

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

this Nevada Partners Program targets youths ages 16 to 21. This program, which is known as the YES Program, is a summer jobs program offering a series of workshops designed to help applicants to gain an understanding of the tools and skills necessary to obtain employment. Working with local employers who have committed to providing summer opportunities, Nevada Partners offers these young people critical exposure to professional environments, as well as the opportunity to become acquainted with community role models.

Mr. President, I had the good fortune many years ago, when I practiced law, to be one of the attorneys in my law firm representing the interests of Kirk Kerkorian and his family. He has done a lot of things of which he is very proud. He created thousands and thousands of jobs in America. But there is nothing that he is any more proud of than what has happened here with Nevada Partners. As a result of his investment, we now have over 2,200 people working. And from the time these remarks were outlined for me, we have a lot more. The number is unknown.

One of Nevada Partners' most compelling programs—perhaps a model for welfare reform—is the Women in Transition Program. Women in Transition provides 6 weeks of in-depth transition training in addition to task-oriented counseling provided by the University of Nevada-Las Vegas masters of social work interns. Focusing on empowerment issues such as domestic violence, evaluating and selecting child care, and women in the work force, this pilot project is providing an alternative to public assistance by successfully placing women in the work force.

The key ingredient to the success of Nevada Partners is the commitment and participation of the private sector. Private sector involvement allows Nevada Partners and its participants to respond more quickly to changes in the business climate than many Government programs allow. Moreover, the private sector can easily and readily assist in identifying real job opportunities and has a vested interest in ensuring new employees become trained team members as quickly as possible. Here is one of the good things that comes from programs like this. More than 80 businesses, including hotels, casinos, banks, and utilities are consistently providing employment opportunities for Nevada Partners' applicants.

Programs such as Nevada Partners provide an invaluable service to southern Nevada and all of its communities. Providing individuals with work greatly enhances their self-esteem, their sense of responsibility and citizenship. Employment is a key factor, as we know, in reducing drug use, crime, teen pregnancy, and other social ills that affect all of America. This program saves untold amounts of money in our criminal justice system, our welfare system, and our educational system.

Mr. President, I believe that people want to lead productive lives, not collect handouts. I think it is programs like this that we, the Government, can use as a model to develop successful welfare-to-work programs. I look forward to the debate that is coming soon dealing with welfare and to talking with my colleagues about the program that has worked in Nevada, a program that we can use to help formulate what we need to do to reform welfare on the Federal level.

Mr. President, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the ensuing months to formulate welfare-to-work proposals that include and incorporate programs that are working—programs like Nevada Partners.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

CONVENTION ON PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF CERTAIN CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following treaty: convention on prohibitions or restrictions on the use of certain conventional weapons (Treaty Cal. 1).

I further ask unanimous consent that the treaty be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification: that the seven conditions recommended by the Committee on Foreign Relations be considered as having been offered and agreed to, en bloc, and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that no other amendments, conditions, declarations, provisos, reservations or understandings be in order; that any statements be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as if read; that when the resolution of ratification is agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that the President be notified of the Senate's action and that the following disposition of the treaty, the Senate return to legislation session.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask for consideration of the resolution of ratification by a division vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is requested. Senators in favor of the resolution of ratification will please stand and be counted. [After a pause.]

Those opposed to ratification please rise and stand to be counted.

On a division, two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That (a) the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the

following Convention and two accompanying Protocols, concluded at Geneva on October 10, 1980 (contained in Treaty Document 103-25), subject to the conditions of subsections (b) and (c):

(1) The Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed To Be Excessively Injurious or To Have Indiscriminate Effects (in this resolution referred to as the "Convention").

(2) The Protocol on Non-Detectable Fragments (in this resolution referred to as "Protocol I").

(3) The Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices, together with its technical annex (in this resolution referred to as "Protocol II").

(b) The advice and consent of the Senate under subsection (a) is given subject to the following conditions, which shall be included in the instrument of ratification of the Convention:

(1) RESERVATION.—Article 7(4)(b) of the Convention shall not apply with respect to the United States.

(2) DECLARATION.—The United States declares, with reference to the scope of application defined in Article 1 of the Convention, that the United States will apply the provisions of the Convention, Protocol I, and Protocol II to all armed conflicts referred to in Articles 2 and 3 common to the Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949.

(3) UNDERSTANDING.—The United States understands that Article 6(1) of Protocol II does not prohibit the adaptation for use as booby-traps of portable objects created for a purpose other than as a booby-trap if the adaptation does not violate paragraph (1)(b) of the Article.

(4) UNDERSTANDING.—The United States considers that the fourth paragraph of the preamble to the Convention, which refers to the substance of provisions of Article 35(3) and Article 55(1) of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949, applies only to States which have accepted those provisions.

(c) The advice and consent of the Senate under subsection (a) is given subject to the following conditions, which are not required to be included in the instrument of ratification of the Convention:

(1) DECLARATION.—Any amendment to the Convention, Protocol I, or Protocol II (including any amendment establishing a commission to implement or verify compliance with the Convention, Protocol I, or Protocol II), any adherence by the United States to Protocol III to the Convention, or the adoption of any additional protocol to the Convention, will enter into force with respect to the United States only pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as set forth in Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

(2) DECLARATION.—The Senate notes the statements by the President and the Secretary of State in the letters accompanying transmittal of the Convention to the Senate that there are concerns about the acceptability of Protocol III to the Convention from a military point of view that require further examination and that Protocol III should be given further study by the United States Government on an interagency basis. Accordingly, the Senate urges the President to complete the process of review with respect to Protocol III and to report the results to the Senate on the date of submission to the Senate of any amendments which may be concluded at the 1995 international conference for review of the Convention.