

constitution of 1987 provides for a parliamentary system of government with executive authority divided between a president and a prime minister. Political reconciliation is necessary before the larger task of nation-building can begin.

Aristide has the opportunity to initiate a new, constructive phase in Haitian history. But first he must take the lead in creating a participatory political culture in which all Haitians have a voice. The coming elections are an excellent place to start. If he can bring himself to play a historically creative role, he may be able to convince Haitians steeped in cynicism that political comity is achievable. And once the promise of political stability is buttressed by visible signs of political reconciliation, he may find it easier to attract the private investment that his country desperately needs.

Rather than resting on laurels that can quickly turn to ashes, the Clinton administration should view the Carter visit as a wake-up call. It should take the lead in getting more international observers to monitor the June elections. And, more important, it should be urging Aristide to act as a true democrat and president of all the people of Haiti at this critical time.

Lawrence Pezzullo is former special adviser on Haiti to the Clinton administration. He and his son Ralph Pezzullo, an author and playwright, are writing a book on Haiti.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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

#### ORDERS FOR MONDAY, APRIL 3, 1995

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 11 a.m. on Monday, April 3; that following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be deemed approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and there then be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each, not beyond the hour of 12 noon.

At 12 noon, under provision of rule XXII, a live quorum will begin. Following the ascertaining of the quorum, a cloture vote will occur on the conference report to accompany H.R. 831. Additional votes can be expected to occur during Monday's session.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REGARDING RULE XXII

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Saturday count as the intervening day necessary under rule XXII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, Senator DASCHLE, the Demo-

cratic leader, because that will save a pro forma session tomorrow.

#### OFFICIAL SENATE PHOTOGRAPH

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, Senators are also reminded that the official Senate picture of the Senate in session will be taken on Tuesday, April 4, at 2:15 p.m.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, following the remarks of Senator DASCHLE, Senator KENNEDY, Senator DORGAN, and Senator SIMON, the Senate will stand in recess under the previous order.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

#### SELF-EMPLOYED HEALTH INSURANCE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I am disappointed with the news that we will not have the opportunity to vote on the conference report. I do not think there is any doubt that when the conference report passes, it will pass overwhelmingly.

There is no need to file a cloture petition. There is not one Democrat holding up the conference report this afternoon—not one. Whenever we have that vote, it will be overwhelming. Cloture will be invoked overwhelmingly. I doubt that even one Democrat will oppose cloture. So to go for a cloture motion at this point is really meaningless. There is no need for it. No one is holding up the conference report.

Cloture is designed to break a filibuster. There is no filibuster. We have not even had a good chance to discuss it, much less filibuster it.

So for anyone to misunderstand what is happening here would be a very significant mistake. The fact is, we are on the floor this afternoon and we are prepared to work.

I had hoped that by now we would be in the middle of a good debate about protecting children. I thought we would have a good opportunity here to talk about helping 1 million children with the Democratic amendment that was offered this morning. That is what this debate was supposed to be all about today. The fact that that debate is not being held is, in and of itself, a very significant disappointment. Because the majority leader saw fit to offer a second-degree to our amendment, I also feel very disappointed.

The fact is that we ought to have an opportunity for an up-or-down vote on that amendment itself. If the Republicans have alternatives, we ought to discuss those. But we will save that argument for another day.

It was the majority leader's decision to take that legislation off the table and then to put the conference report before the Senate for consideration this afternoon.

All we were suggesting as part of that consideration is to deal with the matter the Finance Committee had taken up, and that was to eliminate a tax break providing millions of dollars of benefits to some of the wealthiest people in this country.

The headline in the Washington Post says it all: "Tax Break for Wealthy Expatriates Sparks Class Warfare Charges: 'Confiscatory Tax' on Rich Who Leave U.S. Denounced."

What kind of class are we protecting here, for heavens sake? What kind of class warfare is this?

The real class warfare is occurring by many Republicans who will not even allow us to have a vote on the minimum wage issue. That is class warfare; an unwillingness to provide those at the lowest rung of the economic ladder with a meaningful income. That, in my view, is what class warfare is all about.

Every Republican and Democrat ought to be opposed to providing expatriates a huge tax handout. There should not be any question about that.

But let there be no mistake: As strongly as we feel about this, as strongly as we want to address this issue, we are prepared to set it aside, to have a vote at a time certain next week so that we can move along the legislation dealing with the deductibility for the self-employed.

We want that to happen. We are going to vote for cloture on Monday. We are going to support it on Monday or Tuesday, whenever the leader decides to bring it up. And it is our desire to move this legislation along as quickly as possible.

So there is a nice ring, perhaps, to the indignation on the other side, but the fact is that ring rings pretty hollow when the truth is laid out. The fact of the matter is, very clearly, Democrats want just as much as Republicans to pass this legislation.

We offered a vote in relation to both Senator D'AMATO's and Senator KENNEDY's amendments on Tuesday morning and to pass the conference report today.

So the record ought to be very clear about this. We were going to break the logjam the Republicans caused yesterday with the D'Amato amendment. We were going to break the logjam that was created, in part, by the determination by some Republicans to protect the wealthiest among us, and we were prepared to have the votes next week, Monday and Tuesday, just as quickly as we could work out an arrangement for both Democrats and Republicans.

That is not going to happen, and I am disappointed. It is only 1:30. We should not have the afternoon off. We ought to have the ability to debate why we are leaving 1 million children unprotected as a result of the rescissions made in the supplemental that has been pending before the Senate all week.

We ought to talk about the ramifications of 5,000 kids being denied opportunities to get adequate child care and hundreds of thousands of children who

are not going to get the opportunities in education that they should because we are rescinding the funds that provide those opportunities.

Those are the kinds of debates we needed to have this afternoon. It is very unfortunate that we will not be given that chance.

Let me say one more time, without equivocation so that everyone understands, we want the legislation to provide tax deductibility for the self-insured to pass this afternoon. We are prepared to vote right now. We will bring people back and vote as often as we need to to make that point clear, if that is required. But there ought not be any mistake. No one on this side of the aisle is holding that provision up. We want it this afternoon. We will take it on Monday, we will take it whenever it is offered, but it is going to happen, and it is going to happen with overwhelming Democratic support.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I thank our leader, Senator DASCHLE, for a very clear, concise summation as to where we are in the Senate this afternoon.

I might be missing something. I think, given the tone of some of those who have spoken this afternoon, that evidently I am missing something. All week we talked about how we were going to get into the issue of rescissions. That is a matter of enormous importance and consequence. The reason it is of enormous importance and consequence, in many respects more so than regular appropriations bills, is because this is funding that has already been planned to be used.

In particular, when so many of the funding cuts that are included in the rescissions bill affect children and affect education, this is the opportunity for the Senate of the United States to make a statement, to have a debate, and to have accountability—and also, hopefully, to take positive action on those issues affecting children and education.

The Senator from South Dakota indicated earlier in the week that he was prepared to offer an overall amendment to try to reflect the position of a number of different Members of the Senate on these issues affecting children and education and voluntarism. He had stated that earlier in the week.

It was his hope to offer that amendment yesterday but when our friend and colleague the Senator from Connecticut came over here to speak on children's issues, unbeknownst to us, as the debate will show, there was another amendment before us that was not related to the rescission—an amendment that dealt with the Mexican situation. That issue is enormously important and enormously significant.

There was certainly an indication from our side that if the issue regarding Mexico was to be decided and con-

sidered as an independent kind of issue, then the matter could be resolved.

But nonetheless, no, we had no opportunity to consider the Daschle amendment.

Last evening, when I was down in the well at about 10 o'clock there was a sense of urgency: "We have to move ahead with this bill," the Senator from Oregon said. "We are going to stay in all Thursday night and all day Friday." Read the RECORD—all day Friday. We are going to stay here even into Saturday if we have to, he said; we have to finish the bill. There was no comment that the conference report was coming up. That is a different issue, but we understood we were staying here to complete the bill.

And then there were the inquiries in the well: "When are you going to bring that amendment up?" It was decided that the Senator from South Dakota's amendment would be brought up at 10 o'clock this morning. Many of us who are the cosponsors and have had a long-standing interest, committee jurisdiction interest, came over to be able to debate and discuss these issues—at least to make a case about the importance of Head Start, the importance of chapter 1, the importance of the volunteer community service program.

The minority leader had hardly gotten his amendment in when there was an amendment on top of it—an amendment on top of it. Usually in this institution, you permit the person putting the amendment in and the principal cosponsors to speak in favor. That courtesy was not even accorded. We were off and running on another amendment in the second degree that continued on through the morning.

Many of us stayed here. We continued to think that, because of what the majority leader said, we were going to have an opportunity to make our case. Then at 12 o'clock, with a few minutes notice, we were told we were going to set aside the rescission issue. We were only going to return to the rescissions after the disposition of the conference report, which excluded a very, very important provision that had been accepted here in the Senate unanimously, a provision that was valued at \$3.6 billion—\$3.6 billion.

Well, Mr. President, on the one hand, the minority leader's amendment is \$1.3 billion for children that we intended to battle for. It reflects a very substantial group of the Members here, hopefully bipartisan, but certainly an overwhelming majority of the Members on our side. It is \$1.3 billion.

Then we were asked, in a matter of moments, to consider another measure, which I support, which is the deduction in terms of the self-employed. In that particular measure, the conferees had dropped a revenue measure that would have been worth \$3.6 billion, almost three times the amount of money that would fund the children's programs. And we are being labeled this afternoon as being somehow not considerate of the small business men and women.

As the leader said, it is 1:30. We are glad to talk about these issues. We are glad to debate them. I am glad to vote on these measures. And suddenly we found out, no, we are not going to do it. After he speaks, after you speak, the Senate is going out and, no, we are not going to give any consideration to these issues, we are not going to debate them.

It is a reasonable juxtaposition—\$3.6 billion from wealthy individuals who renounce their citizenship and \$1.3 million for children's programs.

The \$3.6 billion is on a measure which was accepted unanimously here in the Senate but resisted by House Republicans. We are told, "Well, we'll do our best, we'll try to come back, the next time we'll do better." I do not question or doubt the commitment of those members of the Finance Committee—but I have been around long enough to know that when you go into conference with a vote of 100-0 of the Members, you get more attention from the House. That is the record around here. That is the history around here.

All we are doing is saying let us have a chance to express ourselves on this issue. Let us have a chance to express our view on this provision that was worth \$3.6 billion when it passed through here last time and \$3.6 billion less when it is considered now this afternoon. We are told that for objecting to that change, we are told by the Republicans that we do not care, we somehow do not really care about the small business men and women. Let me tell you, Mr. President, I propose that we have a vote on adoption at a time certain—at 5 o'clock on Monday—and a 4 o'clock vote on the sense of the Senate.

I am going to vote for the cloture motion. It is going to be agreed to. The minority leader is quite correct, every American ought to understand it is going to go through on Monday at whatever time is established by the majority. It is going to go through. We are all going to vote for it. I do not know anybody who is going to vote against it. That is why this is an extraordinary set of circumstances. I am going to vote for it. Everyone is going to vote for it. But this issue is not going to go away. This issue is not going to go away.

We were quite prepared to have a vote on the measure at a time certain that would accommodate most Members—I would leave that up to the majority and minority leaders on Monday, whenever they want, they know the schedule—and to have a vote on the sense of the Senate at a time certain. We were even prepared to have that vote on adoption of the conference report and then a time certain have a vote on the sense of the Senate. That was certainly acceptable. But we in this body ought to be able to express ourselves on an issue of that kind of consequence and importance; \$3.6 billion—here today, gone tomorrow, when

one of the major amendments on the rescissions is going to be \$1.3 billion.

There are a dozen other amendments, Mr. President—on the voluntary community service programs, on education programs, children's programs—that are a fraction of that, a fraction of the \$1.3 billion. Nobody is interested in an undue delay in the rescissions bill.

But to say that, my goodness, this is somehow out of sync with what has gone on in common debate, and that this is an unusual way to proceed, defies the history of this institution.

I must say, I would think that the parents of those children would have to be asking themselves this afternoon, why is it that my child, who is one of those 70,000 that could have received assistance under the chapter 1 program, or under Head Start, will not be able to get it? Why is the \$1.3 billion is not there? My child will not be able to get in a Head Start Program because the resources are not there; my child will not be able to get day care because the money is not there. We are saying, no, your child will not get into Head Start, will not get into chapter 1, we are saying no to the school boards that are trying to have education reform, and no to the school boards and parents, that we cannot afford to provide the already appropriated \$100 million for safe schools.

The Senator from North Dakota debated the issue about guns in the schools, and we had a long debate about safety in the schools. And we accepted money for safety in the schools—\$100 million is proposed to be cut out of that. Parents are wondering why, if my school board wants to have those programs for safety in the schools, we cannot have it. The money has just been rescinded. We have just said no to \$3.6 billion in revenue that was accepted unanimously by Republicans and Democrats in the Senate. That is gone. That disappeared somewhere out there.

To raise the issue that somehow we are not really serious about dealing with this underlying issue, that is hogwash. I do not know why it is that every time you agree with one side of the aisle, you are a statesman or a stateswoman, and when you do not, you are political. Just read the RECORD on that. That was said earlier today. You are political somehow. This is politics. It is about children. When you agree, you are a statesman; when you differ, it is somehow politics. We heard that on the floor. I was not here. I was at another conference dealing with another issue which is affecting working people, the issue on the minimum wage.

Four years ago, the last incremental increase in the minimum wage took place. We have not had an increase in the minimum wage in the period of the last 4 years. Most Americans believe that men and women in this country want to and can work 40 hours a week, 52 weeks of the year, and if they do, then they ought to be able to provide

for their families. That has been true under Republicans and Democrats. The last time we increased the minimum wage, we had a Democratic Congress and a Republican President. BOB DOLE voted for the increase and so did NEWT GINGRICH. We are just asking to bring the purchasing power back to where it was 4 years ago. But they say, "We have no time to debate it. We have no time to consider it. We are opposed to it."

Evidently, those dozen multimillionaires were able to get their wages or incomes taken care of—to the tune of \$3.6 billion. They are able to get their interests taken care of.

Well, I wish that we had on the floor of the Senate the Dowd family—a young, very appealing young man and his wife and two children, making virtually the minimum wage. They spend \$75, \$80 a month just to repay a student loan. He is making the minimum wage and is still trying to pay a student loan. He did not have enough money to continue his education, and he is trying to pay for it. They are both working, Mr. President, trying to make ends meet.

As we pointed out—and I see my friend and colleague Senator SIMON on the floor here, and he attended that event—the principal problem this family has—even though they could do better in remaining on welfare, they want to work and want to be able to provide for their children—the principal problem they have is that they do not have enough time to spend with their children. The mother's principal concern is that, "My children will not grow up in a home like I did, where we used to be able to have one meal a day together, dinner. That does not happen in our family because my husband comes home at 3 o'clock, and I leave at 3:30." They spend an hour and a half with their children on the weekends.

These are our fellow citizens. They are wondering why some of us are raising the issue of preserving \$3.6 billion for a dozen very wealthy individuals who renounced their citizenship and we have no time for these hard-working Americans. They are not out there to renounce their citizenship; they are not out there to try to find loopholes; they are not out there to try to evade the taxes. They are playing by the rules. They are playing by the rules and are honored to be citizens of this country. But we have no time to consider them. We do not have the time. That is shameful, Mr. President.

I am not going to be lectured to by any Member of this body about what is in the interest of those self-employed people. We know what is going on. We know. That is a red herring. That is a red herring for protecting those dozen wealthy taxpayers who want to change their nationality and bug out with all the money that they have made here in this country. That is scandalous.

So I am quite prepared to discuss this issue. There are those who say, oh, well, by doing this we are somehow not

concerned. The American people are much more intelligent and much fairer than many in this body give them credit for. And they know, or hopefully they will know, what is at issue here. It is an issue about fairness. You can talk about provisions and contracts and compacts and all the rest of it. But, Mr. President, it is wrong, it stinks.

It stinks when we reject a provision that would have provided \$3.6 billion in revenues for the deficit. We are trying to do something about education and children in this country, and this provision, which the Finance Committee said will return \$3.6 billion, disappears out there because of some complexity. This loophole remains, and at the same time we are not prepared to get some resolution on the issues that have been talked about in Senator DASCHLE's amendment—the Head Start children in this country, or the chapter 1 kids, or safe schools, or the day care programs. That is just wrong.

This Senator is not going to go along with it this afternoon. We will have a chance to vote in favor of cloture, and that conference report will pass and will become law. Every self-employed person ought to understand that there was not one person on the floor of the U.S. Senate who spoke this afternoon who is not going to vote in favor of and support the conference report. I certainly urge that they do.

This did not have to happen this way. All we had to do was accept the sense of the Senate, pass this measure, and it could have been done this afternoon. We could have done it that way, or we will do it in a different way. We are still going to do it. I regret the inconvenience to Members if their plans have to be altered; but it did not have to be that way. I think the RECORD will show that it did not.

I yield the floor.

(Mr. SMITH assumed the chair.)

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, before I get into prepared remarks on another subject, let me associate myself with the remarks of Senator KENNEDY. I think we have to ask ourselves why we can be so responsive to a few millionaires who want a tax break that is going to cost \$3.6 billion and we cannot respond to millions of Americans who are struggling at the minimum wage?

I think we have to go to two things. No. 1, our system of financing political campaigns. Those millionaires, I am sure, if we look at our financial records, have contributed to Members of the Senate. Maybe to PAUL SIMON, I do not know. They have a voice.

How many people working at the minimum wage have contributed to Members of the U.S. Senate? Not very many, if any, because they cannot afford it.

We respond to those too much, to too great a degree, who pay for our campaigns. That is the simple reality.

I think the second reality is, millionaires can hire the lobbyists. That is

part of our system. I do not suggest that we change that. I do suggest that we change the way we finance campaigns.

What we have to keep in mind is, who is contacting Members? And the people who have real needs, working men and women who are struggling, are they getting their voices through? Too often, they are not.

#### FOREIGN AID AND FAMILY VALUES

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, after I announced I would not seek reelection to the Senate, President Clinton called me and suggested that periodically I should make comments about issues, on the assumption that someone who will not again be a candidate for public office could speak without having the onus of public gain associated with the remarks. This is the second in a series of observations in response to the President's suggestion.

We have heard a great deal about family values during the recent political season. There are few Americans who do not recognize the virtues of family values and treasure them. However, in no other nation do political leaders talk as much about family values as in our country, and in no other Western industrialized nation is there anywhere close to the 23 percent of children living in poverty that we have.

Political leaders talk more about family values than act upon them. Assuming that we are serious in our concerns about family values, we should ask ourselves what that implies in policy.

There are some obvious answers. We will be concerned about one another in a family. Violence will not be part of that family life. Each person will try to live responsibly and help others in the family when there are needs, great or small.

A slight bit of reflection will cause people to recognize, if we follow the finest ethical standards and if we show love and concern for everyone in our household, but ignore the problems of our neighbors, we will not be protecting our family. We will have failed in our attempt to project family values.

If the neighborhood in which we live deteriorates, our family is in jeopardy because of problems of crime, or simply because of a loss of economic value to our home. If an unpleasant atmosphere where we live replaces a pleasant atmosphere, fear will be the unseen companion, as our family members walk the streets of such a neighborhood.

Anyone who professes family values but ignores the neighborhood is betraying the very values he or she professes.

What is true of homes immediately adjacent to that family is also true of homes 6 blocks away. While the threats of crime and economic deterioration are less pressing than to a home next door, the threats are, nevertheless,

real. We recognize that family values are not a set of virtues to be practiced in isolation.

On further reflection, we recognize that what is true of immediate neighbors and those who live 1 mile away is true for those at greater distances. Ultimately, people in the Chicago suburbs who wish to practice family values must understand that they have a stake in what happens on the west side of Chicago. People in New York sense that they have a responsibility to themselves to help victims of a flood in California.

"One Nation, under God, indivisible," is more than a phrase. To the extent that we create that as a reality, we protect our families. To the extent that we permit the artificial barriers of race or geography or sex or religion or ethnic background to diminish our concern for one another, we diminish the quality of life for our families—all of them.

Concern for others cannot stop at the borders of our Nation if we are to protect our families; 650,000 American homes have experienced grief because of a loss of a family member in military contests with other nations. We have slowly learned that we cannot protect our families when we ignore the threats to nations beyond our borders.

If I were speaking a decade ago, I would have said that the great external threat to the families of our Nation is nuclear annihilation; the United States and the Soviet Union have thousands of nuclear warheads pointed at each other. If that spark had been ignited in some way, civilization, as we know it, would have died.

Today, the great threat to our security is instability in trouble spots around the world. As the only superpower left in the world, we will either provide leadership or there will be deterioration within nations and between nations.

Few thoughtful people in this country or any other would deny that the United States should lead. But there are sizable numbers of observers of the international scene who believe this Nation is too often squandering its opportunity for significant leadership.

Ultimately, the United States, along with the rest of the world, will suffer because of that. I say that with the knowledge that both political parties in this Nation must do better.

President Clinton faced the huge task of moving from Governor of Arkansas to suddenly becoming the most influential person in the world in foreign policy. It is not an easy transition.

In March of 1994, he did a better job than in March 1993. This year, he is doing a better job than last year. A year from now, he will do a better job than he is doing today. That is encouraging. He is a giant on the international scene by reason of his position.

But he is hampered in his effectiveness by limited background and also by

the reality that his two key players in international affairs, Secretary of State Warren Christopher and National Security Adviser Anthony Lake, are capable and knowledgeable but both are, by nature, cautious.

The net result from the executive branch is leadership that is generally solid but sometimes not as bold as it might be.

The greater deficiency is with the legislative branch. We too often micromanage. I have been guilty of this myself. A much worse offense is that we pander to public opinion and reduce this Nation's ability to lead more effectively.

A public opinion poll suggests foreign aid is unpopular; we cut foreign aid, even when it hurts our long-term interests. If there is a surge of public opinion suggesting that we avoid sharing risk for peace with other nations, we follow the surge of public opinion rather than national and international need.

When we discover that speeches calling for reductions in what we pay to the United Nations bring applause, we pander to the applause and become the world's No. 1 deadbeat.

What should the United States be doing? Let me suggest three points: No. 1, as a people, we must broaden our understanding of other nations and other cultures.

The provincialism of Congress mirrors our people.

A family cannot be said to truly have family values if they do not understand one another.

That is true within our Nation, where we have far too little understanding between urban and suburban and rural populations and far too little understanding across the barriers of race, religion, sex, and ethnic background.

But it is true beyond the borders of our Nation. The family of humanity needs to understand the hopes and fears, the dreams and problems of those who live in other nations. As we learn, we will be willing to share more than our experiences. But basic knowledge is vital, whether within a single family, a community, a nation, or in the community of nations.

Our knowledge is lacking. That is why the Peace Corps is more important than what our volunteers do for other nations; we gain a sensitivity to other cultures, a major asset to the nation. Colleges and universities can do much more to broaden the understanding of students. Can someone really be considered educated if, upon graduation as an engineer or physician or teacher or journalist or accountant or architect, he or she does not have the most minimal understanding of the rest of the world? We understandably lament the failure of too many graduates having even a cursory understanding of the religious heritage of the United States, but can people who do not have some appreciation of the beliefs of Moslems and Buddhists be expected to deal effectively with other nations?