

and from rural and urban areas to ensure that American agriculture remains a model of quality and efficiency for all nations.●

NOMINATION OF MERRICK GARLAND

● Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, yesterday I voted "no" on the nomination of Merrick Garland to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

In so voting, I take no position on the personal qualifications of Mr. Garland to be a Federal appeals court judge. What I do take a position on is that the vacant 12th seat on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit does not need to be filled. Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, has examined this issue thoroughly, and has determined that the court's workload does not justify the existence of the 12th seat. Last Congress, Senator GRASSLEY introduced legislation to abolish this unneeded seat. By proceeding to renominate Mr. Garland, President Clinton has flatly ignored this uncontradicted factual record.

I commend Senator GRASSLEY for his important work on this matter, as well as Senator JEFF SESSIONS, who has also emphasized the importance of this matter. With the Federal deficit at an all time high, we should always be vigilant in looking for all opportunities to cut wasteful government spending; this is one such opportunity. After all, each unnecessary circuit judge and his or her staff cost the taxpayer at least \$1 million a year.

Lastly, our vote yesterday is an important precedent, since it marks the beginning of the Senate's new commitment to hold rollcall votes on all judicial nominees. This is a policy change which I had urged on my Republican colleagues by letter of January 8, 1997, to the Republican Conference. Voting on Federal judges, who serve for life and who exert dramatic—mostly unchecked—influence over society, should be one of the most important aspects of serving as a U.S. Senator. Rollcall votes will, I believe, impress upon the individual judge, the individual Senator, and the public the importance of just what we are voting on. I hope that my colleagues will regard this vote, and every vote they take on a Federal judge, as being among the most important votes they will ever take.●

TRIBUTE TO PROF. ROBERT J. LAMPMAN

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to offer tribute to Dr. Robert J. Lampman, economist, University of Wisconsin-Madison professor and noted researcher on poverty, who passed away March 4 at his home in Madison.

Mr. President, Dr. Lampman spent much of his distinguished professional

career studying and writing about poverty and working to develop strategies to achieve its end. In 1966, he became the founding director of the Institute for Research on Poverty, a nonpartisan center for research into the causes and consequences of poverty and social inequality in America, on the UW-Madison campus, which established the university as a leader of research in that field. A colleague at the University of Wisconsin, Dr. Lee Hansen, called Dr. Lampman "a true scholar in that he was always asking questions to get a better understanding of the issues."

Despite his standing in his profession, Dr. Lampman was known as a professor who regarded his students as colleagues. One news report describing his career included a recollection by Dr. Thomas Corbett, once a graduate student studying with Dr. Lampman and now a University of Wisconsin professor of social work and acting director of the IRP. Dr. Corbett recalled Dr. Lampman's stopping by his office and saying he wanted "to pick my brain." "In a world where egos can become overwhelming, he was a guy who never lost his perspective," Dr. Corbett said.

In 1962, he joined the staff of President John Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisors, where he prophetically warned that economic growth, alone, would not eliminate poverty. He was later a key author of the historic chapter on poverty contained in Lyndon Johnson's "Economic Report of the President" in 1964 that helped call America's attention to poverty.

Dr. Lampman became, in the words of Nobel laureate economist James Tobin, "the intellectual architect of the War on Poverty," and he emphasized the importance of economic growth, income maintenance, and opportunities for education and jobs for those mired in poverty.

In 1964, as the War on Poverty was getting underway, he predicted to a group of University of Wisconsin-Madison graduate students that, within 20 years, "by present standards, no one will be poor."

Mr. President, it turned out that Professor Lampman was overly optimistic. Poverty was not eliminated in 20 years, but the War on Poverty had an impact. In 1964, before the War on Poverty was up and running, 19 percent of Americans were poor. Within 5 years, programs created by the Federal Government and a broadly expanding economy had combined to bring that number down to 12.1 percent. By 1973, the poverty rate was down to 11.1 percent.

That progress stalled, for many reasons. Census Bureau estimates for 1995, the most recent year for which data are available, tell us 13.8 percent of our Nation's population was poor, and, in the wealthiest nation in history, one American child in five lived in poverty.

Mr. President, Dr. Lampman's dedication, his intellectual energy, and his commitment to solving one of the most difficult, complex, and persistent social challenges we face should inform and

inspire us. We should apply, as Dr. Lampman did, our best efforts to ridding our world of the plague of poverty and finally establishing social justice. That would be the most fitting tribute we could pay to this man.●

RURAL HEALTH

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to pledge my support to the Rural Health Improvement Act of 1997. In my home State of Michigan and across the Nation, this legislation would improve the standard of health care for millions of Americans who live in rural areas.

Mr. President, I am very aware of the problems inherent in caring for citizens who live far away from major cities. Too often, these hardworking taxpayers and their children are not given easy access to the quality emergency and primary care services they deserve. There have, however, been two recent efforts that have been extremely successful in providing such care while also controlling costs — the Montana Medical Assistance Facility demonstration project and the Essential Access Community Hospital and Rural Primary Care Hospital demonstration program.

Mr. President, the bill that I endorse today would extend these successful initiatives to all 50 States. It would also ease Federal regulations for small hospitals that wish to be designated as "critical access" institutions. The aim of the bill is to allow these facilities greater flexibility in tailoring their services to the needs of patients in their particular communities. In short, I believe this law would improve care and save lives. A study of these programs by the General Accounting Office, in fact, has found that these initiatives actually decreased Medicare costs while maintaining a high standard of care.

In my view, Michigan and the rest of the Nation must receive the most affordable high quality care available. I believe this legislation is an important step in that direction. For these reasons, I am proud to cosponsor this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.●

SAFE ADOPTIONS AND FAMILIES ENVIRONMENTS ACT

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my strong support for the Chafee-Rockefeller Safe Adoptions and Families Environments Act [SAFE]. What's more, I commend each of them for their tireless and bipartisan efforts on behalf of this issue.

As I come to the floor today, it is difficult for me to imagine a more outrageous and disgraceful form of violence than child abuse.

However, while national attention to the problems of abuse are increasing, regrettably, so too are incidents of child abuse and neglect.

In fact, the number of abused and neglected children nearly doubled from

1.4 million in 1986 to over 2.8 million in 1993. During that period the number of children who were seriously injured quadrupled—from about 143,000 to nearly 570,000.

In my own State of Connecticut incidents of child abuse and neglect increased 118 percent from 1984 to 1994. In fact, between 1993 and 1994 alone there was a 43-percent increase.

Unfortunately, many child welfare agencies lack the resources to effectively deal with the increase in child abuse cases or efficiently place children in safe, permanent, and loving homes.

Legislation introduced today by Senators CHAFEE and ROCKEFELLER, of which I am an original cosponsor, would do more to not only protect these abused children but also ensure that they are not returned to environments where they will be abused or neglected.

First, it would work to ensure that abused and neglected children are placed in safe and protected settings.

Second, it would more rapidly move children out of the foster system and into permanent homes.

If there is one thing that all of us can agree upon it is the importance of assuring the safety and well-being of our Nation's children. This bill would improve our child welfare system and help ensure that every child is given the opportunity to grow up in a safe and healthy home.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in a bipartisan manner, and support this critically important legislation for our children's future.●

THE NATIONAL ENTERPRISE

● Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, the extraordinary lifestyle, security and standard of living Americans have enjoyed since the end of the Second World War is one of our most notable achievements in recent history. We are wealthier, healthier, and safer than any people before us. We have built an economy whose resilience, ingenuity, and potential are truly the envy of the world. We have become the standard by which all other nations are measured. The century in which we have survived economic collapse and two world wars only to become stronger bears our name, the "American Century."

This unparalleled achievement is not a product of chance or fate, luck or serendipity, or even good timing. It is the product of an extraordinary effort on the part of the American people and the institutions we have built and strengthened. It is the product of the American spirit and work ethic which, in our first 100 years, propelled us from the periphery of a colonial empire to an independent nation a continent wide. It has allowed us, in our second century, to defeat challenges under which other nations withered.

Since the end of the Second World War, we have witnessed and enjoyed progress and growth unparalleled in

our own history. That unparalleled progress is the product of a unique effort that helped us win the cold war and, among other notable achievements, put Americans on the moon. The effort is best described as a National Enterprise: a strong foundation built upon a shared responsibility and a common vision for our country's success.

The common vision that helped define our National Enterprise was shared by three basic pillars of our society: our Government, our academic institutions, and our private industries. The cementing agent is a sense of singular mission, embodied largely, but not exclusively, in the cold war effort, our love of freedom, and our free markets. Its medium and fuel are an ingenious, compassionate, optimistic, hard working, and resolute people.

The National Enterprise has now reached a crossroads, and we are facing one of the greatest but understated challenges of our history. With the advent of two historical trends, we face a challenge more daunting than any enemy: a potential loss of our own resolve.

First, growing Federal entitlements have created a fiscal crisis in the Federal Government, with 28 consecutive years of deficit spending, a \$5.3 trillion debt, and shrinking discretionary spending. The money we allocate to research and development faces increasing competition from other worthwhile endeavors such as environment, education, national parks, infrastructure, and defense. All are competing for a smaller and smaller slice of the Federal spending pie.

Second, the end of the cold war era has left America with what some might call a diluted sense of mission or common interest. The National Enterprise cannot be defined in a single dimension, but for better or for worse, the cold war's unifying power and the birth of America as a superpower was the single greatest motive driving the Enterprise and the yardstick of its success.

With the launch of Sputnik in 1957, we witnessed a technologically-advanced, symbolic challenge from our would-be enemy. It was the crack of the starter pistol in a race that would bear both frightening military capabilities and extraordinary peaceful dividends. For the first time, we were sobered in our celebration of post-war era wealth and security and were challenged to push ourselves to the limit. The Sputnik era has ended, and with it has ended the series of punctuated events that presented a clear road map for our progress and cold war victory. What will be the new road map for our National Enterprise?

I was heartened to hear the President recognize the importance of the National Enterprise during his State of the Union Address. Without his leadership, any efforts in Congress, industry or education are unlikely to be successful. However, the President addressed

only broad themes and small remedies for a few specific problems. In the President's budget, funding for Federal research and development remains essentially unchanged in a gradual downward trend, with the prognosis for coming years being a point of great concern. The President's emphasis on education is also a positive initiative, but his proposals seem to disproportionately favor higher education over all other levels. The President has presented a budget which seems to recognize some of the problems, but does not clearly articulate the full spectrum of challenges before us.

In addition to addressing the funding challenges that our National Enterprise faces, we must also embolden the Federal Government with a new understanding of mission and role within the Enterprise. This understanding is the critical difference between developing a strategy like the one that won the Cold War, and one that is simply a triage of federal spending programs. We must forge a sense of mission and seek a new understanding, for we may never have another Sputnik to awaken our schools, government and industries to the essence of the National Enterprise.

The challenges of the coming century will be as great or greater than those we have met thus far, but we do have the benefit of learning from our past successes. We can base our inquiry and guide our decisions on a set of simple truths we have learned from that experience. These simple truths make the link between spending and results, and highlight the need to make those links as clear, as direct, and as strong as possible.

Truth number one: research and development, science, and education bring advancements and innovation.

Truth number two: innovation has been the basis of our competitive edge—peaceful and defensive—and of our extraordinary lifestyle; it is the cornucopia of modern America and the envy of the world.

Truth number three: federal funding of research, and creating an environment that encourages private research and innovation, is the bedrock upon which the National Enterprise has been founded.

These fruits of our labor are not obscure laboratory innovations, but integral parts of our lives and economy. The Internet, computer chips, satellites, super-sonic aircraft, higher education and research universities, and strong civilian and defense-related basic research are a few compelling examples.

Therefore, the question is not whether federal research and development spending is the taproot of our innovation and economic growth—it clearly is. The questions we face are, What is the right formula for the federal government in this National Enterprise? What are the actual mechanisms by which that combination of spending and American ingenuity translate into