

African-American leaders. Many of those leaders have been seen as leaders of the African-American community. Ron Brown was intensely loyal to his African-American roots, but, like Colin Powell, he was also a national leader, an American leader who was clearly understood, in his great energetic way, to be battling for the well-being of every American.

In his struggle to save the Commerce Department over the last year, Ron Brown often compared the abolition of the Department to unilateral disarmament in the international economic wars of today. In closing, I note that all around our city of Washington are statues of our great military heroes. Now we are engaged in a different kind of global conflict: an economic global conflict. If we ever start building statues for those who have served courageously and with great success in this economic battle for the opportunity and the well-being of our people, we ought to erect a statue to Ron Brown as one of the finest of those leaders.●

THE MARK AND GARY BEEF PLEDGE

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, cattle producers in my State of Iowa and across the country are facing substantial economic hardship. Record-high grain and feed costs, low hay reserves, drought conditions, and an oversupply of beef are compounding the problem of a 10-year-low cattle market. I am pleased the administration has taken to heart our proposals to assist the sagging cattle market. Allowing haying and grazing on CRP acres is necessary to alleviate the high feed costs and a large beef purchase by the U.S. Government should help turn the tide.

Speaking of helping to turn the tide, a farm broadcasting duo in central Iowa has embarked on a campaign to promote beef consumption in the State of Iowa. Gary Wergin and Mark Pearson of WHO-Radio in Des Moines, IA are calling on their Heartland listeners to take a pledge. As one who proudly and easily accepted their challenge to eat just one more serving of beef a week, I submit "The Mark and Gary Beef Pledge" into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. By working together, Iowans can make a difference.

The material follows:

THE MARK AND GARY BEEF PLEDGE

I, Chuck Grassley, am a proud consumer of beef be it broiled, roasted or grilled. I respect the efforts of all those, from the farm to the supermarket, who make American beef the safest in the world. At this time of low prices, I can help in the most delightful way . . . by consuming more beef. I therefore pledge to boost my beef consumption by one serving per week, while staying within dietary guidelines.

CHUCK GRASSLEY.●

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

THE CHOIR FROM KENTUCKY

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, in Appalachia in a community and a county called Harlan, there is a group of young men who now for decades—some have fathers that sang in this choir, and their sons are now singing in this choir. They all donate their time. The director of this choral group donates his time. It is after everything else is done.

They have won international honors without much fanfare, without much publicity. But we know them, and we love them. In 1988, they were here to sing at the inauguration. They sang for the inauguration, the Kentucky Society, the Bullets basketball game, and they kind of took this town by storm. Everybody liked them when they found out about them, like I do.

Mr. President, this group is back in town. They are here visiting Washington again. I know the policy and rules of the committee. I can go only so far. But I want it to be in the RECORD that this group is here, and I want my colleagues to know how important they are to me, and to our State.

So, Mr. President, if any of you see some young men, fine young men, walking around this town, or walking around this Capitol Building—they have on light green T-shirts—I hope that you will walk up to them and thank them for their contribution to something that is real, something that is tangible, and something that is lasting.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BURNS addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. BURNS. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. BURNS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1726 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BRADLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Jersey.

NEWBORNS' AND MOTHERS' HEALTH PROTECTION ACT OF 1996

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, in 10 days it will be Mother's Day. This means something precious to mothers, grandmothers, and expectant mothers in this country. I, along with many others, also think it means something special to the Senate. It is our opportunity to take up and pass the Newborns' and Mothers' Health Protection Act of 1996.

I have several letters with me today. These were addressed to the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate. Each letter respectfully requests that a date for Senate floor ac-

tion and a vote on the newborns bill be scheduled as soon as possible. This is what we can do for mothers and their families this Mother's Day.

Let me remind us all of the history of the newborns bill. Last year, many of us began to hear disturbing stories about mothers and babies being forced to leave the hospital too soon after childbirth.

While we can all agree that sometimes it makes good medical sense for mothers and babies to go home quickly, we have to recognize that, tragically, many times it is not good sense. We have been moved and saddened to learn of the deaths of babies and of serious and sometimes lifelong threats to their health and normal development that come from leaving the hospital too soon after childbirth.

Many of us began to hear that the decision about whether or not a mother and her baby should leave the hospital was being made by the wrong people. We began to hear that those who should make this decision, the doctor or the health care practitioner attending the mother and baby, were in fact not making that decision. Instead, the decision forcing a woman to leave the hospital in less than 24 hours after childbirth was being made by a clerk at an insurance company shaving costs and shortening lives.

I think many of us began to realize that this was the moment in a situation just like this when Government should step in to try to provide protection to mothers and babies. We all know the health care environment has changed, and changed with startling speed, over the last couple of years. Such a massive, fast change, even when positive, always creates instability and temporary imbalances. On occasion, it creates a serious problem. This is a serious problem—forcing women out of hospitals after giving childbirth in less than 24 hours.

With this background, Senator KASSEBAUM and I introduced the Newborns' and Mothers' Health Protection Act, S. 969, about a year ago—last June. This is a bill that respects the authority of doctors and other health care practitioners, in consultation with mothers, to make health care decisions about the length of time their patient should stay in the hospital following childbirth. This is a bill that respects the flexibility that health plans need to manage care efficiently in our rapidly changing health care environment.

Mr. President, the newborns act creates what my colleague and cosponsor on this bill, Doctor and Senator FRIST has called a safe haven of time—a safe haven of time for doctors, mothers, and babies, 48 hours minimum for normal childbirth, 96 hours minimum for Cesarean sections. Under this bill, doctors, nurse practitioners, nurse midwives, and nurses will all be free to do their job. Mothers will be relieved of the fear that they may be sent home too early before their babies are stable and they are prepared physically and emotionally. Newborns will be watched

and tested and assisted with their job of adapting to this world.

When it is appropriate for mothers and newborns to go home before the end of a 48-hour period or a 96-hour safe haven, they will go home—if it is appropriate, they will go home. Followup care will be required and studied in greater depth because of the fine amendment that Senator DEWINE of Ohio was able to add.

Please understand that this bill does not require that all mothers stay in the hospital for a specified length of time any more than it requires all mothers to give birth in hospitals. A woman, in consultation with her doctor, may decide to leave the hospital before 48 hours, but in no event can an insurance company require that she leave in less than 48 hours.

Mr. President, April 17, 1996, is an important day for the Senate. The Labor and Human Resources Committee held a markup on the newborns bill and, after careful consideration, the committee members voted overwhelmingly to send the bill to the full Senate.

What I would like to do is return to the letters that are en route to the distinguished Senators from Kansas and South Dakota. One letter makes a bit of history. Six different professional medical groups have all signed the same letter asking for full Senate action in behalf of mothers and newborns. They are the American Medical Association, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Nurses Association, the Association of Women's Health, Obstetric and Neonatal Nurses, all joined by the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation. All have joined together to say:

As organizations representing health care professionals and advocates committed to quality maternity care, we urge you to schedule for consideration by the full Senate S. 969. We ask you to lend your leadership to guarantee that women and their newborns receive adequate insurance coverage at one of the most important times in their lives.

Mr. President, this is remarkable unity and should inspire us in the Senate to do the same and take action.

A second letter comes from more than 30 cosponsors and supporters of the Newborns' and Mothers' Health Protection Act. This letter says many of the same things:

Let us move on this bill. Newborns and their mothers need it. It is very important. We hope—

The letter goes on to say—

we will be able to inform hundreds of thousands of interested mothers by Mother's Day when this vote will occur.

Several of our women colleagues in the Senate—in fact, all of them—have agreed to sign a third letter. Let me quote a few words from it. It simply says: "What better Mother's Day gift can we give to new mothers than passing this bill?"

A fourth letter comes from the Center for Patient Advocacy, a non-partisan organization devoted to qual-

ity of care for patients. They write and say much the same thing. They say pass the newborn bill. Pass it so that by Mother's Day we can assure mothers that they will be taken care of.

Finally, I want to mention what I believe are the most important letters and pieces of correspondence of all. Those are from the more than 83,000—83,000 men and women, doctors and nurses, grandparents and families who have written my office alone to support this bill—83,000.

The Baumans in my State of New Jersey, the Drumms of Philadelphia, the Joneses of New York, the Avandoglios of Tennessee, are just a few of the families who have generously shared their personal experience and support for this bill.

The Newborns' and Mothers' Health Protection Act has earned unprecedented, unified, professional support from doctors and prompted many thousands of Americans to write us in support of this bill. The bill has been carefully developed with input from all interested parties on both sides of the aisle and throughout the community. It has passed the wise review of the Labor Committee and passed with flying colors.

Many in the Senate have indicated their support. I hope we will honor the occasion of Mother's Day and the voice of so many Americans by announcing as soon as possible that the Senate will vote on this bill and, in passing this bill, will say to mothers that now we understand that giving birth deserves the respect that the insurance industry has failed to give it in requiring women to leave hospitals in less than 24 hours.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Delaware.

WELFARE REFORM

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, it has been 39 months since President Clinton outlined his welfare reform goals to the American people. But he has failed to deliver on his promise. Welfare reform was not enacted in 1993 nor in 1994.

Sixteen months ago, President Clinton declared at a joint session of Congress that, "Nothing has done more to undermine our sense of common responsibility than our failed welfare system. It rewards welfare over work. It undermines family values."

As a matter of record, the new Republican Congress passed welfare reform twice in 1995.

H.R. 4, the "Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1995," received bipartisan support in both the House and Senate as it was being drafted. But the President rejected this bipartisan approach. It has now been 16 weeks since he vetoed authentic welfare reform legislation for the second time.

Mr. President, few people have dared to look inside H.R. 4 as it was, after

all, a complex bill reflecting a complex welfare system. Today, I would like to recommend a recent article on the Republican welfare proposal. The article describes how the bill incorporates three different conservative approaches to solving the problems which plague our failed welfare system. Let me quote from the conclusion of the article entitled, "Welfare Fixers."

What is especially interesting about the three conservative strands of thought about welfare is that despite the theoretical differences among them, together they provide a coherent guide as to how to fix a broken system. As men are not angels, Charles MURRAY's negative incentives have their place. But neither are men brutes, and hence something more is needed than a "technology" of behavioral change. As Marvin Olasky reminds us, a rebirth of the spirit of religious charity would change many lives for the better. And as Lawrence Mead reminds us, in a commercial republic such as ours, work is the proper condition for all who are able.

The article goes on to say that:

Indeed, the politicians have seen the big picture in a way that is perhaps not so easy for the lone social thinker to do. The Republican welfare-reform bills in Congress, along with the many state plans being put into effect by Republican governors, make use of Murray's incentives, Olasky's religious charities, and Mead's workfare. If there are theoretical and practical difficulties with each of these approaches, it is precisely the combination that may make conservative welfare reform politically palatable and even, in the end, effective.

Mr. President, you might expect such praise to come out of the Heritage Foundation or the National Review or another prestigious conservative organization. However, this particular article was written by Adam Wolfson, the Executive Editor of the Public Interest and was just published in this month's edition of Commentary.

Republicans understand, and H.R. 4 reflects the reality, that there is not a singular approach to welfare reform. We believe that if families are going to escape from the vicious cycle of dependency, they must be enabled to find their own way out. Welfare reform is not simple because human beings are complex.

The goal of welfare reform for all families to leave welfare.

But the path on how they get there is not necessarily a straight line. Nor, under the Republican approach, must all families follow the same path.

In contrast, this is precisely why Washington will never be able to end welfare as we know it. The bureaucrats in Washington see people only in terms of numbers, not as individuals. In the tradition of scientific management, everything must be reduced to bureaucratic procedures and mathematical equations.

But by vetoing welfare reform, the President ignored the most important number of all. That is, if we do nothing, the number of children on welfare will increase in the coming years.

When he talks about work and family values, President Clinton may talk like a Republican, or at least like a