

that time, when the emergency folks responded, was sitting on a bed near the crib eating a hot dog. That is how they found the mother when the medics arrived at the home.

The New York Daily News obtained secret documents which indicate how city child welfare workers and public school officials repeatedly ignored warning signals in Nadine's case. That is from the New York Daily News.

School officials never turned in Nadine's mother for not showing up for school, nor did anyone report the fact she did not show up for medical appointments. Officials did not notify the State child abuse hotline when Nadine's siblings were out of school for long periods of time.

In May 1995, the anonymous caller I mentioned earlier reported to the State child abuse hotline that Nadine was, in fact, starving.

Mr. President, tragically, Nadine is far from alone in falling through the cracks in our system. In December, a 10-month-old girl named Delores died after savagely being beaten by her mother's boyfriend; ten weeks earlier, child welfare officials had been warned that she and her siblings were in danger.

Mr. President, let me be very clear—I cannot stress enough that I am not trying to lay the blame on children's services officials in these cases. I worked with children services officials for many years, going back in time to when I was an assistant county prosecutor in 1973. These are good people, people who try to do their job. They generally are overworked and have too many cases and have many challenges to face.

I think it is clear as we look at these cases of abuse, as we recount the fact that we lose at least three kids every day to child abuse in this country—and those are just the kids who die, let alone the other ones who are savagely beaten or abused—I think it is clear that there is one part of this problem that Congress can fix. We cannot fix it all by passing legislation. We can try. But one part of the problem can be fixed, and that is to move forward in fixing, in clarifying the 1980 law that I refer to, to make it clear that we want these professionals, children's service workers, to have the flexibility to do what we all want done, and what they want to do, and that is to save the kids first, save the children, to set as a priority the best interests of the child and the safety of the child, and that priority has to take precedence over everything else.

These case workers work very hard to meet, many times, conflicting mandates. We should make their job a little easier and say to them that Federal law from now on will be abundantly clear, that the primary mission should always be to save the children.

Mr. President, some families are families in name only, and simply should not, should not be reunited. Mr. President, my proposed legislation would

change the law to make this the key goal. I think Washington Post columnist Mary McGrory made the case in a very compelling way in her column of February 9. I ask unanimous consent that column be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, let me conclude by saying once again how pleased I am that the President has joined our efforts. I am confident that his proposal will help us speed up the adoption process in this country and bring us closer to the day when every child in America will be cared for by a loving family. Mr. President, I will continue to come to the floor and talk about this issue until we make that change in Federal law. It is a change that is urgently needed.

I simply conclude by saying what I have said many times on this floor, and that is that it was never, I am sure, the intent of the authors of the 1980 law—which has done a great deal of good in this country—it was never their intention to in any way tell case workers who are making life and death decisions every day in this country that anything other than the best interests of the child, anything other than the safety of children should be their primary concern. But it is also abundantly clear to me, I have traveled through Ohio and talked to people from other States, that this law is being misinterpreted day after day after day. We should clarify it. We should make the job of a case worker simpler, and by doing that, I believe we will save some children.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 9, 1997]

SAVE THE KIDS, NOT THE MOM

(By Mary McGrory)

Richard Gelles, an authority on child welfare, is boldly intervening in a custody case that may be without parallel in the sorry annals of the Family Reunification Act. Latrena D. Pixley, a District mother who, at 19, killed her 6-week-old baby, is asking to be reunited with two of her three other children—a boy of 6 and another of 1 year. Gelles is volunteering to come at his own expense from Rhode Island—where he is director of the Family Violence Research Program of the state university—to offer his view that a woman who has committed infanticide is not a fit mother.

"In these cases, we're often too late," says Gelles, who wrote "The Book of David," the story of a baby who was murdered by a mother who had abused an older child. Social workers had a watchful eye on the mother all along. "This time, I'd like to be early. Most of the time the children are dead or grievously injured by the time I get involved."

The Pixley case has already attracted major attention because it could answer the question of what limits, if any, there are to the Family Reunification Act, which puts preservation of the family over the protection of children. It could also provide a measure of how far our culture has advanced in victimhood: Can a mother who kills her baby succeed in portraying herself as a victim?

Gelles knows what it's like to get involved in the Pixley case and with the District bureaucracy. Last year, at the request of Jerome Miller, the receiver in charge of the D.C. Department of Human Services, Gelles did a study of Pixley. He told Miller that he did not think she could then or at "any foreseeable date" provide adequate care for her children. He says he was not paid for his work; the receipt of his report was never acknowledged.

Miller is one of several figures in the Pixley case who believe in her. He hired her as a clerk while she was serving her sentence for infanticide. Social workers were indignant, and Pixley abused his trust by engaging in credit card fraud, but Miller remains a fan. She's still in jail for fraud (not murder). He told the weekly City Paper this week, "I'll take her back in a minute." Social workers who are critical of him, he says, are "probably lousy social workers."

Striking as Miller's tolerance is, it pales beside the mercy shown by Superior Court Judge George W. Mitchell, who seems stricken with sympathy. He accepted Pixley's attorney's plea that she killed 6-week-old Nakya in 1992 as a result of postpartum depression. Pixley has testified that, after she had suffocated the crying baby under a blanket, she stuffed the body in a dumpster and went off to a barbecue with her boyfriend.

Social workers and therapists speak well of Pixley's cooperativeness and progress. Her lawyer told Judge Mitchell that, apart from the smothering, Pixley had been a good mother to the infant. Gelles observed that she was a quiet, "compliant" person but "seriously damaged." Mitchell, in imposing his feather-light sentence—weekends in jail for three years—said he wanted to give Pixley's plea as much respect as that of "some high society woman."

The judge is sending Pixley to a halfway house where she will be joined in time by 1-year-old Cornilius, who is in the care of an acquaintance of his mother. She will be taught "parenting" and could eventually get custody of 6-year-old Edward, whom, Gelles thinks, should be made eligible for adoption.

Gelles says he has no choice but to volunteer as a "complaining witness" for the two little boys whose lives he feels are in danger. He finds it ironic that this test of the Family Reunification Act comes at a time when so many are trying to undo it. Both the president and the First Lady have held White House conferences about it. Sen. Michael DeWine (R-Ohio) has introduced a bill making the safety of the child the prime consideration—a concept sinking out of sight in our addled, victim-struck culture.

TRIBUTE TO LAWRENCE GRESSETTE, JR.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in any State, there is a core group of businessmen and women who help promote and guide development and economic success. These are the people who serve as the leaders of the private sector, individuals who work in concert with elected officials to create jobs, opportunity, and growth. Lawrence Gressette, Jr., has been one such leader in South Carolina, and I rise today to pay tribute to him and the many contributions he has made in helping South Carolina become one of the fastest growing centers for commerce and industry anywhere in the Nation.

Though Lawrence Gressette presides over one of the biggest corporations in our State, he did not begin his professional career with ambitions to become

a captain of industry. As a matter of fact, Mr. Gressette started out as a country lawyer, which is about as far away from corporate America as one can get.

Born in rural St. Matthews, SC., Lawrence Gressette, Jr. was the son of a well-respected attorney who also served as one of the Palmetto State's most influential elected officials, State Senator L. Marion Gressette, Sr. Early on in life, Lawrence learned the importance of being a man of integrity and dedication, and he approached all his tasks with a keen sense of purpose. These characteristics have helped shape Lawrence's life and are a direct correlation to the many successes he has enjoyed. Whether it was during his days at Clemson, where he played football for the Tigers on scholarship and served as student body president; graduating first in his class at the School of Law at the University of South Carolina; building a successful practice as an attorney; or rising to the position of chairman and chief executive officer of the SCANA Corp., it was a commitment to hard work and honesty that paved the way for Lawrence Gressette to become one of the most influential and respected citizens of South Carolina.

While he did not follow his father's footsteps into public service, Lawrence Gressette, Jr. has certainly been a public spirited person, and he has repeatedly lent his time, name, and efforts to many causes, all of which had the goal of making the Palmetto State an even better place to call home. A devoted family man, he served his Nation as an Infantry officer in the U.S. Army, he serves on several boards and committees throughout the State, and he is very active in his community. For his efforts, he has been recognized on several occasions with awards and commendations, and most significantly, he has been awarded two honorary degrees from colleges and universities in South Carolina.

Mr. President, Lawrence Gressette, Jr., is about to step down as the head of the SCANA Corp. We are grateful for all his hard work and leadership in running not only one of our State's most important organizations, but for his commitment to helping make South Carolina one of the Nation's most economically dynamic States. We wish him great health and happiness in the years to come, as well as continued success in whatever endeavors he chooses to undertake.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JAY PHILIP SANFORD

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, perhaps one of the best kept secrets in the American medical community can be found not far from this Chamber, the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences [USUHS], located in Bethesda, MD. For more than the past 20 years, this institution has trained in excess of 2,000 doctors who have gone

on to serve our Nation either in one of the branches of the military, or in the Public Health Service. Without question, this university has greatly benefited the people and military personnel of the United States, and a tremendous debt is owed to the man who is known as the founding dean of this institution, Dr. Jay Philip Sanford. Unfortunately and sadly, Dr. Sanford passed away in October of last year.

To those who willingly risk their lives in order to ensure the security of the United States, there is probably no more comforting thought than to know that should they be wounded, they will receive excellent medical care. Indeed, advances in military medicine have helped to ensure that our service personnel will have access to the very best possible treatment and care no matter where they are located or what the conditions in which they are carrying out their duties. Whether it be the rugged and frigid mountains of Bosnia, or the harsh and hot deserts of Kuwait and Iraq, American military personnel do not want for the most advanced and competent medical care available. Without question, the corps of military medical professionals who have graduated from the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, and the research conducted at that facility, have a great deal to do with that success.

The success of USUHS is directly attributable to the guidance and hard work of Dr. Sanford, who truly molded that university into the respected institution it has become. Established in 1972 at the direction of Congress, USUHS was to become a school that would prepare men and women for medical service careers in the Armed Forces and the U.S. Public Health Service. Not only creating a reliable source for military doctors, the university was to stress the instruction of the highly specialized fields of military medicine, preventive medicine, tropical medicine, and disaster medicine. It was the responsibility of Dr. Sanford to help build the university from the ground up, establishing curriculum, securing the necessary books and equipment required of a first-rate medical school, and ensuring that the first class of doctors would graduate from that school in 1980, as required by law. Dr. Sanford rose to the daunting challenge presented him, and in the finest traditions of the military, succeeded in achieving his mission and opening the doors of USUHS on schedule.

For his many impressive achievements, as a doctor, a researcher, and an educator, Dr. Sanford was awarded no shortage of tributes and recognitions. Regrettably, space does not permit a complete recitation of all the accolades he was granted in his life, but I think my colleagues would be interested to know that his alma mater, the University of Texas Southwestern Medical School established the Jay P. Sanford Lectureship in Infectious Diseases, and the Jay P. Sanford Professorship;

and, USUHS established the Sanford Chair in Tropical Medicine, as well as creating the Jay P. Sanford Distinguished Alumnus Award. Furthermore, in addition to serving as the third president of USUHS, Dr. Sanford was awarded the doctor of military medicine degree [Honoris Causa], the USUHS Distinguished Service Medal, and the Department of Defense Civilian Service Medal.

Despite all these recognitions, one cannot help but think that the distinction of which Dr. Sanford was most proud would be the creation and success of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. In the years since the first class of doctors graduated from that school, USUHS trained physicians have supported American military operations throughout the world as well as have made many important contributions to the country through the Public Health Service. There is perhaps no greater legacy Dr. Sanford could have left than this institution which is dedicated to helping others. I do not exaggerate when I say that Dr. Sanford was a man who gave his all to our Nation and has left the United States a better place for his service. He will certainly be missed by all those who knew him, and his family has my deepest sympathies.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

APPROVING THE PRESIDENTIAL FINDING REGARDING THE POPULATION PLANNING PROGRAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 1:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 36, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 36) approving the Presidential finding that the limitation on obligations imposed by section 518A(a) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1997, is having a negative impact on the proper functioning of the population planning program.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 hours of debate evenly divided.