

The article that I just talked about describes a case where two children, twins, were abandoned by their natural mother, a natural mother who had serious substance abuse problems. These children were then placed in foster care for 3½ years while efforts were made to fix the mother, efforts were made to reunify that family. These particular children happened to be fortunate. They are probably the exception, because they spent the majority of that time with one person, Diane Hendel, who wanted to adopt them, Diane Hendel who nursed them back to health, who helped them get through some very, very tough times.

But now, Mr. President, the system says they cannot stay with the only person that they have known as their mother. They have to go back to their natural mother, the person who abandoned them in the first place. Mr. President, does that really sound like a good idea? I do not think so.

The article quotes child psychiatrist Marilyn Benoit of the Devereux Children's Center in Washington, DC:

Three and a half years? And then the biological mother gets the children back? You have now disrupted the emotional development of those children. You, the court, have created a new abandonment. You have deliberately interjected separation and loss into their lives. What we know that does is disrupt development. You have depression. You have regression. You undermine a sense of trust. You introduce a sense of powerlessness. Children that age, what they want to develop is a sense of mastery, and you have done everything to thwart that, and you have really compromised that child's ability to move on.

Mr. President, I think that comment by a child psychiatrist confirms what all of us know, any of us who know anything about children. Children need a stable and permanent home, a permanent home where they will learn the skills of love, the skills of friendship and survival.

Mr. President, I think that Sister Josephine Murphy, who runs a home of severely abused children in Hyattsville, MD, is also exactly right. She is quoted in the article as saying the following:

I know what they say, blood is thicker than water, and it is, but we're adults, and at some point we have to have the guts to say, "This is it. No more."

No more, Mr. President. Enough is enough. Who benefits from the current bias toward reunifying abusive families? Certainly not the children. Whose interests were taken into account when the decision was made to rip these two children away from the only mother that they ever knew? Was it the children's? I don't know any rational person who would say that was in the best interest of the child. In conclusion, Mr. President, let me quote from this article. There is a portion of the article on page 10 that describes the scene when these children were taken away from their foster mother.

... Off they go. Goodbye to the toys. Goodbye to their drawings. Goodbye to their bedroom. Goodbye to the house. Goodbye to ev-

everything. Just like that. And then, goodbye to Diane. Who leaves the children, as ordered, so they can say hello a moment later to their new mother, who is the woman who conceived them and abandoned them and was charged with neglecting them and now, 3½ years after they were born and 2½ years after Diane took them in with the hope of adopting them, has been declared legally fit to take them with her to a new place, a strange place, their true home.

Just like that.

Goodbye.

Hello.

Mr. President, we have before us in this Congress several bills, one that just passed the House, the Camp-Kennelly bill, one that has been introduced in the Senate, which I am a cosponsor of, the Chafee-Rockefeller bill. Both of these bills, while they will not solve this problem, I think will help because they say quite simply what we all know deep in our hearts the fact should be, which is, yes, whenever possible, whenever reasonable, we should try to reunify families; but while we do that, we should not forget what our ultimate goal should be, which is to be concerned about the safety and welfare of the children.

I think, Mr. President, if we focus on the child and focus on what is in the best interest of the child, we will have fewer crazy, ludicrous decisions, such as the one we have seen recounted in the Washington Post story of this past Sunday.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, May 2, 1997, the Federal debt stood at \$5,331,758,952,154.60. (Five trillion, three hundred thirty-one billion, seven hundred fifty-eight million, nine hundred fifty-two thousand, one hundred fifty-four dollars and sixty cents)

One year ago, May 2, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,100,093,000,000. (Five trillion, one hundred billion, ninety-three million)

Twenty-five years ago, May 2, 1972, the Federal debt stood at \$425,052,000,000 (Four hundred twenty-five billion, fifty-two million) which reflects a debt increase of nearly \$5 trillion—\$4,906,706,952,154.60 (Four trillion, nine hundred six billion, seven hundred six million, nine hundred fifty-two thousand, one hundred fifty-four dollars and sixty cents) during the past 25 years.

COMMEMORATION OF THE WORK OF JUDY CAMPBELL

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, today I rise to acknowledge the recent retirement of a long-time congressional staff member, a dedicated public servant and a loyal friend. On April 2, 1997, Judy Campbell, who for the past 10 years served as the financial clerk of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, completed 36 years of congressional service. This institu-

tion is a better place because of her faithful service.

I first met Judy Campbell late in 1974, shortly after my election to the U.S. House of Representatives. She was one of the first individuals I hired on my congressional staff. Judy's ability and exceptional organizational skills were first brought to my attention by one of the most able and respected legislators of his generation, the late Congressman Richard Bolling of Missouri, for whom Judy had already worked for over a decade. Judy served as my office manager, first in the House of Representatives and then in the Senate, for 12 years.

In 1987, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, Senator Quentin N. Burdick of North Dakota, hired Judy and she soon became the committee's financial clerk. Judy served the committee and the Senate in that capacity under four chairmen—Senators Quentin N. Burdick, DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, JOHN CHAFEE, and myself. The hallmark of Judy's congressional service was always her professionalism. She worked with Democratic and Republican Members and staff with similar dedication and equal enthusiasm.

Judy has also been an invaluable resource to her colleagues on my personal staff, the committee and around the Hill. The process of hiring new staffers always involves a certain amount of coaching and training. Judy was particularly good in this role, and I know she was always willing to provide counseling and support to other committee financial clerks and office managers around the Hill.

Longevity was only one aspect of Judy's career. Through her work she epitomized dedication in public service. For 36 years, Judy has been one of the selfless and nameless individuals who, day in and day out, make the congressional branch of government function effectively, year in and year out. Judy's detailed knowledge of congressional operations and finances is legendary. She took seriously the public trust for the millions of dollars which were her responsibility over the years. To say Judy was prudent with taxpayer funds would be an understatement. In the mid-1970's, when America's ultimate tightwad—Jack Benny—died, the joke in my office was that Judy Campbell took his place.

Mr. President, this institution is a better place because Judy Campbell toiled here. She made a difference. Her many friends on Capitol Hill and I will miss her. I personally wish Judy and her husband Denny nothing but the best in retirement. As they complete construction of a new home this summer, we wish them many years of good health and enjoyment. On April 3, 1997, Judy realized a longtime dream. On that day she started a new career—that of a full-time grandmother.

Thank you, Judy, and good luck.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AL-LARD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 79.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 79) to commemorate the 1997 National Peace Officers Memorial Day.

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. SESSIONS. 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 any statements relating to the resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 79) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. RES. 79

Whereas, the well-being of all citizens of this country is preserved and enhanced as a direct result of the vigilance and dedication of law enforcement personnel;

Whereas, more than 500,000 men and women, at great risk to their personal safety, presently serve their fellow citizens in their capacity as guardians of the peace;

Whereas, peace officers are the front line in preserving our children's right to receive an education in a crime-free environment that is all too often threatened by the insidious fear caused by violence in schools;

Whereas, 117 peace officers lost their lives in the performance of their duty in 1996, and a total of 13,692 men and women have now made that supreme sacrifice;

Whereas, every year 1 in 9 officers is assaulted, 1 in 25 is injured, and 1 in 4,000 is killed in the line of duty;

Whereas, on May 15, 1997, more than 15,000 peace officers are expected to gather in our Nation's Capital to join with the families of their recently fallen comrades to honor them and all others before them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That May 15, 1997, is hereby designated as "National Peace Officers Memorial Day" for the purpose of recognizing all peace officers slain in the line of duty. The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe this day with the appropriate ceremonies and respect.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS ACT OF 1997

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of S. 672.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 672) making supplemental appropriations and rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 672, the supplemental appropriations bill:

Trent Lott, Ted Stevens, Mike DeWine, Bob Bennett, Tim Hutchinson, Richard G. Lugar, Pete Domenici, Pat Roberts, Connie Mack, Frank H. Murkowski, Richard Shelby, Craig Thomas, Chuck Grassley, Christopher S. Bond, Michael B. Enzi, Jeff Sessions.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business.

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

NOTICE OF ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO PROCEDURAL RULES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, pursuant to section 303 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1383), a notice of adoption of amendments to procedural rules was submitted by the Office of Compliance, U.S. Congress. The notice publishes amendments to the rules governing the procedures for the Office of Compliance under the Congressional Accountability Act. The amendments to the procedural rules have been approved by the Board of Directors, Office of Compliance.

Section 304(b) requires this notice to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, therefore I ask unanimous consent that the notice be printed in the RECORD.

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

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995: Amendments to Procedural Rules

NOTICE OF ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO PROCEDURAL RULES

Summary: After considering the comments to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking pub-

lished January 7, 1997 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Executive Director has adopted and is publishing amendments to the rules governing the procedures for the Office of Compliance under the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (P.L. 104-1, 109 Stat. 3). The amendments to the procedural rules have been approved by the Board of Directors, Office of Compliance.

For Further Information Contact: Executive Director, Office of Compliance, Room LA 200, 110 Second Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20540-1999. Telephone No. 202-724-9250. TDD/TTY: 202-426-1912.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

I. Background

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 ("CAA" or "Act") was enacted into law on January 23, 1995. In general, the CAA applies the rights and protections of eleven federal labor and employment law statutes to covered employees and employing offices within the Legislative Branch. Section 303 of the CAA directs that the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance ("Office") shall, subject to the approval of the Board of Directors ("Board") of the Office, adopt rules governing the procedures for the Office, and may amend those rules in the same manner. The procedural rules currently in effect, approved by the Board and adopted by the Executive Director, were published December 22, 1995 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (141 Cong. R. S19239 (daily ed., Dec. 22, 1995)). Amendments to these rules, approved by the Board and adopted by the Executive Director, were published September 19, 1996 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (142 Cong. R. H10672 and S10980 (daily ed., Sept. 19, 1996)). The revisions and additions that follow establish procedures for consideration of matters arising under Parts B and C of title II of the CAA, which became generally effective January 1, 1997.

Pursuant to section 303(b) of the CAA, the Executive Director published for comment a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("NPR") in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 7, 1997 (143 Cong. R. S25-S30 (daily ed., Jan. 7, 1997)) inviting comments regarding the proposed amendments to the procedural rules. Four comments were received in response to the NPR: three from Congressional offices and one from a labor organization. After full consideration of the comments received, the Executive Director has, with the approval of the Board, adopted these amendments to the procedural rules.

II. Consideration of Comments and Conclusions Regarding Amendments to Existing Rules

A. Section 1.04(d)—Final Decisions

One commenter noted that, although section 1.04(d) provides that the Board will make public final decisions in favor of a complaining covered employee, or charging party under section 210 of the CAA, as well as those that reverse a Hearing Officer's decision in favor of a complaining employee or charging party, section 1.04(d) does not specifically provide that decisions in favor of an employing office will be made public. Rather, such decisions may be made public in the discretion of the Board. The commenter suggested that the rules should provide either that all or none of the decisions be made public, asserting that, if section 1.04(d) were not so modified, there would be "inconsistent access" to decisions and "the impression that the Board's procedures are weighted against employing offices." Proposed section 1.04(d) is identical to section 416(f) of the CAA, and its language, therefore, should not and will not be altered, whatever the Board's ultimate practice with respect to the publication of decisions in favor of employing offices.