

Moines to cover the girls' tournament. In 1990, the tournament even attracted a film crew from Japan. The television contract for the Iowa girls' basketball tournament is the largest for any girls' or boys' high school sport in America.

From 1920 through 1984, Iowa high school girls exclusively played the six-on-six version of basketball. The six-on-six girls' game was such an important part of Iowa culture that national newspapers, television stations, and magazines rushed to Iowa in 1993 to cover the final six-on-six tournament. Iowa girls now play the common five-on-five style of basketball, and Iowans still flock to see their daughters and sisters compete annually for the State championship.

Whether they were trained in the five-on-five or six-on-six game, Iowans have had a national impact on girls' basketball. This success has continued beyond the high school level. Since 1935, more than 100 Iowans have been named to the Amateur Athletic Union or Collegiate All-American women's basketball teams. Some of the country's most notable girls' and women's basketball players have come from Iowa. Denise Long of Union-Whitten High School set the national high school scoring record in 1969 with more than 6,000 career points. Lynne Lorenzen of Ventura broke that same record in 1987 by scoring over 6,700 points. At the college level, Molly Goodenbauer of Waterloo led Stanford University to the 1992 national championship, and was chosen Most Outstanding Player of the NCAA Tournament. And Karen Jennings of Neola Tri-Center High School was named National Player of the Year at the University of Nebraska in 1993.

Girls' basketball has been a source of community pride and honor in Iowa for more than 100 years, from small towns like Mediapolis and Auburn, to the cities of Cedar Rapids and Des Moines. The sport has become an expression of Iowa's qualities of competitiveness, teamwork, and determination. But above all else, girls' basketball has allowed the State to showcase one of its most precious resources—the young women of Iowa.●

THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. ARMY VETERINARY CORPS

● Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the U.S. Army Veterinary Corps on the occasion of its 80th anniversary.

Established on June 3, 1916, the Veterinary Corps has distinguished itself through exemplary service in two world wars, the Korean and Vietnam conflicts, Operation Desert Storm, and, most recently, in the peacekeeping operation in Bosnia. The responsibilities of the Veterinary Corps have evolved from that of equine medicine for the cavalry of 1916 to diverse roles encompassing not only the traditional role of animal medicine but also food hygiene and quality assurance, prevention of diseases transmissible between animals

and man, and medical research and development.

The professional excellence of the 396 officers serving in the Veterinary Corps is exemplified by the fact that 186—47 percent—of these officers are board certified in at least one specialty recognized by the American Veterinary Medical Association.

As the Department of Defense Executive Agent for Veterinary Services, the U.S. Army Veterinary Corps is responsible for providing its expertise to all of the military services on a worldwide basis. Through the assurance of a safe and wholesome food supply, animal disease prevention and control, animal-facilitated therapy for hospitalized service members and families, and medical and subsistence research and material development, the contributions of veterinarians as health care providers are essential to the well-being of the soldier, sailor, airman, and marine. It is indeed a pleasure for me to salute the U.S. Army Veterinary Corps in recognition of its innumerable contributions to our national defense, and to extend my congratulations to the members of the Veterinary Corps, past and present, upon this 80th anniversary.●

TRIBUTE TO STANLEY O. BROWN

● Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay a special tribute to Mr. Stanley O. Brown. It is a great pleasure to recognize Mr. Stanley O. Brown for his 36 years of loyal service to the Missouri League of Savings Institute and its members.

Mr. Brown joined the Missouri League of Savings Institute in Jefferson City, MO, on February 1, 1960. Since then his dedication and constructive counsel to the State's savings and loan industry have made an invaluable impact on the State of Missouri and our Nation's banking institutions. His inestimable contributions and respected professional experience will be sorely missed when he retires from his position as vice chairman of Missouri League of Savings Institute on June 30, 1996.

Prior to his vice chairmanship of the Missouri League of Savings Institutions, Mr. Brown served as president of the Staff Leadership Conference and was a member of both the Missouri League's Legislative Committee and the Missouri League's Insurance Trust Committee.

It is an honor to congratulate Mr. Stanley Brown on his long-lasting commitment to the Missouri League of Savings Institutions and to the State of Missouri. I wish him the best of luck in all his future endeavors and continued good health and happiness.●

BIPARTISAN WELFARE REFORM

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, a couple of days ago the Mason City Globe-Gazette in my State of Iowa published an excellent editorial calling on national policymakers to put partisan politics

aside in order to pass bipartisan welfare reform. I couldn't agree more.

Over the past 3 years I have talked time and time again about the need to enact bipartisan welfare reform which demands responsibility from day one, requires work and releases welfare families from the cycle of dependency. The Iowa family investment program provides us with an effective model for achieving these goals. Since Iowa began implementing the welfare reforms in October 1993, the number of people working has almost doubled, the welfare caseload had declined, and welfare costs are down. I call that a triple play.

Those are good reasons to look at the Iowa experience as we craft legislation, but I commend the Iowa experience to my colleagues for another reason. In 1993, Iowa enacted sweeping changes to the welfare system and did so with very strong bipartisan support. In fact, the Iowa plan received only 1 dissenting vote from the 150-member Democratically controlled general assembly and was signed into law by our Republican Governor. It shows that it is possible to work together on welfare reform and the State of Iowa is better because of it.

In 1994 I sought to take a page from the Iowa play book and went to work with my Republican colleague from Missouri, Senator KIT BOND to develop bipartisan welfare reform legislation modeled on innovations occurring in our respective States. The result was the first bipartisan welfare reform legislation in that session of Congress. The bill was reintroduced again last year.

For the most part partisan wrangling prevailed in 1995. There were a few instances of bipartisan cooperation, but they were quickly overtaken by political gamesmanship.

There is one lesson to be learned from the past year and half—confrontation and partisanship is a prescription for failure. The only way we can truly accomplish welfare reform this year is to stop the political games and join forces across the aisle to craft bipartisan welfare reform which accomplishes the goals that the American people support—a welfare system that puts people to work and gets them off public assistance quickly and permanently.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the editorial be printed in the RECORD, and urge my colleagues to hear its message.

The editorial follows:

[From the Mason City (IA) Globe-Gazette, June 18, 1996]

REFORMING WELFARE AND PARTISAN POLITICS SHOULD BE SEPARATE

It's true that in many cases, public opinion changes faster than the politicians.

That's certainly the case with welfare reform, according to a recent Associated Press poll.

The poll shows that most Americans favor converting welfare into a work program and that half are ready to pay more taxes to make jobs available.

The poll also shows that most Americans wish to limit welfare funds to single mothers, and to put single mothers on a work plan.

Those types of plans are being tested in several states, including Iowa and Wisconsin. The reform agenda is clogged, however, in the Washington political system.

A welfare system that puts people back to work, and aims to get them off welfare is a good idea. The only exception that should be added is that the system include some compassion.

One of the reasons welfare reform hasn't taken off in Washington has to do with political posturing.

Both Democrats and Republicans are turning the debate into a class issue. That's not where the issue belongs.

For example, both Democrats and Republicans make a major issue out of single mothers. Truthfully, however, single mothers make up only a small percentage of the welfare recipients.

Both sides also talk about welfare recipients as if they spend their lives on the dole. The truth, however, is that most welfare recipients move in and out of the system. A small percentage spend an extended amount of time on welfare.

A welfare reform plan that includes work or schooling instead of hand-outs is a good idea. Limiting welfare recipients to two years of benefits is also an improvement.

Both Democrats and Republicans have said they would support plans similar to those currently in use here and in Wisconsin.

But nothing will really happen until highly partisan politics are removed from the picture.●

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1219

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on the campaign finance reform bill scheduled for the morning of Tuesday June 25 be equally divided between the two leaders.

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

AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY AND REPRESENTATION OF FORMER SENATE EMPLOYEE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of a Senate resolution submitted earlier today by the majority leader and the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 269) to authorize testimony and representation of former Senate employee in *Ward v. United States*.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, in the case of *Ward versus United States*, a civil action for damages resulting from alleged improper disclosure of tax-return information by the Internal Revenue Service, the plaintiff has requested testimony from a former chief of staff to Senator BROWN. While he was employed

by Senator BROWN in the summer and fall of 1993, the former chief of staff provided consistent services to the plaintiff by contacting the IRS on her behalf. The plaintiff is seeking testimony from the former chief of staff describing his conversations with Internal Revenue Service employees. Senator BROWN believes that it is appropriate for his former chief of staff to submit an affidavit and to testify in this proceeding.

Mr. President, this resolution would authorize the former chief of staff to provide testimony in this case, and would authorize the Senate legal counsel to represent him.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that a statement of explanation be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 269) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. RES. 269

Whereas, in the case of *Carol Ward v. United States*, Civil Case No. 95-WY-810-WD, pending in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, testimony has been requested from William T. Brack, a former chief of staff to Senator Hank Brown;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That William T. Brack is authorized to testify in the case of *Carol Ward v. United States*, Civil Case No. 95-WY-810-WD (D. Colo.), except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent William T. Brack in connection with his testimony in *Carol Ward v. United States*.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 153 that has just been received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 153) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered and agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 153) was agreed to.

PROGRAM

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, under the order of last night the Senate will reconvene at 1 p.m. on Monday, June 24. The Senate will be debating the campaign finance reform bill during Monday's session. However, no rollcall votes will occur during that day.

A cloture motion was filed on the campaign finance reform bill last night, with the cloture vote ordered to occur at 2:15 on Tuesday, June 25.

As a reminder, Senators have until the hour of 2 p.m. on Monday in order to file first-degree amendments, and until 12:30 on Tuesday in order to file second-degree amendments.

The Senate will also be resuming the Department of Defense authorization bill next week. Therefore, Senators can expect a busy session with rollcall votes throughout.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the morning business period during Monday's session be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

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

ORDER FOR RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN UNTIL 2 P.M.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD remain open today until 2 p.m. for statements only.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 1 P.M., MONDAY, JUNE 24, 1996

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:18 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 24, 1996, at 1 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 21, 1996: