

majority planned until the new majority puts its budgets on the table. They will be here soon, and they will move to a balanced budget by the year 2002.

I might also add, if the Senator from North Dakota had voted for a balanced budget amendment, we might be on a near course to getting this job done. I yield the floor.

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

#### U.S. INTELLIGENCE AND MEDICAL COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP

Mr. KERREY. Madam President, I rise to issue a challenge that I hope will be answered with the creation of a stimulating partnership between business, medicine, and the Government, in this case the Federal Government. An important relationship is developing today between U.S. intelligence and the medical communities.

Technology to support intelligence analysis is being adapted to improve significantly a doctor's ability to detect breast cancer in its earliest stages. Over 46,000 women die each year. The early estimates are, with this technology, that up to one-third of these women could be saved as a consequence of this technology conversion.

The technology being developed is simple to describe but very difficult to achieve. Daily, intelligence analysts deal with the problem of detecting changes in photographic images they are reviewing. As they watch foreign airfields, they want to know arrivals, bed-down, and departures of aircraft. As they watch foreign seaports, they want to know the arrivals, unloading, and departures of ships carrying cargo of interest. Computer software can be of great assistance in automatically detecting these sorts of changes at airfields and at seaports. It is this intelligence technology that is being adapted for the medical community.

Early detection of breast cancer currently relies heavily on the judgment and professional experience of doctors who review mammograms and magnetic resonance images. A significant part of their judgment is based on comparing previous images with the current image of a woman's breast. As in the intelligence world, detecting change is fundamental to understanding what is going on.

Through some exciting developments managed by the National Information Display Lab at the David Sarnoff Labs in Princeton, NJ, computer analytical techniques are being developed for the medical community. Relying on the technology developed for intelligence, they are adapting the technology to combat a dreaded disease that attacks 1 in 8 women in America today.

Madam President, I want to emphasize that the tens of thousands of lives that already have been saved as a result of intelligence technology by providing more effective national defense will be complemented by the thousands

of lives that will be saved through the earlier detection of breast cancer.

This is an excellent example of the sound investment of taxpayers' dollars being paid off by saving thousands of lives in both national defense and medicine.

The National Information Display Lab, or NIDL, is an inspiring arrangement that needs to be duplicated by other Government/private-sector relationships. NIDL provides the bridge between Government/civilian-sector requirements and Government/civilian-sector technology. By understanding both requirements and technologies, NIDL is able to help close the gap between the Government and the private sector. Perhaps the most significant part of NIDL's story is their funding. NIDL relies on Government funding to begin to develop technology, which is then spun off to the commercial world for civilian and Government applications.

On Tuesday of this week, Madam President, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Senator ARLEN SPECTER, and I announced intelligence community funding to begin the technology transfer for breast cancer research. The community is providing \$375,000 to the NIDL to push the technology ahead. We are all aware of the intelligence community's keen sense of urgency, great technical expertise, and excellent planning skills which will ensure that the push forward has an effective start.

I also want to personally thank President Clinton for making all of this happen. His commitment to breaking down the walls between defense technology and commercial technology, and his passion to attack the Nation's health problems with every weapon in our arsenal are the reasons this project is going forward. Once he knew that intelligence systems could bring earlier detection of breast cancer, this Government acted with determination and dispatch.

I began, Madam President, by saying that I was issuing a challenge. The challenge is this: Will all the interested parties—Government, medical, and commercial—now pick up the ball that has been put into play and carry it forward so that within 12 to 24 months—I emphasize this, Madam President, because this start will not come to completion unless we set a deadline and say that within 12 to 24 months, we are going to carry this technology forward into the clinical labs and clinics of this country, so that within this period of time, more women's lives will be saved through the earlier detection of breast cancer. The National Information Display Lab must be put on a sound financial basis, and everyone must help. I hope the challenge will be met.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

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

#### GUIDE TO SMALLER GOVERNMENT

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, I have several matters I would like to call to the attention of the Senate.

First, in this morning's Wall Street Journal, we have "A Bureaucrat's Guide to Smaller Government."

The following was sent in by a Federal employee who asked to remain anonymous so she can keep her cushy Government job.

She describes the way in which she talked to her other Federal employees or fellow Federal employees, asking them, "How will you know that the Government is truly shrinking?" They came up with their top 10 list.

These are the top 10 ways we can know that the Government is truly shrinking:

(10) When the Equal Employment Opportunity [EEO] office has a layoff.

She says:

Our EEO chief gets paid more than \$70,000 a year to coordinate "diversity" events and spout aphorisms at meetings. When that sacred cow gets a real job, I'll know the change has come. Which brings me to \* \* \*

(9) No more paid time off for diversity or charity events.

She says employees can get away with murder because of the Federal culture. It lacks an urgency to produce.

A lazy but savvy employee can spend most of his or her workweek attending such vital events as Earth Week, Women's Equality Day, AIDS Awareness Day, or helping in the annual United Way shakedown.

She says:

I'll know the cuts have had an impact when agencies like mine no longer can afford to have an \$80,000-a-year employee take "a few months off" to work on the United Way fund drive.

(8) When upper management is replaced for not making cuts fast enough.

(7) When the entourage for agency heads disappears.

She says:

My agency has about 600 people—small by Federal standards. Even so, the guy who runs the place has a scheduler who's paid \$70,000 a year, a public relations staff to write his speeches and press releases, and a clutch of assistants and advisers \* \* \*. A Congressman or Senator can get by with fewer helpers. Why not a bureaucrat?

(6) When the newspaper subscriptions stop. Scientific or trade journals are one thing, but why does the Federal Government need to buy thousands of subscriptions to The Washington Post or the New York Times?

(5) When somebody gets canned—and quickly—for running a business from his desk.

This one struck me, interestingly. She says:

I saw my first answering machine in 1979 on the desk of a Federal employee who was running a real estate business "on the side." Moonlighting on the job is still lucrative, as the chance of being punished, let alone fired, is very small. If the White House caves in to union pressure and won't push for streamlined firing procedures, then the Hill should do it and get these thieves off the payroll.

(4) When top management takes cuts, too.

She talks about the hiring freezes at lower levels, but not at the top.

(3) When nobody says "because we've always published this report."

"Hundreds of Federal documents," she says, "are published out of habit, not need."

No. 2, Madam President, as to how we will know the Government is being cut back:

When they take "solitaire" off the computer.

And (drum roll) the No. 1 way Federal workers will be able to tell when big Government is being cut: When there's nobody in the cafeteria at 2 p.m.

She says:

I believe the Federal culture can change. But does the GOP Congress have the guts to give the Federal bureaucracy a long-overdue kick in the pants? Some of us will be watching for the signs.

I found that amusing, and having served in the executive branch myself, somewhat familiar, Madam President.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### A BUREAUCRAT'S GUIDE TO SMALLER GOVERNMENT

The following was sent in by a federal employee who asked to remain anonymous so she can keep her cushy government job:

Does tough, bureaucracy-busting talk from the new Congress and the White House scare the average federal worker? I'm a federal employee and have yet to see any signs of fear among my colleagues. Perhaps that's because I have yet to see any signs of real change in the federal government.

Yes, there are some grumblings about pensions. But we've seen administrations and Congresses come and go, with their blue-ribbon commissions on cutting budgets, pay and jobs. Yet, budgets always continue to grow, hiring expands, and people get paid more for doing less.

I recently asked a few of my federal-worker friends, "How will you know that the government is truly shrinking?" Here's our top 10 list:

(10) When the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) office has a layoff. Our EEO chief gets paid more than \$70,000 a year to coordinate "diversity" events and spout aphorisms at meetings. When that sacred cow gets a real job, I'll know the change has come. Which brings me to . . .

(9) No more paid time off for diversity or charity events. Today, the lazy but savvy employee can spend most of his or her workweek attending such vital events as Earth Week, Women's Equality Day, AIDS Awareness Day, or helping in the annual United Way shakedown.

Employees can get away with this because the federal culture, in general, lacks an urgency to produce. I'll know the cuts have had an impact when agencies like mine no longer can afford to have an \$80,000-a-year employee take "a few months off" to work on the United Way fund drive.

(8) When upper management is replaced for not making cuts fast enough. Politically appointed managers serve at the pleasure of the president. If he's displeased by an appointee's not being willing to cut, the appointee should go. Likewise, the appointee should threaten transfers or demotions to

senior civil servants who don't or won't hustle.

(7) When the entourage for agency heads disappears. My agency has about 600 people—small by federal standards. Even so, the guy who runs the place has a scheduler who's paid \$70,000 a year, a public-relations staff to write his speeches and press releases, and a clutch of assistants and advisers. These people are mostly civil servants, and they represent a bloat at the top as they pamper and package their boss. A congressman or senator can get by with fewer helpers. Why not a bureaucrat?

(6) When the newspaper subscriptions stop. Scientific or trade journals are one thing, but why does the federal government need to buy thousands of subscriptions to the Washington Post or the New York Times?

(5) When somebody gets canned—and quickly—for running a business from his desk. I saw my first answering machine in 1979 on the desk of a federal employee who was running a real estate business "on the side." Moonlighting on the job is still lucrative, as the chance of being punished, let alone fired, is very small. If the White House caves in to union pressure and won't push for streamlined firing procedures, then the Hill should do it and get these thieves off the payroll.

(4) When top management takes cuts too. Hiring freezes and "reductions-in-force" are two tricks politicians and upper-level civil servants use, probably because lower-level employees get shuffled around while the top-heavy structure remains intact. Corporate America has known for years that a flatter management structure is more efficient. A smaller budget coupled with a results-oriented Congress might do the trick for the federal sector.

(3) When nobody says "because we've always published this report." I heard Mike Espy did something right at the Agriculture Department. He stopped publishing the agency's yearbook because nobody read it. Hundreds of federal documents are published out of habit, not need.

The original need for all this paper came from the days when the federal government was one of the few reliable sources of information—and when the kind of information it provided was difficult to get otherwise. Economists call that "market failure," since the market couldn't give the service. Today, there is no market failure in information, thanks to modems and the Internet. Except for the Census (which is constitutionally mandated), the feds should stop handing out information for free, cut the staffs, and let the market take over.

(2) When they take "solitaire" off the computer. Gov. George Allen of Virginia did it to his state's computers, and he was right. He didn't think Virginia could afford to have such addictive time-wasters on people's desks, and the same goes for the federal government.

And (drum roll) the No. 1 way federal workers will be able to tell when big government is being cut: When there's nobody in the cafeteria at 2 p.m.

There's a story that now-Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas was hated when he was a commissioner at the Equal Employment Opportunity commission, because he would scour the coffee shops in the afternoons and order people back to work. Someday, I hope a manager will find an empty cafeteria at 2 p.m. because his employees can't afford to goof off.

I believe the federal culture can change. But does the GOP Congress have the guts to give the federal bureaucracy a long-overdue kick in the pants? Some of us will be watching for the signs.

#### SENATE VOTES \$16 BILLION IN CUTS

Mr. BENNETT. Now, Madam President, I rise this morning to talk about what happened in this Chamber last night.

I am interested in the fact that neither the Washington Post nor the New York Times—the paper that considers itself the paper of record in the United States—took proper notice of what happened here last night.

I would like to correct that and talk about it for just a minute. I have here a copy of the Washington Times, the upstart newspaper, and it says in the headline "Senate Votes 99 to 0 for \$16 Billion in Cuts."

Now, Madam President, we were here 2 years ago, when the Senate was fighting about \$16 billion—interesting symmetry in numbers—for a stimulus package which we were told was absolutely essential to get the economy on its feet. Indeed, we were told on this floor that if we did not pass this stimulus package of \$16 billion in increased spending, the economy would collapse, people would be out of work, everything would fall apart.

We Republicans opposed the stimulus package. We did not have enough votes to defeat it, but we had enough votes to prevent cloture, and we kept talking about it and ultimately it was taken down.

That is, for those who do not understand the language of this place, "taken down" means that the majority leader removed it from the floor and it was left for dead.

We were told at that time, we have dealt the economy a serious blow. Indeed, that stimulus package was an appropriations bill referred to as "an emergency." It was an emergency appropriations bill, the advantage of that being that it did not have to come under the budget requirements.

You see, we have budget caps here and they say this is what is required. But if you have an emergency appropriation, that goes above the budget caps. We had this \$16 billion stimulus emergency before us and promises of all kinds of dire disastrous events that would occur if we did not pass it. We did not pass it. The disastrous events did not come to pass. And then, in this Congress, to show the difference, we had a bill on the floor, a rescission bill—meaning we were cutting out of the present fiscal year's activities \$16 billion. In business terms this is a \$32 billion turnaround.

While we were debating these \$16 billion in rescissions, in cuts, we were told, again on this floor: Disaster. If you make those cuts you will be throwing children out into the snow. If you make those cuts you will be trying to balance the budget on the backs of those people least equipped to handle it. We were told how terrible that would be. And we persisted. We stood firm.

When I came on the floor last night to vote I expected the vote on this bill