

P.G.E.I. of America Charitables Foundation, Inc., the Council Generals of Greek Cypriot, the Order of AHEPA and the Joint Public Policy Committee of Hellenic American Women. On behalf of these organizations, the Greek community in New Jersey and all Americans of Greek descent, I am honored to pay tribute, on behalf of the Nation, to the Greek community on the anniversary of their independence day.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I will use some of my leadership time to speak as if in morning business.

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

NOMINATION OF DR. FOSTER TO BE SURGEON GENERAL

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to state my concern about the direction and tenor of the debate on the nomination of Dr. Henry Foster to be Surgeon General.

I spoke on the floor a month ago about this nomination. At that time, I expressed hope that this debate could be restored to its proper perspective—an honest assessment of whether Dr. Henry Foster's skills fit the Nation's needs for the position of Surgeon General.

So far, Mr. President, that has not occurred.

First of all, there has not been much substantive discussion about this nomination. At a time when many of the public health problems historically addressed by the Surgeon General are reaching crisis proportions, it seems that there should be more discussion about the contributions Dr. Foster can make in this capacity and the urgency of approving his nomination.

Unfortunately, what little debate there has been has not centered on Dr. Foster's qualifications, skills, and contributions to society. Instead, it has revolved around Dr. Foster's performance of a legal medical procedure, and how many times he has performed it.

Little attention has been paid to the thousands of lives Dr. Foster has brought into the world over his 35-year career, or the hundreds of lives he has saved.

Little attention has been paid to the evidence that supports President Clinton's evaluation that Dr. Henry Foster has much to contribute as Surgeon General of the United States.

Do not be fooled into believing the evidence is lacking. Nothing can be further from the truth.

Before being nominated to the post of Surgeon General, Dr. Foster was perhaps best known for his efforts in establishing the I Have A Future Program. This teen pregnancy prevention program, which stresses abstinence and attempts to help teens understand the positive reasons for delaying pregnancy, was selected by President Bush as one of his Thousand Points of Light.

Listen to the words of Dr. Louis Sullivan, President Bush's Health and Human Services Secretary.

[The] I Have a Future [program] turns young people's lives around . . . [it is] the kind of program that the country needs.

Dr. Foster has pledged to focus on teen pregnancy prevention as Surgeon General. That cause certainly should be a national priority, and Dr. Foster would bring great experience and credibility to it.

Little attention has been paid to the stories of Dr. Foster's commitment and heroism. Like the time he saved the life of the mayor's son when his wife developed complications with her pregnancy.

Or the time a pregnant patient of Dr. Foster's called him up in the middle of the night because she was bleeding, and Dr. Foster met her at the hospital in his bedroom slippers.

Or the time Dr. Foster talked a young, pregnant and unmarried woman out of having an abortion. Her child later went on to become high school valedictorian.

These are the elements that are missing in the debate over the Surgeon General nomination. These are the reasons Dr. Foster deserves every consideration for this post.

It is my sincere hope that Dr. Foster will receive a fair hearing. It is unfair to judge a candidate before having heard all the facts. I hope that those who have reservations about the nomination will keep an open mind until committee hearings are held.

I also hope that these hearings will be held sooner rather than later. The Nation needs a Surgeon General.

Every day approximately 2,781 teenagers become pregnant.

Mr. President, this many teenagers become pregnant while we wait to confirm a Surgeon General who plans to make teen pregnancy prevention the centerpiece of his tenure in that post.

We should not delay action on this nomination. I urge the Chair of the Labor Committee to schedule hearings on this issue as soon as possible and do everything within her power to ensure that Dr. Foster is given a full and fair hearing.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERREY. 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. KERREY. Mr. President, is there a time limit for morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been 10 minutes per Senator.

FARM POLICY REFORM

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, every year the President of the United States is required by law to send an economic report not just to the Congress but to the people of the country. It is a very, very important report. It provides us

with the administration's assessment of where the economy is and what needs to be done both to sustain economic recovery and to adjust in certain areas.

There is a section in the President's economic report described as farm policy reform. I would like to comment upon that here this afternoon in the time that I am allowed.

Mr. President, one of the first statements that this document says is:

Efficiency requires that farmers be given greater opportunity to respond to marketing incentives, and the cost-effective public policies used to correct market failures in agriculture. Revising agriculture to meet better these objectives will help unleash more of the innovative energy that has long characterized American agriculture.

Mr. President, there is very little barrier between the farmer and the marketplace today, notwithstanding a lot of the political rhetoric that seems to imply that somehow agriculture is heavily subsidized. If agriculture was heavily subsidized, Mr. President, one would expect an economic analysis to reveal very low rates of productivity. That is typically what one sees.

If I subsidize somebody a great deal—we hear this in the welfare debate—subsidize somebody a great deal, it is apt to encourage not increased productivity, it encourages just the opposite.

If agriculture was heavily subsidized, one would expect to see very low rates of productivity and would expect to see economic analysis, particularly analysis that showed how the agriculture sector compared to other sectors of the U.S. economy and our international competitors, it would show that we are relatively unproductive. Just the opposite, Mr. President.

Compared to our OECD competitors, agriculture is more productive than computers, more productive than automobiles, more productive than steel, more productive than pharmaceuticals, more productive than chemicals, more productive than all other sectors of our economy.

This report, Mr. President, implies that the Government of the United States of America somehow is standing in between farmers out there who would like to be competitive and the market, and it just is not true.

The report, in my judgment, distorts what is actually in plain view out there in the countryside. The report says that "The farm sector no longer looms large in the macroeconomy."

Now, that is based on a GAO analysis that showed that only 2 percent of the U.S. population is now in agriculture production. But 18 percent of all the jobs, according to this report, are either directly or indirectly related to agriculture production. So if farmers are not making money, if the profit shifts someplace else, Mr. President, these businesses are going to have a tough time making ends meet and,

thus, production in agriculture is still vital not just in the micro-sense but in the macro-sense of the entire U.S. economy.

Now, let me provide what I would have hoped this kind of report would have provided. Instead of beginning with, I think, an incorrect identification of what is going on in agriculture, let me provide those in America who are wondering what this farm program is all about with some basic facts.

First, there are only 500,000 full-time farmers left in this country. This report has a statement in here, a commonly applied statement, that agriculture production is increasingly concentrated. Well, you would think—increasingly concentrated—does that mean that it is like automobiles, where we have three? Is that like pharmaceuticals, where we have 9 or 10? Is that like computers, where we have half a dozen? Is that what we are talking about? No.

There are 500,000 fully competitive, relatively small businesses—even a big farm is relatively small, Mr. President. A farm that an economist might describe as a large farm might not have as much revenue as an average McDonald's restaurant, for gosh sakes. So these are very competitive businesses.

Indeed, if you ask a Nebraska farmer, "Honestly, what is your idea of an enlightened policy?", they will say, "We pray for bad weather in Iowa." Well, you know, we do not honestly do that.

But the truth is, it is very competitive. We are competing out there not just with each other, but we are competing throughout the world. We would not be this productive were we not faced with the blessing of having this large number, still relatively large number, of full-time, highly competitive small businesses, family-operated businesses, mostly, that are manufacturing food products.

Now, one of the common things that I very often hear, not just in Washington, but I hear in Grand Island or Hastings and other communities in Nebraska, they will say, "Well, why do we have to have any kind of a Government program?"

Well, there are a couple of reasons that we do this. This report here, by the way, traces it all the way back to the 1920's and 1930's. It says in this report, "Today's agriculture commodity support programs are rooted in landmark New Deal legislation that followed the agricultural depression of the 1920's and 1930's." Again, feeding a misperception that this is a 60-year old program, started by Franklin Roosevelt, no longer needed; modern times no longer needs this sort of thing.

Well, Mr. President, one thing today is true that was true in 1930. And Americans who wonder why we have a program need to take this into consideration. Unlike other manufacturing businesses that I have referenced—automobiles, textiles, computers—we manufacture food out of doors. You might think that is kind of a silly and

simple observation, but as long as we manufacture food out of doors we are always going to be dependent upon God to give us good weather. If we do not have good weather, if we have drought, we do not produce food. It is as simple as that, Mr. President.

You think, well, that is not a big deal.

Well, in 1987, I remember just after I left the office of Governor and went back into business, in 1987, swirling in the country was this big debate: What are we going to do with these enormous reserves that built up after the 1985 farm program was enacted? It is too costly—\$125 billion a year, I believe it was. What are we going to do with these large reserves?

We had a drought in 1987. Then in 1988, we had another drought. I was campaigning at the time for the U.S. Senate. I almost remember the day when the American people stopped talking about these excess reserves and they started to say to themselves, "Oh, my gosh. Maybe we do not have enough inventory." Suddenly, the reserves became an inventory.

Now, I say that to Americans who are saying, "Is this worth it?"

We have an \$8 billion program, the Commodity Credit Corporation program. There are \$450 billion worth of food purchases in the United States. So you really pay \$458 billion, \$8 billion through farm price deficiency payments and \$450 billion at the supermarket.

The reason that this reserve issue is important, I say to consumers, is because—I will tell you, as somebody who represents about 55,000 of those full-time farmers in the State of Nebraska, if we cut this program back too much and listen to the rhetoric, both Republican and Democrat, around here, it leads me to believe that may happen. You may find this Senator on the floor saying to the American consumer, no longer are we going to maintain a reserve, because that reserve serves the American consumer, Mr. President. It does not serve the producer.

In spite of what this report says, that reserve is there because the American consumer is concerned about what happens if we find ourselves short of food. You say, "Well, that's an exaggeration." It is not.

In 1993—and again, this report would lead you to believe that farm policy does not have any impact at all on macroeconomic policies—in 1993, the Secretary of Agriculture, at that time Secretary Espy, was having to make a decision: What should our reserve program be? Should we set a 5-percent reserve, a 10-percent reserve, a 0-percent reserve? What should our reserve be?

The farmers in Nebraska, the farmers in Iowa, but particularly in Nebraska where we are polled a lot, said, "Set it at 10 percent acreage reduction program."

Secretary Espy said out loud and in public, "I am going to set a 0-percent acreage reduction program." Go back

and look at what Secretary Espy said. He said:

I'm afraid if I set a 10-percent ARP that my food prices are going to be higher, and if food prices get higher, inflation comes back in the economy, high interest rates could come back in the economy and this entire recovery could get shut down.

That was the economic analysis done by the administration. You say, "Well, OK, so he did that, what is the impact?" It is a big impact. Farmers were asking for a 10-percent acreage reduction program. They got a 0-percent acreage reduction program, and here is the effect:

In 1993, the corn payments under CCC in the State of Nebraska were \$600 million. In 1994, they dropped to \$160 million. This year they are probably in the \$700 million range again. You say, "My gosh, why are they going back and forth? Why is it 600, 160, 700?" The answer is, the price is impacted by the decision that the Secretary makes to set the reserve. When the Secretary set the reserve at 0 percent, farmers wanted 10 percent. When he set the reserve at 10 percent, we produced a bumper crop in 1994, along with tremendous weather that we had in 1994, we have lower prices and higher deficiencies in 1995.

So the higher budget exposure in 1995, which would probably be \$700 million in my State, is not something I asked for. I asked for a 10 percent reserve which probably would have cost the taxpayers \$160 million again. But USDA says, "No, we're going to go with the 0-percent reserve." The cost to the taxpayers ends up being four times greater, and guess who gets blamed? The farmer. The farmers in Nebraska are accused of wanting more welfare. The farmers in Nebraska are accused of wanting more money from the Government. Mr. President, American taxpayers should understand that the farmers were asking for a higher reserve which would have resulted in lower payments by the Federal Government.

Now it may be, I must say, that this kind of language, and others that I have heard, will result this year in deficiency payments being cut back. Perhaps the permission granted to this program is going to be pulled out if we change it radically. Mr. President, if we change it radically, consumers need to understand that this representative for American farmers is going to come to the floor and say we ought to get out of the reserve business altogether. No more reserve for the American consumer, no more holding food back on behalf of the American consumer, and we will just let the market set the prices. There will be times, as a consequence of that, when the price ends up being much higher.

This is not the only area where increasingly we come down and hear this mantra: Well, 60 years of failure, 40 years of failure. You hear it a lot about welfare today. You hear it a lot about other programs. I heard the chairman of I guess it is called the Health and

Economic Opportunity Committee. They renamed it over on the House side. The committee chairman, Representative GOODLING, stood on the floor of the House of Representatives the other evening—I watched on C-SPAN—and he said, “Just name me one thing this Federal Government of ours does well. Just name me one.”

I wish that he was a Senator in some way so in unlimited debate we had an opportunity to challenge that. I would have said, “Senator Goodling, how about you, are you one good thing? Are you efficient and effective? Because, if you are not, get out of here, resign and let somebody else take your job. If the answer is yes, then at least we found one.”

Then I would pursue it.

How about your staff, buddy? They work about 16 hours a day. Are they efficient and effective? Are the taxpayers getting their money's worth out of your staff? How about those folks over at NIH trying to find a cure for AIDS or cancer? Are you getting your money's worth? How about those folks up in the *Endeavor* a week ago exploring space? Are you getting your money's worth there?

I must say, Mr. President, I think as we come and debate, particularly as we are trying to find ways to balance the Federal budget and trying to find ways to restore America's confidence in Government, we ought to take care not to throw out those things and, in fact, to work it and take care not to throw out those things that, in fact, are lifting a little bit of hope in the country.

I find, as well, a tendency to blame the wrong people, blaming farmers for the farm program, while farmers are arguing for something that would cost taxpayers less; blaming the poor, for gosh sakes, for their own behavior. We know that the nonpoor behavior is having some difficulty as well.

Mr. President, I came to the floor because I did not like the language in the President's economic report to the Nation. I hope, though I am not overly optimistic given what I have seen thus far, I hope that we are, in 1995, able to write not just a farm program but a health program, a children's program, an education program, a welfare program that takes into account what is going on in the countryside.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, before my friend from Nebraska leaves the Senate floor, I would like to respond through the Chair to my friend the Congressman from the State of Pennsylvania that I do believe without any question that we do have in this body a person who is efficient and effective, and I believe the State of Nebraska is certainly getting its money's worth from the junior Senator from the State of Nebraska.

NEVADA PARTNERS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we come to this floor often, and most of the things we talk about are in a negative sense, whether it is the farm program, taxes, delinquency, schools, students, teachers, health care, floods, earthquakes, deficits, lost species, endangered species, all types of crimes—murders, rapes, robberies, battering of women—unemployment.

Mr. President, I am here today to talk about something on a positive note, something that has taken place in the State of Nevada that is now to the point where we can talk about it as being effective and having worked.

We all know that work is the cornerstone upon which we can do something about welfare reform. I have long been a supporter of a welfare-to-work program. I, with a couple of my colleagues in this body, sponsored legislation that would have modern-day American welfare programs handled like they were handled during and after the Depression, programs like the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Works Progress Administration, where people who needed Government help would work in exchange for that help.

That legislation—five pilot programs—passed the House and the Senate and was sent to the President. Because this very important legislation was part of an overall tax bill that President Bush did not like, he vetoed the legislation. I am sorry that our bill was part of the tax bill because, on its face, I am sure he would not have vetoed it. But those are the kinds of programs that we need to recognize have worked in the past and will work again if we allow them to come into being.

As we continue to debate these welfare-to-work proposals, Mr. President, I think it is important that we, as an example, look to the private sector, programs there that we know are already successful, and are placing people into the work force. A program in Nevada like that is called Nevada Partners.

Nevada Partners came into being after the Rodney King riots that took place in southern California and in Las Vegas, NV. We had significant civil unrest in Las Vegas, and the community joined together to find out what could be done so that this would not take place in the future. This effort was led by Gov. Robert Miller, who was then Governor and is still Governor of the State of Nevada. This was in 1992. He was the guiding light, along with the mayor of Las Vegas, Jan Laverty Jones, a number of State legislators, and others, to set up a program that has worked very well.

Nevada Partners works with business, industry, and government, to provide job readiness, training, and placement to the at-risk and disadvantaged and unemployed in southern Nevada. Too often, we have people who we train, but they are trained for jobs that do not exist or jobs that they cannot find. Well, this program includes all them all.

I want to take a minute here to talk about the reason this program came into being. It was as a result of the generosity of one man by the name of Kirk Kerkorian. He is a man who came from, to say the least, humble beginnings, a person who has made it on his own, and who is now, it is no secret, one of the richest men in America. Kirk Kerkorian has been a very successful businessman all over the United States, but especially in Nevada. It was as a result of his generous contribution of a million dollars that this program was able to get started. The program received its funding from an organization that he established called the LINCY Foundation. Nevada Partners now is wholly funded by the private sector. It receives no Government funding, not a single penny.

Since its inception, Nevada Partners has placed more than 2,200 applicants into the work force. This is not a statistic used to make a report to some Government agency just to look good. These are 2,200 people who are actually working now and who were not working previously. As part of their job readiness training, participants with Nevada Partners must take a 2-week class focusing on personal success, pre-employment and post-employment issues such as stress management, hygiene, dressing for success, interviewing techniques, résumé writing, filling out an application, and what to expect from an employer.

Remember, Mr. President, many of these people are people who have never worked and if, in fact, they have worked, it has been unsuccessful, or they would not be out of work now, most of the time. In addition, Nevada Partners, in collaboration with the Training Station, which is a private sector computer training school, offers a 3-week computer fundamentals course designed to equip the trainee with the skills necessary to obtain positions requiring some computer literacy.

What is unique about Nevada Partners is that this program not only assists those on public assistance, but—and this is important—it helps many avoid the welfare rolls. It has been successful in that we have taken people who are on welfare and put them into the work force. But it has also taken people who are on the verge of going on welfare and put them to work.

This program deals especially with young people. It recognizes the importance of reaching out to our young people to break the cycle of dependency. That is why, Mr. President, we must be concerned about the summer jobs programs that have taken such a hit in the other body. I was happy to see in the original markups over here that the committees of jurisdiction within the Appropriations Committee have not treated them accordingly. I think that is good.

We must reach out to youth. Mr. President, the Youth Employment for the Summer Program that is part of