumer—by capping punitive damages and eliminating joint and several liability.

The bill would empower clients in their dealings with lawyers by requiring that attorneys disclose in writing, to any client with whom they have entered a contingency fee agreement, both the actual services performed and the precise number of hours expended on performing them. The bill also would require lawyers to tell clients that they may pay a percentage of their award or, alternatively, pay an hourly fee.

Thus we would protect consumers' right to know how much they are paying and for what services. We recognize this right to know in all other markets and should do so in the legal services market as well.

Our bill also would reform contingency fees by providing that, if a plaintiff receives a settlement offer and still wants to go to trial, the lawyer would receive the usual contingency percentage only on the portion of the award that is above the original offer.

Besides preventing lawyer overreaching, this last contingency fee reform also will encourage early settlements, thus saving transaction costs