

Are we going to continue without a Secretary of Labor until the majority leadership gets their way on every labor issue? I hope not. I don't think that hostage holding is a proper way to pass good legislation. It is not the way to have the President's nominees chosen. The President has a right to select who he wants to work in these very sensitive Cabinet positions. He has chosen a woman that is certainly qualified.

Mr. President, this woman is a graduate, as is my colleague, the junior Senator from Maryland, from Xavier University in New Orleans, LA. In 1977, she was the youngest director ever of the Woman's Bureau at the Department of Labor. She is certainly entitled to this job by virtue of her qualifications.

We are willing to debate these issues and work for compromises if, in fact, that is necessary. But the majority is saying that it is their way or no way. This tactic is becoming a way of business under this majority. Also, I don't believe there has ever been judicial nominations put on hold by a Congress as we have seen with this one. One must wonder about the pattern of the recent majority attacks—Alexis Herman, Senator LANDRIEU, Congresswoman SANCHEZ, and judicial nominee Margaret Morrow. For example, take Margaret Morrow; she has been found very qualified by the American Bar Association.

She was first nominated almost a year ago, and we still have not had the opportunity to vote on this woman. This is wrong. The rules of the Senate allow leadership to delay a nomination if there are questions about the nominee's qualifications. But there are no questions about this nominee's qualifications.

There is no reason that we don't have a vote on Alexis Herman. And we should have it this week. I think that it is wrong that we go forward with legislation—the majority feels important, and the minority goes along with that—but I think we are going to have to arrive at a point where we have to take a look at how the majority is handling what takes place on this Senate floor. Maybe what we should do is nothing until these people who are qualified, like Alexis Herman and like Margaret Morrow, until we have votes on them.

If they want to vote against Alexis Herman, then the majority should vote against Alexis Herman. But to hold this woman hostage—it is now approaching the 1st of May, and this woman has not been able to go to work as Secretary of Labor. That is wrong. I think the American public deserve more, and I hope that majority leadership will allow her nomination to go forward along with some of other nominees that are being held up for reasons unknown to most of us.

Mr. DEWINE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes, and I also ask unanimous consent that the time for the Senator from Georgia be extended by 10 minutes.

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

ORGAN DONATION STATUS REPORT

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today on the occasion of National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week. I rise to challenge all of us to take actions that will eliminate the chronic shortage of organs available for transplant in the United States.

Mr. President, this Nation faces a severe organ shortage. I have talked about this issue several times on the Senate floor. Last year at this time when I talked about it, at least eight people in America every day were dying while waiting for organ transplants. One year later, tragically, the figures are even worse. Today, 10 people now die every day while waiting for organs.

Mr. President, these numbers are certainly very distressing. They are devastating because the technology to save these men, women, and children is available. It is there. If you ask our expert on this issue, and the Senate's expert, Dr. FRIST from Tennessee, he will tell us that these people can be saved. These 10 people who die every day could have been saved. The technology is there. Medical science has advanced that far. But they die because there are simply not enough available organs. That is a tragedy, Mr. President.

In January 1996, there were almost 44,000 patients in this country waiting for an organ transplant. One year later, the figure is up to 51,000 individuals who are today waiting—up 7,000 from just a year ago.

The need for transplantable organs has increased in all categories. These aren't just statistics, not just numbers, not just longer and longer lists. These are people. These are children, friends, and families that love them, and that pray every day that there will be a chance for that loved one to live—that there will be an organ that is available for that child, that parent, that husband, or that mother.

I think that we have to ask ourselves what we can do about this. What can we do about this as individuals and as elected officials?

As private citizens, when we go to get our driver's license for the first time, or when we go to get it renewed, we are asked sometimes very quickly, "Do you want to donate your organs in case of an accident, in the case of your death?" We all need to say yes when that question is asked. We can also, and should, encourage our relatives and friends to do the same thing. As Americans, we need to talk about this issue. As families we need to talk about this issue before tragedy strikes.

This is not a subject that anyone of us likes to discuss. But it is very im-

portant that we do so because our willingness to discuss it now, our willingness as a people to be open and to organize a donation is really a matter of life and death.

My wife, Fran, and I faced this issue when our daughter, Becky, was killed almost 4 years ago. This was not something that we had thought about really. It was not something that we had talked about as a family. When we were asked the question whether we would do this or not, my wife, Fran, turned to me, and said, "You know that is what Becky would have wanted us to do." So we did it.

I think, Mr. President, that most people would want their loved ones to do the same thing. Too often the survivors—people who are faced with life's most horrible tragedy—just do not want to do it. They do not know that the loved one would have wanted them to do it.

So I think by talking about this we will increase the number of organs that are available, and we will, in fact, save lives.

I think too often that the No. 1 obstacle to life-saving organ donation is simply that lack of awareness. People simply aren't aware of the huge difference—the life-saving difference that they can make in someone else's life. They don't think about it. They don't talk about it. And that is natural. But that is why the decision to donate the organs of a loved one sometimes is a very difficult decision. But I think when people talk about it that it will be made much easier.

As elected officials, we in this Chamber have another responsibility. I believe that we must take this message to the American people. Educational efforts have, of course, already begun.

Thanks to the leadership of our colleague, Senator DORGAN, information about organ donations is being enclosed with Federal income tax refunds that are going out this year. It is estimated that 70 million individuals will receive these refunds. So information contained in those envelopes is going out.

Further, today I sent a letter to Postmaster General Runyon asking him to approve a "Gift of Life" postage stamp as soon as possible. Mr. President, I have been talking to the Postmaster General's office for more than a year now about this issue because I am firmly convinced that this stamp will remind people of the vital importance of organ donation. It will save lives. It will bring about more awareness. Mr. President, anything that we can do to encourage families to discuss this issue will, in fact, better prepare them to make this life-saving decision.

Further, Mr. President, as you and other Members of the Chamber may know, Senator KENNEDY and Representative MOAKLEY held a field hearing in Massachusetts on this very issue. I will hold a similar field hearing in Ohio this fall, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same in their

home States, to bring this issue closer to home.

Recently, there has been a lot of publicity about organ donation—publicity specifically about controversial protocols that have been considered to enhance the viability of transplanted organs. I support an informed public dialog on this, or any other medical issue. As this debate continues, however, Mr. President, we have to make sure that we keep our eye on the ball, that we stay focused, and not lose sight of the fact that organ donations save many thousands of lives each year in this country, and that thousands of other Americans are still waiting for this precious gift of life.

Mr. President, together we can build a national consensus to increase the rate of organ donations. Seriously ill Americans who are on these waiting lists should not have to wait so long for a second chance. They should have a second chance. And I look forward to working with all of my colleagues in the Senate and with people across this country to achieve this goal in the months ahead.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I may proceed in morning business for 20 minutes.

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

BUDGET REALITIES

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, on this past Sunday, the Outlook section of the Washington Post published articles regarding Uncle Sam's red ink. The unfortunate part is that these stories highlight is that debt is nothing new for the United States. While it is making us poor, one article claims that is has made us prosperous.

I rise today to make the point that our debt is not only making us very

poor, it is making us totally inadequate at the governmental level in Washington, DC. All our moneys are being expended for interest costs on the debt rather than active Government.

Specifically, I want to talk about the here and now rather than the next millennium. Dick Morris detailed in his book, Mr. President, that he had counseled President Clinton, running for reelection last year, that the budget deficit was a boring subject. He claimed that nobody was really interested in it and that the President should instead focus on school uniforms and child curfews, family values and everything else.

Mr. President, people are interested in the crushing burden of our federal debt, and to show specifically what concerns them, I have a chart that I would refer to. It is in enlarged fashion. I ask unanimous consent that we have printed in the RECORD at this particular point this one budget document "Hollings' Budget Realities."

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

HOLLINGS' BUDGET REALITIES

[In billions of dollars]

President and year	U.S. budget (Outlays)	Borrowed trust funds	Unified deficit with trust funds	Actual deficit without trust funds	National debt	Annual increases in spending for interest
Truman:						
1945	92.7	5.4	-47.6	-10.9	260.1	
1946	55.2	-5.0	-15.9	-10.9	271.0	
1947	34.5	-9.9	-4.0	+13.9	257.1	
1948	29.8	6.7	11.8	+5.1	252.0	
1949	38.8	1.2	0.6	-0.6	252.6	
1950	42.6	1.2	-3.1	-4.3	256.9	
1951	45.5	4.5	6.1	+1.6	255.3	
1952	67.7	2.3	-1.5	-3.8	259.1	
1953	76.1	0.4	-6.5	-6.9	266.0	
Eisenhower:						
1954	70.9	3.6	-1.2	-4.8	270.8	
1955	68.4	0.6	-3.0	-3.6	274.4	
1956	70.6	2.2	3.9	+1.7	272.7	
1957	76.6	3.0	3.4	+0.4	272.3	
1958	82.4	4.6	-2.8	-7.4	279.7	
1959	92.1	-5.0	-12.8	-7.8	287.5	
1960	92.2	3.3	0.3	-3.0	290.5	
1961	97.7	-1.2	-3.3	-2.1	292.6	
Kennedy:						
1962	106.8	3.2	-7.1	-10.3	302.9	9.1
1963	111.3	2.6	-4.8	-7.4	310.3	9.9
Johnson:						
1964	118.5	-0.1	-5.9	-5.8	316.1	10.7
1965	118.2	4.8	-1.4	-6.2	322.3	11.3
1966	134.5	2.5	-3.7	-6.2	328.5	12.0
1967	157.5	3.3	-8.6	-11.9	340.4	13.4
1968	178.1	3.1	-25.2	-28.3	368.7	14.6
1969	183.6	0.3	3.2	+2.9	365.8	16.6
Nixon:						
1970	195.6	12.3	-2.8	-15.1	380.9	19.3
1971	210.2	4.3	-23.0	-27.3	408.2	21.0
1972	230.7	4.3	-23.4	-27.7	435.9	21.8
1973	245.7	15.5	-14.9	-30.4	466.3	24.2
1974	269.4	11.5	-6.1	-17.6	483.9	29.3
Ford:						
1975	332.3	4.8	-53.2	-58.0	541.9	32.7
1976	371.8	13.4	-73.7	-87.1	629.0	37.1
Carter:						
1977	409.2	23.7	-53.7	-77.4	706.4	41.9
1978	458.7	11.0	-59.2	-70.2	776.6	48.7
1979	503.5	12.2	-40.7	-52.9	829.5	59.9
1980	590.9	5.8	-73.8	-79.6	909.1	74.8
Reagan:						
1981	678.2	6.7	-79.0	-85.7	994.8	95.5
1982	745.8	14.5	-128.0	-142.5	1,137.3	117.2
1983	808.4	26.6	-207.8	-234.4	1,371.7	128.7
1984	851.8	7.6	-185.4	-193.0	1,564.7	153.9
1985	946.4	40.5	-212.3	-252.8	1,817.5	178.9
1986	990.3	81.9	-221.2	-303.1	2,120.6	190.3
1987	1,003.9	75.7	-149.8	-225.5	2,346.1	195.3
1988	1,064.1	100.0	-155.2	-255.2	2,601.3	214.1
Bush:						
1989	1,143.2	114.2	-152.5	-266.7	2,868.3	240.9
1990	1,252.7	117.4	-221.2	-338.6	3,206.6	264.7
1991	1,323.8	122.5	-269.4	-391.9	3,598.5	285.5
1992	1,380.9	113.2	-290.4	-403.6	4,002.1	292.3
Clinton:						
1993	1,408.2	94.3	-255.0	-349.3	4,351.4	292.5
1994	1,460.6	89.2	-203.1	-292.3	4,643.7	296.3