

products my constituents use every day.

OPEC's action has and will continue to drive up costs for transportation, and the bottom line is that the consumer will eventually be forced to bear the burden of the cost. As anyone can see, this situation has the ability to have a substantial detrimental impact on the economies of Iowa and the entire Nation.

For this reason, I have tried to address this problem from every angle available to me. I recently wrote to Energy Secretary Bill Richardson and asked him to encourage the President to use the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to stabilize the price of petroleum products. As he is well aware, the President has the power to use the reserve when a very sharp increase in petroleum prices threatens the Nation's economic stability. In my opinion, the current situation meets this test. At the very least, the option should be heavily weighed.

I also sent a letter to Mr. Stanley Fisher, First Deputy Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, to ask that the market-distorting behavior of the 11 members of OPEC be weighed when these nations apply for loans. Twenty percent of the IMF money comes from the American taxpayers. We should not be using U.S. taxpayers' money to further the causes of an economy that is anticompetitive and is strangling the economy of the very taxpayers who support the IMF.

IMF is an international organization of 182 member nations. Each member of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries also belongs to the International Monetary Fund.

Due to the fact that the IMF's purpose is to promote monetary cooperation and economic growth, I find it disheartening that the member nations of OPEC have chosen a course of action which adversely affects economic growth and stability in the United States. It is for this reason I ask the IMF to consider developing criteria to judge market-distorting behavior which would be weighed when nations exhibiting monopolistic behavior apply for loans through the IMF.

I also spoke out against Saudi Arabia previously in my remarks and about their joining the World Trade Organization. I have made this a formal request of U.S. Trade Representative Charlene Barshefsky.

As we all know, we have become far too dependent upon foreign oil. For a very long time, I have been a leading advocate for the development and expanded use of renewable sources of energy, especially corn-based ethanol as well as wind energy and biomass. I have been successful in getting tax credits applied to these alternative forms of energy. I thank my colleagues for their support of that.

You have all heard me say that not only is clean-burning ethanol good for the rural economy and the environment, it helps to reduce America's dan-

gerous and expensive dependence on foreign sources of energy. I am disappointed it took a crisis to make some people aware of this unhealthy addiction, but now we should all see how our dependence on foreign crude can impact our economy and why we should seek to develop domestically-based renewable fuel sources.

This is a very important issue, and I applaud the resolution offered by the Senator from Missouri. I thank him for bringing the resolution to the floor and for helping to bring this issue to the attention of the Clinton-Gore administration, which needs to finally get on top of this growing problem.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will reserve that for use at a later time.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed under the leader's time.

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

SENATE PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I want to carry on a little bit regarding the colloquy we have had on the floor during the day about the need for us to proceed as the Senate has always worked in the 200-plus years of this Republic. I asked staff during this intermission time to pull for me at random a bill we worked on when we were in the majority. They chose a bill that doesn't have a really sexy title but which is very important; it is called the Enterprise Zone Tax Incentives Act. On that piece of legislation, there were 109 amendments filed. This bill was taken up on September 25, 1992.

We completed this bill 3 or 4 days later and it was passed. The Enterprise Zone Tax Incentive Act dealt with scholarship tax, dental schools, tractors—many things that really weren't relevant or germane to this particular piece of legislation. But we dealt with it. We allowed the minority to offer whatever amendments they wanted, and we proceeded with the legislation. That is what we need to do. That is what the Senate is all about. I hope everybody will understand we are not asking to break some new territory, new ground, or do something that was never done before. We simply want to say that once in a while we need a piece of legislation to which we can offer amendments.

Now, we are very happy to be discussing education. I believe it is the most important issue facing the country today, and my pet project on which I have worked for a number of years with the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. BINGAMAN, is high school dropouts. Three-thousand kids a day—500,000 children each year—drop out of school in America.

That is something we need to work on. That is only one aspect of edu-

cation that is important. We know about school construction. We know about smaller class sizes. There are lots of things we need to do in education. There are other important things we need to work on. I think we should have a debate about Social Security. I think we have to do something right away about Medicare and the attachment of prescription drug benefits. Which is very important to our seniors.

In the 35 years since Medicare came into being, we now have people's lives being saved as a result of people being able to get prescription drugs. Senior citizens have an average of 18 different prescriptions filled during a period of a year. That is the average. Some have more than that. We need to do something about prescription drug benefits.

Certainly we need to do something to have reasonable gun control. All we are asking is that you are not able to buy weapons at gun shows without a background check. With pawnshops, the same should apply, as it applies every place else where you buy a gun in stores.

We think we should do something updating the minimum wage. We think there are so many issues that deserve our attention, notwithstanding the terrible health care delivery system we have in this country. Over 40 million people have no health insurance. Every year it is going up 1.5 million.

We need to pass a comprehensive Patients' Bill of Rights. The lucky people are those with insurance, but even they aren't being treated fairly.

Referring again to the Enterprise Zone Tax Incentive Act, H.R. 11, in September of 1992, we spent less than 4 days on this piece of legislation. We dealt with 109 amendments and passed a bill.

If we had gone to work on this education bill on Monday, the bill would have been completed today. But the way things are happening, we are not working the will of the Senate, and we are not working the will of the people of this country. I think we need to do that as quickly as possible.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a quick question?

Mr. REID. Yes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. He can answer them in a relatively brief fashion, I think.

First of all, is it not true that when his party was the majority party in the Senate the minority party would come out with many amendments to a piece of legislation and sometimes we would have 100 amendments?

I want to get to the definition of what "relevant" means so people following this will know what that definition is.

Is it not true that we would have many amendments and we would basically debate these amendments and then after several days of hard work, even if we had to work 14 hours a day, we would go forward and pass that legislation? That is one of the ways you

represent people back home. If there is a compelling issue, you offer an amendment to a piece of legislation and you hope to pass it.

I remember the amendment on mental health parity that I offered with Senator DOMENICI. It was an amendment on housing on the veterans appropriations bill.

Will the Senator from Nevada not agree with me that is the way the Senate has always conducted its business?

Mr. REID. The answer is yes. They have the right to offer amendments. Sometimes they offer an amendment and debate it.

I see my friend, who I came to Congress with in 1982, from Florida, the senior Senator from Florida. I have been talking about this H.R. 11. On that particular piece of legislation, the Senator from Florida offered five amendments.

The Senator from Florida had some good reasons to offer every one of these amendments. For example, you would ask: Why did he offer an amendment dealing with tractors to the Enterprise Zone Tax Incentive Act? I don't know. I am sure he had a good reason for doing so. They had a right to offer the amendments, and they offered them.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, on this particular piece of legislation that Senator COVERDELL introduced, which we have been debating, will the Senator from Nevada not agree with me that the kind of amendment, for example, I wanted to offer to this legislation dealing with the hunger of children, dealing with the poverty of children, dealing with how to deal with the violence in children's lives in their homes would not be considered to be by the definition of "relevant" relevant? Yet it affects education and children's lives. There have been hardly any opportunities over the whole last year to come out on the floor with amendments to different pieces of legislation. Is that not true? So it gets to the point where you can't even represent people back in the State as a Senator.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I believe there are times when we should enter into unanimous consent agreements to move legislation. We have been willing to do that. We have done that time after time in an effort to complete things that are important.

As I said earlier, I say to my friend from Minnesota, we need opportunities. It should be all the time, but I will settle for opportunities once in awhile to have a bill on which we can offer amendments. We might want to offer an amendment dealing with tractors. I should be able to do that.

CAPITOL HILL SECURITY

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I come to the floor to raise a question which I can't believe I have to keep raising over and over again.

Many of us attended the services for Officer Chestnut and Agent Gibson. They were part of the Capitol Hill po-

lice force. They were here every day not only protecting Senators and Representatives but the public. I started speaking about this before. We had the 1-week break. I want to come back to this again. This is the one issue on which I want to focus.

We made a commitment to do everything we could possibly do to make sure the officers were as safe as possible and would never have to go through this kind of hell again, for families and for loved ones, and that the public would be safe. Part of that commitment was the idea that surely at the different stations, especially those with the most public, we would have at least two officers.

This morning, again—I think it is the Second Street or C Street entrance, the barricaded part of the Hart Building—at about 10 o'clock in the morning when I came in there was one police officer with all sorts of people. There must have been about 20 people streaming in. That one officer is in peril, and the public is in peril.

I cannot believe we have not lived up to our commitment. I say to colleagues that it is pretty simple. I think the Senate Sergeant at Arms said this: A, we need to pass a supplemental appropriations bill so that you can use overtime in the short run to do the staffing so we have two officers at each one of these stations, or each one of these posts; and, B—I applauded the Senate Sergeant at Arms—we need to hire about 100 more officers so that on a permanent basis we can staff and have two officers at each one of these posts.

I am telling you, colleagues, what we have done is absolutely unconscionable, or what we have not done. How in the world can whoever makes these appropriations decisions—given all we have been through, given all of our concern and all of the commitment we have made, given the service we attended for the two officers who were slain—how can we not put the resources into this so our officers are safe, and, for that matter, so we are safe and the public is safe?

I for the life of me don't get it. I honest to goodness don't get it. I think that every day I am going to come out and mention this. I can't believe this.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The Senator from Minnesota knows I support him on this issue. I am the only former Capitol Hill police officer serving in the Senate. I know the importance of the issue on which he has spoken. I followed the Senator on a number of occasions, and I back up everything he said. I agree with him.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Having talked to the Senate Sergeant at Arms, I think that Senators who care about this issue—and I think all do—need to make sure our voices are heard. We support the Capitol Police.

On the House side, there seems to be some slowness on a decision about whether or not we will pass through the supplemental appropriations bill

and whether or not we will do the job here.

I say to colleagues one more time, I think this is a scandal. I think it is an absolute scandal. We have two officers that have lost their lives. I believe we have made a commitment to the police officers and to their families. I think we have to do much better. It won't happen right away, but at least the decisions need to be made so we can do the staffing to make sure we have two officers at each post.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following Senator MACK, the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. HOLLINGS, be recognized for 15 minutes as if in morning business.

Mr. MACK. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we will make sure that Senator HOLLINGS has 15 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Carolina be allowed to speak for 15 minutes, following Senator MURKOWSKI. The Senator from Washington has agreed to allow the Senator to speak before him. That will be about 30 minutes from now.

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

TANF SURPLUS SHOULD FIGHT POVERTY

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, there was a press conference today held by the National Campaign for Jobs and Income. There were some very dramatic findings reported. This is directly relevant to the debate we were having with the majority leader. They reported today in a prosperous country, we still have about 35 million poor Americans and 13 million of those Americans are children. They reported that while the administration and other Senators and Representatives boast about having cut the welfare rolls in half, we actually have just made a small, hardly any, dent in reducing poverty.

Remember, the goal of the welfare bill was to move people from welfare to economic self-sufficiency.

They report that the poorest children in America are getting poorer. That is worth repeating: The poorest children in America are getting poorer.

They report there is a whole group of people, mothers and children, remaining in poverty. Many are families under tremendous stress and strain. Perhaps a mother has struggled with substance abuse; a mother who is a single parent has a severely disabled child; a mother has been battered, beaten up over and over again. About every 13 seconds in America, a woman is battered in her home.

There is precious little evidence these families will be able to move to work. Pretty soon, depending on the State, they will be pushed off a cliff.