

political violence and another mass exodus of refugees to Florida. The Cuban Government, which is successfully expanding political and economic ties with the rest of the world, is unlikely to give in to United States demands. If economic pressure succeeds in encouraging the people to take to the streets, the most likely consequence would be bloodshed. The military remains united behind Castro, the opposition is too weak and the government too repressive for any uprising to be successful.

Mr. President, it is my hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join officials who served in the Bush, Reagan, Ford, Nixon, and Kennedy administrations as well as the editors of the Wall Street Journal, the Washington Post, the New York Times, USA Today, the Economist, the Journal of Commerce, the Chicago Tribune, and U.S. News & World Report in calling for an overhaul of United States policy toward Cuba and working to promote a peaceful transition to democracy in Cuba.

Let us try the same policies and the same methods that have produced the freedom that has come to Eastern Europe and Central Europe and knocked off the shackles, chains of the Soviet Union.

#### TRIBUTE TO DEBORAH K. HAUGER

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I was deeply saddened last month by the death of Deborah Hauger who served as the Latin American advisor to the former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Congressman LEE HAMILTON. I had the pleasure of meeting Deborah on several occasions and was struck by her intelligence, vibrance, warmth and her deep commitment to doing what was right for United States foreign policy and for the people of Latin America.

I came to know Deborah through my work with Congressman LEE HAMILTON to change United States policy toward Cuba. On behalf of myself and Congressman HAMILTON, she and a member of my staff traveled to Cuba and reported to us their strong belief that United States policy was counterproductive and contrary to United States national interests. She demonstrated enormous commitment to the Cuba issue in particular, and to promoting democracy and human rights throughout the hemisphere.

She died at the young age of 34 and her death is a great loss not only to her family, friends and colleagues, but to the foreign policy of this country, to the people of Latin America and to the U.S. Congress as well. I hope my colleagues will join me in sending my sincere condolences to her family, to Congressman HAMILTON and to her colleagues.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

#### THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to call attention to a bit of an inconsistency in this amendment. If I may direct a question to one of the managers with regard to the amendment that is pending.

Is it correct that the Senator from Alaska, as he reads the prohibition on gifts, that it precludes a Senator from being reimbursed for travel or transportation to a charitable event such as the event which for a number of years was sponsored by former Senator Jake Garn of Utah? As my colleagues know, that was for a charitable purpose of the Children's Hospital. I think several hundred thousand dollars were raised for that purpose. As a consequence, transportation was provided to Members as well as lodging.

Under the proposed amendment, would transportation and lodging reimbursement for such a charitable event be precluded? I would be happy to have a response to my question without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, if the Senator would allow the Senator from Michigan to respond to that question.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Surely.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the answer to the question is yes, it is the same language as was in the conference report which was before the Senate last October, which had the support of the vast majority on both sides of the aisle and is the same language that was in an earlier bill. The answer is yes.

The reason for it is that a significant portion of the money which is contributed by the interest groups to those events is used for the transportation, lodging, and the recreation of Members of Congress. That is the reason for it.

But the answer to your question is yes, it is the same language as was in the conference report.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I wonder if I could follow up with one other question. Why would we preclude reimbursement for transportation and lodging for charitable events, yet allow transportation and lodging for political events?

It is my understanding that there is nothing in this amendment that would preclude a Member from going out to Los Angeles for a political event, getting his lodging taken care of, getting his transportation taken care of.

Mr. President, I think there is an inconsistency here as relates to the merits of considering gift ban legislation. And I wonder why the floor managers have not seen fit to include a prohibition which I understand was not in last year's bill either. I think that the American people should understand as we consider the merits of banning gifts, that there is certainly reasonable expectation that if we ban it for charitable events, that we ought to also ban it for political events. I wonder if my colleague would enlighten me as to whether I am accurate in my interpretation that, indeed, for political

events, one could get full reimbursement for travel and full reimbursement for lodging.

Mr. LEVIN. The Senator from Alaska raised this very point during a debate on the language which would ban travel to the so-called charitable events. That exact argument was raised. The Senator from Alaska attempted to strike the language which would have or which does prohibit the travel paid for to these so-called charitable events, and the amendment of the Senator from Alaska was defeated, I believe, by a vote of 58-37.

So, that argument was made at the time and the distinction had to do with whether political events are within the political activities of elected officials and are different from entertainment, lodging, meals, and travel to entertain where one brings his or her family. The distinction was adopted by the Senate during that debate by a vote of 58-37, I believe.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Well, Mr. President, I respect the response from my colleague, but when we consider just what constitutes a gift, I think we have to recognize that if we travel to a charitable event to raise money for a worthwhile cause, there is some merit to that. On the other hand, if we go to a political event in Los Angeles and get our transportation paid for and get our lodging paid for, that is meritorious, too, from a political point of view. But we are talking about a great inconsistency here in this legislation that is proposed by my colleagues on the other side. We are talking about cleansing the process, the process of accepting gifts. But they do not want to touch the area that is sacrosanct, and that is specifically political contributions and the way that money is raised.

Money is raised by travel to legitimate political events. And reimbursement occurs not only for the Member but, very often, for the spouse as well. And so I hope that those watching this among the American public, as they reflect on the merits of this debate on gifts, recognize the inconsistency that is proposed here. If my friends on the other side were suggesting that we do away with gifts, period, do away with gifts associated with charitable events, we do away with gifts that are associated with political events from a standpoint of travel and a standpoint of lodging, then there would be consistency.

But clearly, that is not the intention because there is a lot of money raised in this process. That process gets Members elected. So, I think as we address the merits of reform here in this body on the issue of gifts, we should specifically reflect on this other overlooked issue—political travel. As most of us recognize, the reason my amendment did not pass last year is there was some motivation, the motivation by those that suggested that that was too great a sacrifice, too great a sacrifice to give up political travel.

Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE]. I have little doubt that Congress, some time this year, will vote to ban most gifts to Senators and Congressmen.

Why will we make that change? Because there is a perception in the country that accepting a meal or a small gift from a lobbyist somehow corrupts the moral fiber of Congress. So we will pass the gift and meal ban to fix the perception problem.

END PAC CONTRIBUTIONS

I have no problem with banning gifts. But I believe it is hypocritical to say that you cannot buy a Senator lunch, but it's OK for a political action committee [PAC] to give a Senator \$10,000 for his political campaign or for a lobbyist to sponsor a \$500-per-person political fundraiser.

Last year, the Senate adopted my amendment banning all lobbyist and PAC contributions to Senators. However, when the lobby disclosure/gift ban bill emerged from the Democratically controlled conference, my PAC and lobbyist contribution ban reform had, not surprisingly, been deleted.

Mr. President, if we are really sincere in getting special interest money out of politics, then we ought to stop wasting our time arguing over small gratuities, gifts and meals, and instead focus our efforts on ending the insidious activities of political action committees.

Since passage of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974, the number of PAC's increased from 608 to 4,729 in 1992. Total PAC contributions to Federal election candidates increased more than 2,000 percent—from \$8.5 million in 1972 to \$189 million in 1992.

In 1992, PAC contributions comprised 24 percent of Senate campaign receipts and 38 percent of House campaign receipts. PAC's are touted by their defenders as a means to allow individuals to get together and advance their collective interests in politics. Presumably, that would include supporting challengers. Yet, in 1992, in races where Members were up for reelection, incumbents received 86 percent of the PAC contributions—\$126 million for incumbents versus \$21 million for challengers.

Overall, PAC's distributed more than \$160 million to congressional candidates in 1992; \$24 million—15 percent—went to candidates running for open seats. Since the 1970's, PAC's increasingly have funneled contributions to incumbents with little or no regard for ideology or voting records. Corporate and trade association PAC's are among the worst in this regard, giving upward of 90 percent of their PAC contributions to incumbents.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR CHARITABLE TRAVEL AND LODGING

Moreover, Mr. President, I oppose the portion of this amendment that disallows Senators from being reimbursed for travel and lodging in connection with a charitable event. This is an-

other example of the hypocrisy of the bill. Nothing prevents a lobbyist from paying a Senator's travel and lodging if it is in connection with a political fundraiser. If a lobbyist wants to pay for a Senator to go to Hollywood to raise money for the Democrats or Republicans, that's permitted.

But if I want to host another charitable function like I had this summer where I raised more than \$120,000 for a portable mammography machine that helps detect breast cancer, transportation and lodging cannot be reimbursed. This rule is not only hypocritical but also discriminates against charitable events in Alaska because the cost to travel there is so high.

You can be sure that charitable functions will continue to be well-attended by Senators, Congressmen, and lobbyists if they occur inside the beltway. But if we want to do a charitable function that benefits the needy in Alaska, it's going to be nearly impossible.

Mr. President, my colleague Senator MCCONNELL has been working on a realistic gift ban and PAC ban bill that will address the so-called problems associated with special interest influence in Washington. We will surely have an opportunity to consider these issues later in the year.

But now, the issue before us is whether we are willing to apply the laws we impose on the rest of the country on our own institution. This amendment is merely a diversion from that issue. Let us pass the congressional coverage bill now, and address the gift ban/PAC ban legislation at a more appropriate time.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

So, Mr. President, I am not going to talk any longer. I just wanted to point out the inconsistency here.

This whole matter began rather curiously when the association of former Senator Jake Garn from Utah ran a charitable event that was for a children's hospital—a very worthwhile cause. But a so-called television exposé featured several Members of this body, some of whom have already spoken on the issue of gift bans, and which implied that Members were being bought off by accepting transportation and accepting lodging.

There is very little consideration as to the contribution given to the Children's Hospital. I participate in that event each year, and I intend to participate in the event again this year because it is a worthwhile cause. Because Senators come, there is an attraction, whether it be curious or otherwise, to raise money for the effort, and it is a worthwhile effort.

Obviously, I can hold a charity event here in Washington, DC. If I hold that charity event here, there is no transportation; there is no lodging. I can legitimately do it. But if I want to hold it in my State, it is a significant cost to Members if they want to come up to Alaska for a fishing event of some kind for a worthwhile charity.

We had an event last year to buy a new mammogram, a mammography machine for the Best Cancer Clinic of Alaska. We raised \$149,000. There were no other Senators who could come because we were in session, but we were not precluded because the legislation proposed last year did not pass the conference. But it was a worthwhile cause.

The inconsistency, I think, is obvious, as a consequence of what we have before us. We seem willing to do away with reimbursement for transportation and lodging, but we would still provide it for political events. That is the inconsistency which this Senator sees is so glaring. That is why I urge my colleagues, when the appropriate hour is here, to reject the amendment because it is simply inconsistent; it does not do the job; it is less than a halfway effort.

Let me also comment relative to remarks that were made by others who spoke with regard to gifts to chairmen and CEO's of corporations. I was a CEO. There are policies within corporations that you designate procedures, and that is entirely different from the function within this body. Those people, through boards of directors and oversight and checks and balances, have to maintain the scrutiny and the appropriate responsibility to the shareholders. We have a responsibility to the citizens of this country, but part of that responsibility is consistency.

When we talk about a gift ban, if we are going to be consistent, we are going to do away with a gift ban and political contributions associated with transportation and travel. That is what is lacking in this legislation.

I hope we will have an opportunity to get into this at some length and hold the necessary hearings so we do not just end up window dressing a situation that many of the American public assume is being taken care of under the gift ban, but still provides us with transportation and lodging for our political events.

I thank the Chair. I thank my colleague from Michigan for responding to my questions. I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, if I may comment further, briefly—and I know my friend from Colorado seeks recognition; I will not be long—on the points that were made by our friend from Alaska. I just have a couple things to say.

First of all, we sure do need political campaign finance reform. I could not agree with the Senator more. One of the glaring omissions from the Gingrich contract, it seems to me, is that there is no reference to campaign finance reform and how money is raised. I sure hope we address it. It is a glaring omission from any contract of reform.

Second, last year during the debate on this bill, the Senator from Alaska moved to strike the prohibition on reimbursement for recreational travel

and made the same points that were made here. The Senate rejected the deletion of that prohibition by a vote of 58 to 37.

Is it inconsistent, then, to permit travel to political events? Some think it is, perhaps; some think it is not. Political events are closer to our duties in that they are not recreational; they are different.

On the other hand, for those who think there is no distinction, for those who think there is an inconsistency, they had an opportunity to strike travel reimbursement to political events. No Senator, including the Senator from Alaska, offered an amendment to strike travel reimbursement to political events.

So if there is an inconsistency that people feel here, they surely had an opportunity to offer the amendment to strike that travel reimbursement. There was no such amendment offered. I do not know whether it would have been adopted or defeated.

I also know that 37 Republicans and a larger majority, I believe, of Democrats, specifically supported this gift ban language in October; 37 Republicans cosponsored a resolution of this gift ban language, and a large majority of Democrats voted for cloture on the conference report.

So we had a situation where if there were an inconsistency perceived, any Senator could have moved to strike the travel reimbursement. The Senate did vote to prohibit recreational travel, and that is the way it appeared before the Senate in the conference report when the majority of Senators of both parties indicated support for the language.

So I think there is a differentiation, arguably, but there is not. Any Senator could have offered to strike the travel reimbursement, and no Senator chose to eliminate that alleged inconsistency by amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, if I may respond to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I think my friend will recall, last year I offered an amendment and the amendment was adopted banning all lobbyist and PAC contributions to Senators. It was rather interesting because that clearly cut to the core of the question of PAC contributions.

However, when the lobby disclosure gift ban emerged—emerged, Mr. President, from a Democratic-controlled conference—my PAC and lobbyist contribution ban reform surprisingly had been deleted.

I say to my good friend, clearly we had an opportunity last year to delete all PAC contributions. It passed the Senate, but it was not supported in a Democratic-controlled conference.

The Senator from Alaska has to conclude one thing: A gift is a gift. If it is a gift associated with a charitable event, it is a gift associated with a

charitable event and the merits are the charity. If it is for political purposes, it is still a gift. It is a gift if it is travel. It is a gift if it is lodging. And the justification is the political event and who benefits from the political event.

Sure, we are professionals. We are professional politicians, so we obviously benefit, as opposed to a worthwhile charity out there. If we did not subtract the transportation and did not subtract the lodging, there would be more money coming back associated with the political event. That is the logic that is used to say what is wrong with the charitable event. They take too much out for travel and lodging.

I think we have made the point, Mr. President, and it is one that this proposal lacks consistency and it lacks the reform that is recognized. I know my friend from Michigan and I agree that we need substantial review of the various political contributions, and that will come. But I rise in the sense of pointing out that, indeed, we have an inconsistency. We had a chance to clear it last year by accepting my amendment which was done in this body, but I think many people knew it would die in a Democratic-controlled conference, which it did.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN addressed the Chair.

Mr. LEVIN. I wonder if the Senator from Alaska will yield briefly, before he yields the floor, for a question.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. LEVIN. I was one of the conferees last year in that conference, and the language which was added here was not adopted by the conference.

I do not know of any Republican in the conference or Democrat that supported the language being in the final conference report because it would have had the anomalous effect of discriminating against incumbents against challengers and is more properly part of campaign finance reform. However, that was not just Democrats in the conference that did not hold out for that language. There were no Republicans as well. And I was wondering whether or not my friend from Alaska was aware of that.

And second, this amendment that is pending is amendable. If the Senator from Alaska feels there is some inconsistency here, he is free to offer an amendment to the pending amendment to strike the reimbursement for political travel the way it is stricken for recreational travel.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. In response to my friend from Michigan, obviously I was not in the conference but one has to conclude that as a consequence of the prevailing vote which this body initiated by adopting my amendment banning all lobbyist and PAC contributions to Senators, one would think that the conferees would have a responsibility to support it. Clearly, they chose not to. And one can come to his or her own conclusion as to why.

Mr. BROWN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Accountability Act.

I think my first contact with this basic issue that we consider tonight came in 1983 when I was a member on the House Judiciary Committee. At that point, Congress was in the process of adding new statutory controls over the direction of the private sector. I offered an amendment in that committee to apply the same guidelines, regulations, and restrictions to Congress that we applied to other members of this society.

That amendment lost on a straight party-line vote. Every Democrat in that subcommittee voted against it. When I attempted to offer it in full committee every Democratic Member voted against it, and I was refused an opportunity to offer the amendment later on in the process.

Thus, it is with some surprise that I find that this measure, passed the House unanimously last night. It appears that good ideas sometimes grow.

I think part of the reason this bill is going to pass, and the reason it passed in the other body, is because the spotlight is on and people know it is not fair to subject them, the working men and women in this country, to rules that this Congress will not apply to itself. It is a matter of simple fairness.

Mr. President, let me confess also to another reason for favoring this measure. The burden we impose on working men and women in this Nation is atrocious. It is criminal what we do to the men and women of this Nation who work and make the Nation go. The legal liability we impose on them, the paperwork we impose on them, the incredible overlay of bureaucracy, red tape and guidance is outrageous. The tragedy is that nearly half the Members of Congress have not had an opportunity to work in the private sector. Many of them do not appreciate the burdensome regulations we have put on working men and women nationwide.

I truly believe that if Members of Congress have to live under the laws we impose on the rest of the Nation, two things will happen. One, we will be treated fairly and they will be treated more fairly. And two, we will take a strong look at the kinds of laws we impose on people. This country is overregulated, productivity is damaged. We have laid a burden of redtape, regulation, lawyers, CPA's, and audits on this Nation that strangles our ability to compete in the international marketplace.

What we need more than anything else is the men and women of this Congress to realize the damage they have done to this Nation and inject common sense into the kinds of statutory control we impose on our country.

So I am going to support this bill. I am going to do it not only because of simple fairness, but because I firmly believe that it will lead to the end of

overregulation imposed on the citizens of our country.

Mr. President, there are a number of amendments, many of them sincerely offered and well founded, that should be considered. However, the leadership has promised that they will provide another vehicle to consider all of these amendments.

Indeed, there are many additions to this bill that I would like to see. I will support the effort to bring these additional measures to the floor.

I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan I think he has some good ideas. I have supported the gift ban in the past, and I intend to in the future. But I wish to see this bill enacted. I am not going to support amendments to this bill at this time. I am going to trust the leadership's commitment to bring these measures to the floor and provide a full vote.

My hope is that we will debate the issues Members feel strongly about; that we will proceed to pass this bill and enact it, and that we will get to the additional task of other measures as quickly as possible.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I shall be brief. I begin by associating myself with the passion of the distinguished Senator from Colorado, as he articulates a very strong position against the overregulation by the Federal Government which is well known across the length and breadth of this land. And I support the efforts which have been brought by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] and the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] on S. 2 to provide accountability by the Congress, by making Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives subject to the same laws which govern every other citizen.

As a matter of basic fairness, Mr. President, there is no reason why a Senator or Member of the House should not be subject to every rule of law which governs every other American.

Basic fairness should mean that every rule of law applies equally to Members of the Senate and House as they do to every other American. And if that were the case, there would be less regulation in our country.

With respect to the amendment which is now pending, offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, to have a gift ban, I believe that there is great merit in that proposal and in fact supported the gift ban when it was before the Senate during the 103d or last session of Congress. There are a great many amendments which might be offered to the pending legislation; also talk about campaign finance reform which in a sense is related to the subject before the Senate at the present time.

I believe that it is very important that we move forward with the Con-

gressional Accountability Act, which is the pending legislation, without encumbering it with other amendments which will slow its progress.

The reality, Mr. President, which may not be known by many watching on C-SPAN 2 is that when an amendment is tabled or rejected on the pending legislation, it does not mean that those who vote in favor of tabling the amendment disagree with the substance of it, if it were present as a free-standing bill, as it was during the last Congress and, as I said before, a measure which I supported. There is an effort known well through the length and breadth of the land at the present time for the newly elected 104th Congress, controlled by the Republicans, to get some things done and done promptly. And the House of Representatives is moving on similar legislation on congressional accountability, and it is the effort now of the Republican-controlled Senate to move ahead with this bill without having amendments pending which will slow the progress.

Our distinguished majority leader has already given assurances that this issue will be revisited and the distinguished Senator from Maine, Senator COHEN, has commented about bringing the matter up again with Senator LEVIN of Michigan. So this matter will again be before the Senate and we can act to do what is necessary to ban lobbyists' gifts. But at the present time I think our focus ought to be on congressional accountability, which I support, and that is why I will back the forthcoming motion by the distinguished majority leader to table the pending amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I think we have had considerable debate on this issue and I do not, certainly, want to cut off anybody on the other side. But we have a problem that some of us are going to attend a dinner tonight in honor of the two leaders. Some may not be going there. But I would like to move to table the pending amendment and have the vote begin at 7:15, if that would accommodate the minority leader and the Senator from Montana. Then I need just about 1 minute.

Would that be enough?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, if the majority leader will yield, I know Senator BAUCUS has indicated to me that he needed somewhere around 6 or 7 minutes.

Mr. BAUCUS. Six or seven minutes.

Mr. DASCHLE. I only need a couple minutes, so I think that would work out very well.

Mr. DOLE. So could we agree, get unanimous consent there be a motion to table at 7:15?

Mr. DASCHLE. That will be agreeable to this Senator.

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

Mr. DOLE. If I could just have 2 minutes of that time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I first want to applaud Senators LEVIN and WELLSTONE for offering this excellent amendment. It is very similar to the provisions in S. 10, the Comprehensive Congressional Reform Act which I introduced yesterday, and which a number of our colleagues have cosponsored. I believe it is essential that the amendment be included in the final legislation.

This debate really picks up where we left off last year when Republicans blocked consideration of the legislation which was developed through the tireless efforts of the, at that time, chairman and others. I hope my Republican colleagues will now work with us to enact this amendment.

Those of us who want real reform will not stop at congressional coverage. We have to restore public confidence in Government, and our reform efforts must go further. The Levin-Wellstone amendment does just that. Lobby reform is central to true congressional reform. Without it we will never end the undue influences of special interests. But without a ban on special interest gifts to Members of Congress and their staffs, congressional reform is reform in name only. Senators LEVIN and WELLSTONE and many others have worked hard on lobbying and gift reform and, in so doing, have demonstrated their commitment to true reform, to the end of business as usual.

So again, Mr. President, passing the bill that should have been passed last fall, and would have been passed if it had not been for the Republican move to block it, is a very good start today. But it will be a hollow, cynical start if it turns out that those who blocked that legislation did so only to reintroduce it this year, take the credit, and block other essential reforms. Lobby reform and a ban on gifts are essential to a genuine reform effort. Let us begin the year by finishing our old business and moving forward from here. Doing so will provide an even stronger foundation upon which to rebuild trust in this institution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Congressional Compliance Act. It is time for Congress to act by example instead of by exemption. This act will apply 12 basic American labor laws to Congress. They include the civil rights laws, minimum wage, the Occupational Health and Safety Act, the Family Leave Act, and more.

If these and other acts covered by the Congressional Compliance Act are passed, the Federal Government's regulations on the people will then be imposed also on the Congress. In these laws the Federal Government imposes

a good bit of regulation and paperwork on private businesses. All that is in pursuit of good, important goals.

These laws have done a lot of good. Undoubtedly some can be improved. But on the whole they make sure American workplaces are decent places, and there is no excuse for not asking the same of the Congress.

There is some symbolic importance to this. It shows that, as the Founding Fathers who wrote our Constitution intended, today's Representatives of the people are truly Representatives—that is, not a special privileged class.

The act will also have concrete beneficial effects. First, applying basic labor laws to Congress will put a brake on overregulation and overlegislation. Laws like minimum wage, OSHA, and so on are important. Businesses should have some basic standards. And it is no accident that America has a lower rate of deaths and injury on the job than any other industrial nation. It is because OSHA is a tough, effective law. It can no doubt be improved, but we do need a tough, effective OSHA law.

That is one side of the coin. On the other side is that well-meaning people, in pursuit of honorable goals, are sometimes tempted to go too far. They can lose sight of the basic American principle that in the vast majority of occasions, ordinary people do not need a lot of rules and regulations to do the right thing. So it is easy for people who write laws to move on from setting basic standards to requiring paperwork that adds costs, squeezes jobs, and does little good. With this law in place, each Member of Congress will understand the burden a small business owner faces because that Member will live under precisely the same burden. He or she will fill out the same forms, type the same reports, and adjust his or her payroll in the same way. If you live by the regulations you write, you probably will not go too far.

Second, the laws themselves will do some good. Legal guarantees of safe workplaces, minimum wage, guaranteed family leave, and protection for civil rights in congressional offices are important. They were passed to deal with the small minority of abusive employers. And no doubt, in a Congress of 535 Members and dozens of support offices, there are some offices where civil rights laws or workplace safety standards are not being met. This law will help stop that.

Finally, this bill goes a long way toward making Congress a more responsible body. I believe it needs to do more; to make it a responsible body. I thus intend to support an amendment Senator McCain will offer in February that makes sure when Members of Congress are found guilty of violating any of these laws, that taxpayers are not hit with the fine for it.

Again, this reform is long overdue. I cosponsored it in the last Congress. I applaud Senators LIEBERMAN and GRASSLEY for pushing the issue tirelessly throughout the Congress. And fi-

nally, today, we will see this body pass it. I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. 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. LEVIN. Mr. President, if no one else wishes to speak and if the majority leader does not need the full 5 minutes, I will take a minute or two before his motion.

Mr. DOLE. I just need 3 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the majority leader. I will just use 2 minutes.

I want to again urge our colleagues to defeat the motion to table. This is precisely the same gift rule which the vast majority of Democrats and 37 Republicans said they supported last October. There is no change in it. It would seem to me that we cannot duck this issue any longer by just simply saying let us delay it, let us delay it.

If we are serious about reform and the way we run this place, we have to finally, after years of talk, end this scene where free travel, free tickets, free meals from lobbyists and others with interest in legislation, come to Members of this Congress.

It is unseemly. It creates the exact wrong appearance. The American public wants to end it. They are right. This is the time to end it with rules that were supported by the vast majority of Senators in October, including the majority of the Republicans and Democrats. I hope that the tabling motion will be defeated.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the point I want to make was made before last night. After 25 minutes of debate the House passed this measure by a vote of 429 to zero. If we want to take 2 days, or 3 days I guess we can. But I want to pass the coverage proposal as advanced by the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Connecticut. It is bipartisan. It seems to me that the sooner we can do that the sooner we can move on to other legislation.

I indicated to my Republican colleagues earlier today that we intend to not only take this matter up but lobby reform, and other matters that we believe should be addressed which were addressed last year.

I certainly commend the Senator from Michigan, Senator LEVIN, for his leadership. But we believe there are some changes that can be made even in the gift ban. This amendment would not be effective in any event until the end of May 1995.

It would be my hope that by that time we will have even a better package. I hope that we can table this

amendment and move to any other amendments which my colleagues may offer. But we are going to finish this bill either tonight or tomorrow or on Monday unless there is an agreement, a reasonable agreement. I should not say that we will finish it. I know that I have been in the Senate longer than that. We will try to finish the bill by tomorrow or Monday. I know Senators can prevent that from happening.

So I urge my colleagues, including some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who had misgivings about lobbying reform and the gift ban late last year, to join me in tabling this motion so we can move ahead and pass this bill without amendment.

I think there is a good potential that the House may take our bill because it is a bit stronger and pass the Senate bill unless we clutter it up with amendments that require us to spend a considerable time in conference.

If anybody else wishes 2 minutes on either side, I would be happy to yield. If not, is there any objection to starting the vote?

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, we have notified on the hotline that it would be at 7:15. I would appreciate it if the majority leader would not and to save us a couple of minutes.

Mr. DOLE. I would be happy to add 2 minutes at the end.

Mr. FORD. The Senator has that prerogative. He is the leader.

Mr. DOLE. I am going to do it habitually, but I think some may want to vote right now and leave. I have already made the motion to table the underlying amendment, the Levin amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to come to the floor today as the chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee. Governmental Affairs has jurisdiction over this legislation. Our effort to bring this matter to the Senate immediately, is not following the usual procedure of committee referral. But this issue is not new. S. 2 is a modified version of H.R. 4822 as reported by the committee at the end of last session. For a detailed explanation of that bill and for further legislative history, I would refer Members to our committee report No. 103-397. To outline briefly, the committee did hold a hearing on June 29, 1994, and heard testimony from a variety of witnesses, including legal and constitutional scholars, along with our own Senate Legal Counsel, Michael Davidson. On September 20, 1994, the committee voted to report an amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4822, which had passed the House of Representatives on August 10.

S. 2 was developed over the past several weeks in a remarkably cooperative effort of a bi-partisan working group comprised of Members and staff from

both the Senate and the House of Representatives. The product we have before us today reflects the positive results that can be achieved when we are willing to work together.

I want to commend the chief sponsors and floor managers, Senators GRASSLEY and LIEBERMAN, for their leadership and perseverance on the issue. Without them, as well as the leadership of the former chairman and current ranking member of the committee, Senator GLENN, we wouldn't be here debating this issue today. I am pleased to join with them in this effort to enact S. 2 as the first order of business in this 104th Congress.

I believe the bill before us demonstrates that congressional compliance can be achieved without compromising the doctrine of separation of powers. Great care has been taken to maintain the integrity of the Congress as a separate branch of Government. However, there is no way to guarantee that the potential may exist for conflict between the legislative and judicial branches concerning enforcement of subpoena powers.

Another major challenge was to create a bicameral Office of Compliance, yet at the same time retain the independence of the Senate and House of Representatives to establish their respective Rules of Procedure without interference from the other body. Again, I believe this issue has been resolved.

Mr. President, Thomas Jefferson wrote that "the Framers of our Constitution . . . (took) care to provide that the laws should bind equally on all, and especially that those who make them shall not exempt themselves from their operation." In light of Mr. Jefferson's observation, one might wonder why Congress created an ever-growing, complex set of employment and labor laws for the private sector that it has failed for many years to apply equally to themselves. While we are here today to correct that disparity, I do want to point out that Congress has made significant progress over the past few years in extending employment laws to congressional employees—most notably the Senate action in 1991 extending basic civil rights protections to Senate employees and creating the Senate Office of Fair Employment Practices.

S. 2 will go a step further in bringing together the patchwork of laws that have applied in the past and make clear how these laws apply and provides for enhanced enforcement of those laws by establishing a more independent and credible process for remedial action.

S. 2 is an extremely important measure for another reason. Beyond its application of laws to the Congress. It is important because of the message it sends to the American public. It would be naive not to recognize that this legislation is driven in large part by pressure from the public. This is an issue of fundamental fairness to them. We have all heard the references to the "Impe-

rial Congress." For far too long Congress has held an image of isolation, privilege and superiority. That is an image that must change, so that the governed once again have confidence and respect in those that govern. Enacting S. 2 is a critical step moving us in that direction.

Enactment of this legislation will teach Congress valuable lessons about living with the laws it passes. Many of the laws that Congress imposes on citizens are complex and burdensome. It's only fair to make Congress deal with the same paperwork and bureaucracy that the average citizen does. That's certainly a complaint I hear from many of my constituents. Compliance is not simply a matter of probity; it is also a matter of paperwork, bureaucracy, and expense.

While I have long been a supporter of applying private sector laws to Congress, I recognize that some members may be concerned that these laws may be misapplied or abused for political, rather than legitimate, purposes. I share this concern, but I hope that rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure will fairly and adequately address this concern. Rule 11 has been recently strengthened to specifically provide for sanctions when misrepresentations are made to the court for an improper purpose. Significantly, the rule is designed to cause litigants to stop and think before initially making legal or factual contentions and is designed to deter misconduct. I am hopeful that rule 11 in conjunction with the counseling and mediation process developed by the Office of Compliance will preclude abuses of the process.

Let me reiterate, I do believe this is a very important issue and that we will be sending the right message to the American people by moving this bill quickly, without extraneous amendments.

Once again, I thank Senator GRASSLEY for managing this bill on our side and also want to welcome him as a new member of the Governmental Affairs Committee.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, today I am very pleased to join Senator GRASSLEY, Senator LIEBERMAN and my colleagues in the introduction of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1994. This legislation applies 10 labor and employment laws to Congress: First, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, second, the Federal Labor-Management Relations Act 1978, third, the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, fourth the Civil Rights Act of 1964, fifth, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, sixth, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, seventh, the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, eighth, Employee Polygraph Protection Act; ninth, Work Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act and tenth, Veterans Reemployment Act.

James Madison is often quoted in relation to the issue of congressional

coverage. He said, "Congress can make no law which will not have its full operation on themselves and their friends, as on the great mass of society." But I am concerned that the meaning of his words is lost due to their frequency of use in this debate.

What was Madison getting at, and what was so important for him to incorporate this phrase into the Federalist Papers? I believe he had a profound sense of public accountability and integrity in mind when he penned those words. He also remembered the degenerating effect of aristocracy upon the people.

Today, we are in a much different time period, but are never-the-less confronting the same issues as Madison and our founding fathers. To bolster the integrity of this institution, now is the time for the adoption of congressional coverage legislation in keeping with our American tradition. Congress has been exempting itself from employment and labor laws since 1935. I suspect this was done in a sincere effort to maintain a separation of powers. It was also done in a time when Congress was a far simpler organization, not the enormous bureaucracy we have today. Because Congress has changed, so must the laws governing it. Until we are prepared to live under the laws, Congress should not be imposing them on anybody else.

If business or private individuals run afoul of any labor, employment and health and safety laws, they face bureaucratic headaches and possible Federal court litigation. Congress has exempted itself from these laws completely or has limited redress with no right to full judicial appeal.

During consideration of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, I offered an amendment which would have made Congress and its instrumentalities subject to all regulations and remedies contained in many of the employment, discrimination, and health and safety laws enacted since the 1930's. Later, I introduced the amendment as a free-standing bill, the Congressional and Presidential Accountability Act both the 103d and 104th Congresses.

Adopted in lieu of my amendment was a provision authored by the Majority Leader George Mitchell and Senator GRASSLEY which provides procedures to give Senate employees protection under several civil rights laws and limited judicial review. Under the adopted amendment, the Senate was permitted to establish an internal enforcement mechanism under civil rights laws. This was a good beginning.

Since my efforts on the Civil Rights Act of 1991 and the efforts of those before me on this issue including Senator GRASSLEY, the joint committee to reorganize Congress and the bipartisan task force on Senate coverage were established and further analyzed and researched the issue.

The bipartisan task force on Senate coverage report was sent to the majority and Republican leader on November

19, 1993. Although the Senate task force report served an important function in analyzing the issue of congressional coverage, as members of the task force Senator GRASSLEY and I believed its conclusions would only perpetuate the current lack of accountability to the laws of the land by Congress.

Following the task force conclusions, I was pleased to join Senator GRASSLEY and Senator LIEBERMAN in the introduction of the Congressional Accountability Act during the 103d Congress. I believe this legislation met the principles set forth by James Madison.

During the 103d Congress, the House overwhelmingly approved 427 to 4, similar legislation introduced by Congressman SHAYS and Congressman SWETT. Following the House action the Democratic leadership in the Senate blocked any action and the 103d Congress ended without covering Congress under the laws of the land.

The legislation before us today will bring Congress under the coverage of labor, civil rights and health and safety laws from which it has been exempt. I am proud to say that I believe this Congress will finally do the right thing and ensure that Congress lives under the laws it imposes on other and perhaps the consequence will be to ensure that Congress will now understand how the laws it passes actually work.

Our legislation establishes an independent Office of Congressional Compliance to administer and enforce these laws. It also allows a congressional employee the right to sue in Federal court under those laws which allow a similarly situated private sector employee the right to sue. This right is extended to collective bargaining and occupational safety and health claims.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation to end the practice of Congress living above the law and help to regain the trust and confidence of the public.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise to express my firm support for congressional coverage legislation. This bill represents a most fundamental ingredient in the recipe to reform this institution. By exempting itself from the laws it passes, Congress is truly losing touch with the practical consequences of those laws. And today, we have a Congress in Wonderland passing legislation that does not reflect true workplace realities.

Over the years we have heard some very artful explanations as to why Congress continues to exempt itself from the very laws it passes. We have heard that the constitution prevents executive branch enforcement of employment laws on Congress. We have heard that the constitution's "Speech or Debate" clause protecting Members of Congress from legal challenges against them includes their actions as employers. And we have also heard how being a Member of Congress embodies certain highly unique circumstances not faced by other employers. I must say, not

one of these explanations warrants these continued exemptions.

One of the biggest reason why Congress so freely exempts itself is because it is not governed by statute—rather we live by our own rules. We set rules which allow us to go about our merry way with little fear that if we do happen to cross the line from time to time, it doesn't really matter because there is no practical enforcement mechanism.

The current system allows us to change the rules at any time—and for any reason. For example, when the Civil Rights Act of 1991 was signed into law, Senators were held personally liable for any unlawful discrimination. But lo and behold, this provision was quietly dropped from the 1993 legislative branch appropriations bill.

Another example involves the minimum wage law. Last time we increased the minimum wage to \$4.25 an hour, Congress was covered. But because the law was so burdensome, the U.S. Congress effectively exempted itself from the bill's major provisions a short time later. Just imagine if we allowed private employers to behave like this. Imagine an employer tailoring regulations to suit his convenience, and changing them whenever he chooses. Congress would cast a most disapproving eye upon that. So would the public.

Mr. President, it is no wonder why business organizations have made congressional accountability their top legislative priority. If Congress is forced to live with the laws it passes, it may act with considerably more prudence.

Congressional accountability could well become a practical tool in our legislative work. True congressional coverage would provide each of us with immediate impact as to the successes, failures and unanticipated implications of our programs. Exemptions, on the other hand, insulate us from the real impact of the laws we pass. We need to know how our laws feel to those out there in the real world where the rubber hits the road.

Congressional accountability is an issue of necessity. New employment laws are increasingly rushed through congress on unrelated bills, with no opportunity for public hearings or debate. It is imperative that we put the brakes on the accelerating speed of carelessly enacted employment requirements.

Congressional accountability is also about simple fairness. We do indeed deal with a lot of very complicated issues here in the U.S. Senate, but this issue is not really very complicated at all. The rest of American voters are out there paying taxes, complying with Federal regulation after Federal regulation, and playing by the rules. On the other hand, there is the perception that we continue to sit here in our ivory towers issuing our decrees, yet, telling the American public to "Do as we say, not as we do." It is only fair that our own congressional employees should be completely covered by employment laws.

I urge the Senate to pass the Congressional Accountability Act. To pass it cleanly, kept free of unnecessary and nongermane amendments. I thank the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] would each vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 2 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Ashcroft	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Packwood
Brown	Gregg	Pressler
Burns	Hatch	Roth
Campbell	Helms	Santorum
Chafee	Hutchison	Shelby
Coats	Inhofe	Simpson
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith
Cohen	Johnston	Snowe
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Specter
Craig	Kempthorne	Stevens
D'Amato	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Lieberman	Thompson
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
Faircloth	Mack	
Frist	McConnell	

NAYS—39

Abraham	Dodd	Kohl
Akaka	Dorgan	Lautenberg
Baucus	Exon	Levin
Biden	Feingold	Mikulski
Bingaman	Feinstein	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Ford	Moynihan
Bradley	Glenn	Murray
Breaux	Graham	Pell
Bryan	Harkin	Pryor
Bumpers	Hatfield	Reid
Byrd	Inouye	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kerry	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—9

Gramm	Kerrey	Nunn
Hefflin	Leahy	Robb
Hollings	McCain	Simon

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.



Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4

(Purpose: To prohibit the personal use of accrued frequent flyer miles by Members and employees of the Congress)

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

I will not debate this amendment, but I am going to ask the clerk to read the entire amendment. I think it explains it totally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD, proposes an amendment numbered 4.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC.—USE OF FREQUENT FLYER MILES.

(a) LIMITATION OF THE USE OF TRAVEL AWARDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, or any rule, regulation, or other authority, any travel award that accrues by reason of official travel of a Member, officer, or employee of the Senate or House of Representatives shall be considered the property of the Government and may not be converted to personal use.

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate shall have authority to prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term "travel award" means any frequent flyer, free, or discounted travel, or other travel benefit, whether awarded by coupon, membership, or otherwise; and

(2) the term "official travel" means travel engaged in the course of official business of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I thank the clerk.

Mr. President, the amendment I have sent to the desk relates to the use of frequent flier bonuses usually awarded by airlines. Both the Senate travel regulations and those applicable to executive branch travel require that any such benefits paid by an airline that are based on travel that was paid by taxpayer funds must be used for official purposes.

Senate travel regulations on this subject are as follows:

Discount coupons, frequent flyer mileage, or other evidence of reduced fares, obtained on official travel, shall be turned in to the office for which the travel was performed so that they may be utilized for future official travel. This regulation is predicated upon the general government policy that all promotional materials such as bonus flights, reduced-fare coupons, cash, merchandise, gifts, credits toward future free or reduced costs of services or goods, earned as a result of trips paid by appropriated funds are the property of the government and may not be retained by the traveler for personal use.

This amendment will require that all such benefits be used for official travel by the office that pays for the original travel. In this way, the Government rather than the individual traveler will receive the benefit.

The correctness of this policy is so obvious that I find it strange that an amendment, such as the one I now offer, should have to be considered. I can find no justification for a public official or elected Member of Congress to consider and use such a bonus for personal purposes. The value of any such bonus awarded to a traveler is included in the price of the ticket. Since the taxpayers have paid for that benefit when the travel is charged to the Government, it is only right that the taxpayer receive such a benefit.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I have indicated there will be no more votes this evening. This will be the pending amendment. We will be back on the bill at 9:30 tomorrow morning, and we will be on it throughout the day tomorrow and Monday, unless we can reach some agreement. I would be prepared to entertain an agreement that would let us proceed with the amendments and postpone votes until Tuesday a.m. and then move to the unfunded mandates legislation at 2:30 p.m. on Tuesday. So we will be working on it. If we cannot reach an agreement, we will just finish this bill and proceed as we can on unfunded mandates.

Mr. GLENN. There will be votes tomorrow?

Mr. DOLE. There will be votes tomorrow, yes.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is noted.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for not more than 5 minutes each.

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

#### THE DECISION TO ABOLISH CAUCUSES

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, the decision by the House Republican Conference to abolish legislative service organizations brings to an end the proud and productive history of the

Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus.

With regret that the caucus will not be able to play a role at this critical time of debate over the role of U.S. foreign policy in the post-cold-war world, the caucus will cost its doors in 1995. We are pursuing the possibility of establishing a new private entity to perform certain caucus roles, but at this time we plan to transfer caucus papers to the Legislative Archives Center of the National Archives. We also plan to transfer any unobligated caucus funds to the Treasury.

For 30 years this bipartisan caucus—formerly named Members of Congress for Peace through Law—has played a constructive role on issues of war and peace in our time: in the 1960's it opposed the war in Vietnam; in the 1970's and 1980's it championed efforts for nuclear arms control; in the 1980's it built a powerful congressional coalition seeking negotiated solutions to the wars in El Salvador and Nicaragua; and in the 1990's it sought to focus on the post-cold war problems of weapons proliferation and the need for a strengthened United Nations. Throughout, it has also worked to promote human rights and improve the economic situation of peoples in the developing world.

Its record in providing legislative services is also a proud one: during the 103d Congress alone, the caucus issued 150 legislative alerts and reports, over 30 special issue reports and fact sheets, and 3 in-depth comprehensive policy reports. It also hosted 10 meetings for Members or staff with outside experts. Claims by LSO opponents that LSO's are simply special interest groups with little legislative function are, certainly in this case, patently untrue.

Finally, throughout its history, the Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus has upheld the strictest standards of financial accountability and has fully complied with LSO regulations and reporting.

On behalf of the 125 caucus members, I express our hope that in some way, even without a support staff to coordinate our efforts, will be able to continue the distinguished tradition of acting in a bipartisan and bicameral manner to pursue the goal of a more peaceful world.

#### THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the Congressional Accountability Act. I have cosponsored this legislation during the past several years because of my strong belief that what is fair is fair and what is right is right—whether it is in the halls of Congress or the factories, shops and offices throughout America.

Traditionally, Congress has exempted itself from fair labor practices, occupational safety and health, age discrimination and many other laws with which