tremendous bipartisan support when it was first appropriated last year. A cut in this program of any size would be a huge step back for chronically ill children and their families.

When the President promised to leave no child behind, he must not have meant the thousands of children who are warehoused every year in unsafe child care settings. He is proposing to cut child care funding by $200 million and to cut all $20 million for the funding of the new early learning program sponsored by Senator STEVENS of Alaska and Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts. If the President's proposed cuts prevail, 60,000 families with babies and toddlers will be denied child care assistance. At a time when our goal is to give low-income working families the support they need to stay off welfare, such a proposal is unfathomable in my mind.

The President justifies these cuts by saying that instead families will get tax breaks. Allow me to point out a few reasons why I find this justification wrongheaded.

First, this answer conveniently ignores the fact that 43 percent of the tax cut, as we all know, goes to the top 1 percent of the wealthiest families in America, not usually the families who have the biggest problem finding affordable child care or getting good health care when their children are sick.

Secondly, while tax cuts when done in a fair and responsible way can be helpful, they are not the panacea for children's needs. The last time I checked, tax cuts didn't prevent child abuse or make child care safer or make sick children well. The last time I checked, there were proven programs in place, enacted with bipartisan support in this body and the other Chamber, that were addressing those very problems. Yet these are the very programs the President has decided apparently to cut.

The President described himself as a compassionate conservative. Yet every day, with every action over the past 2 months, the evidence seems to be mounting that while he is long on conservatism, he seems a little short on compassion at this point.

Next week the Senate will take up the budget resolution, our blueprint for spending for next year. It is my fervent hope and my intention that these are the kinds of issues we will air and that, with the choices I will be asking us to make, we will have a chance to restore some of this funding when those proposals come up. If they are presently included at the levels that have been suggested, I will be offering appropriate language to address them.

I can't help but notice the presence of my friend from Pennsylvania on the floor, who I know is here to address the matter before the Senate, the Hollings proposal. I thanked him in his absence, and I thank him publicly. It was the Senator from Pennsylvania who last year, when the child care funding levels were going to be raised to full funding of $2 billion, made that happen.

He and I have worked on these issues for 20 years together, from the days when we first identified the issue and then crafted the legislation. In fact, Senator HATCH, who will be coming to the floor shortly, was the original cosponsor with me of the child care development block grant program.

When I express my disappointment, I don't do so in a partisan way because I have worked closely over the years with Members who understand the value of decent child care and the value of children's hospitals, the value of early learning, as Senator STEVENS of Alaska has, as champion of that particular issue.

My hope is that the administration, in the days remaining before they submit the budget to Congress, will listen to some of us who urge them to take a second look at these issues before sending us a budget proposal that sets the clock back at a time when we need to be doing more for families who are struggling to hold their families together to make ends meet.

I didn't mean to raise the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania particularly, but I saw him and I wanted to thank him for the tremendous work he has done on these issues over the years.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an editorial entitled ''The Mask Comes Off,'' by Bob Herbert.

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 26, 2001]

THE MASK COMES OFF

(By Bob Herbert)

Is this what the electorate wanted?

Did Americans really want a president who would smile in the faces of poor children even as he was scheming to cut their benefits? Did they want a man who would fight like crazy for enormous tax cuts for the wealthy while cutting funds for programs to help abused and neglected kids?

Is that who George W. Bush turned out to be?

An article by The Times's Robert Pear disclosed last week that President Bush will propose cuts in the already modest funding for child care assistance for low-income families. And he will propose cuts in funding for programs designed to investigate and combat child abuse. And he wants cuts in an important new program to train pediatricians and other doctors at children's hospitals across the U.S.

The cuts are indefensible, unconscionable. If implemented, they will hurt many children.

The president also plans to cut off all of the money provided by Congress for an ''early learning'' trust fund, which is an effort to improve the quality of child care and education for children under 5.

What's going on?

That snickering you hear is the sound of Mr. Bush recalling the great fun he had playing his little joke on the public during the presidential campaign. He presented himself as a different kind of Republican, a friend to the downtrodden, especially children. He hijacked the copyrighted solgagn of the liberal Children's Defense Fund, and then repeated the slogan like a mantra, telling anyone who would listen that his administration would ''leave no child behind.''

Mr. Bush has only been president two months and already he's leaving the children behind.

There are many important reasons to try to expand the accessibility of child care. One is that stable child care for low-income families has become a cornerstone of successful efforts to move people from welfare to work.

Members of Congress had that in mind when they allocated $2 billion last year for the Child Care and Development Block Grant. That was an increase of $817 million, enabling states to provide day care to 241,000 additional children.

Now comes Mr. Bush with a proposal to cut the program by $200 million.

Is that his idea of compassion?

The simple truth is that the oversized tax cuts and Mr. Bush's devotion to the ideologues and the well-heeled special interests that backed his campaign are playing havoc with the real-world interests not just of children, but of most ordinary Americans.

Mr. Bush is presiding over a right-wing juggernaut that has already reneged on his campaign pledge to regulate carbon dioxide emissions (an important step in the fight against global warming); that has repealed a set of workplace safety rules that were designed to protect tens of millions of Americans but were opposed as too onerous by business groups; that has withdrawn new regulations requiring a substantial reduction in the permissible levels of arsenic, a known carcinogen, in drinking water; and that has (to the loud cheers of the most conservative elements in the G.O.P.) ended the American Bar Association's half-century-old advisory role in the selection of federal judges, thus making it easier to appoint judges with extreme right-wing sensibilities.

The administration of George W. Bush, in the words of the delighted Edwin J. Feulner, president of the conservative Heritage Foundation, is ''more Reaganite than the Reagan administration.''

Grover Norquist, a leading conservative strategist, said quite frankly, ''There isn't an us and them with this administration. They is us. We is them.''

Mr. Bush misled the public during his campaign. He eagerly donned the costume of the compassionate conservative and deliberately gave the impression that if elected we would lead a moderate administration that would govern, as much as possible, in a bipartisan manner.

Last October, in the second presidential debate, Mr. Bush declared, ''I'm really strongly committed to clean water and clean air and cleaning up the new kinds of challenges, like global warming.''

And he said, as usual, ''No child should be left behind in America.''

He said all the right things. He just didn't mean them.

## ADMINISTRATION DECISION REGARDING THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am disturbed by the Bush Administration's announcement last week that he will eliminate the American Bar Association's essential role in reviewing and providing advice on the qualifications of potential judges before those nominations are sent to the Senate for confirmation.

For the past 53 years the American Bar Association has played a critical role in the judicial nominations process by evaluating potential candidates, first for the Senate in 1948, and then in 1952 for President Dwight D. Eisenhower and his eight successors, Democrat and Republican. The ABA's 15-member Standing Committee on Federal Judiciary has examined the candidates' experience and legal writings and then confidentially interviewed judges and lawyers who have worked with the candidates in order to assess their professional reputation.

President Eisenhower's motivation for seeking the ABA's recommendations is precisely the reason I am disturbed by the Bush Administration's move to skewer the ABA's role in screening new judges: President Eisenhower sought to insulate the judicial nomination process from political pressures by inviting the American Bar Association to give him ratings of candidates' professional qualifications. Over the years the ABA's assessments of judicial nominees have been invaluable, and I for one do not support the Bush Administration's retreat from injecting more, not less, information about the competency, temperament, and integrity of the potential judges into the nominations process.

Until this year, the bar association has been given advance word from the administration on potential judges. The ABA's special team of lawyers has been able to analyze the candidates' career, assess their professional reputation, and rate the prospective nominees as qualified, well qualified, or not qualified. This process is totally confidential and enables the colleagues of nominees to answer the questions fairly and honestly.

The White House's decision not to release the names of potential judges to the ABA before they are announced to the public is a tragedy. The nomination process will be severely impaired by President Bush's decision. With this move, the President has lost the opportunity to learn as much as possible about nominees early on in the nominations process.

What I fear most and what I believe will happen is that public confidence in the judicial nominations process will fade. And I'd point out, that confidence in the judicial system and in the objectivity of the court is imperative in the wake of the 5–4 Supreme Court ruling that determined the outcome of the last Presidential election. I would expect President Bush to work diligently to disabuse the country of the notion that the law is a subset of politics, not serve to reinforce that impression.

It is my belief that President Bush's decision signals a retreat from impartiality in the judicial nomination process. No longer will the President be troubled with the objective recommendations of the ABA, but will be free to nominate whichever candidates pass political muster. The ABA vetting process is important to reassure the public that selecting judges for the federal bench is not just the work of a small inner-circle of politicians and advisors who are looking for a person of a certain political persuasion.

The White House legal team has already interviewed nearly 60 lawyers for new judgeships and has done so without consulting the ABA. Most of the interviews undertaken so far have been for the 29 vacancies on the courts of appeal, which as you know Mr. President, is the level just below the Supreme Court. I don't want to return to the days before the ABA was brought into the process to make it more fair and objective, but I fear that's exactly where we have ended up.

## THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, March 23, 2001, the Federal debt stood at $5,734,215,116,583.82, Five trillion, seven hundred thirty-four billion, two hundred fifteen million, one hundred sixteen thousand, five hundred eighty-three dollars and eighty-two cents.

One year ago, March 23, 2000, the Federal debt stood at $5,729,459,000,000, Five trillion, seven hundred twenty-nine billion, four hundred fifty-nine million.

Twenty-five years ago, March 23, 1976, the Federal debt stood at $599,190,000,000, Five hundred ninety-nine billion, one hundred ninety million, which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion, $5,134,549,116,583.82, Five trillion, one hundred thirty-four billion, five hundred forty-nine million, one hundred sixteen thousand, five hundred eighty-three dollars and eighty-two cents, during the past 25 years.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

## ED HILL, J.J. BARRY AND JERRY O'CONNOR

• Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I congratulate Ed Hill, the new president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, IBEW, on his election, and thank the outgoing president, J.J. ''Jack'' Barry, for his years of dedicated service to IBEW.

When I think about all the hard work and long hours presidents Hill and Barry have put in over the years, I am reminded of a story that one of my heroes, the great Hubert H. Humphrey liked to tell.

It was Humphrey's 65th birthday, and he was celebrating with his grandchildren. One of the grandkids looked up and said, ''Grandpa, how long have you been a Democrat?''

Humphrey thought about that for a moment, and replied, ''Well, I've been a Democrat for 70 years.''

His grandson said, ''Grandpa, how could you have been a Democrat for 70 years when you're only 65 years old?''

''Easy,'' Humphrey answered, ''I've put in a lot of overtime.''

Well, these men have put in a lot of overtime on behalf of the IBEW and on behalf of all Americans.

You know, I like to tell people, you go to any town in America, rural or urban, big or small, and you'll see the IBEW's work on display. Whether it's lighting our homes, or heating our schools, or bringing the Internet to our libraries, it's clear that the IBEW's work is critical to our families and our economy.

I welcome the new leadership and express my gratitude to the outgoing leadership.

Ed Hill hails from Beaver County, PA, and he has a long history with the IBEW. Ed joined IBEW Local 712 in his hometown back in 1956 and worked his way up to business manager in 1970. He became part of the IBEW staff in 1982, and, by 1994, he was a Vice President in charge of operations in Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey and Delaware.

In 1997, Ed became the IBEW's second highest-ranking officer, and he worked hard to bring the latest technology to IBEW's operations. He also spent long hours building the membership of IBEW–COPE to record levels and making new strides in grassroots activism and communications.

Ed is a talented leader, and he has a strong foundation to build on. IBEW's outgoing president, J.J. Barry, had a long, impressive tenure at the IBEW. Jack is from Syracuse, NY and joined Local 43 in Syracuse in 1943. He served on the executive board and became business manager in 1962. In 1968, he began serving as International Representative and then, in 1976, became International vice president of the third district which includes New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware.

Jack was a virtuoso organizer, and during his tenure, he began a number of important, new initiatives in education and training for IBEW members. He was widely respected and honored throughout this country and around the world for his outstanding work. While I will miss him in his position as president, I look forward to working with him in a new capacity in the coming years.

I also recognize Jerry O'Connor who was appointed to take Ed's place as IBEW secretary-treasurer. Jerry has been on the IBEW staff since 1987 and has served as International vice president of the IBEW's sixth district covering Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota and Wisconsin since 1995. He was initiated into IBEW Local 701 in Wheaton, IL in 1959, and he served his local as business manager-financial secretary from 1978 until he joined the IBEW staff. I look forward to working with him in his new position.

For over 100 years, the IBEW has been a leader in the union movement in America. Whether they were providing energy to our war efforts during World War II, creating one of the best apprenticeship programs around, or providing workers with the cutting edge skills they need to keep up with current electricity needs, IBEW was always ahead of the times.

I know that the newest generation of IBEW leadership will continue this