named in her honor. The Doctor of Humanities (L.H.D.) degree was conferred on her from Prentiss Institute.

She was married to M. J. Lyells, a longtime professor at Alcorn A&M College and Lanier High School. She was a member of the Christian Science faith having joined the Mother Church in Boston, Massachusetts with local affiliation in Jackson.

Following an extended illness, Mrs. Lyells demise came Friday, December 22, 1994 at Englewood Manor Nursing Home. Survivors include a niece, Mrs. Rose Knowles White, Baton Rouge, LA; grand-nieces: Ms. Angela Denise White, San Francisco, CA, Ms. Ann Rossie White of Chicago, IL; one nephew, Mr. Leon Stutts Knowles, Los Angeles, CA (Dana); brother-in-law, Mr. L. L. Knowles; a special daughter-nieces, Mrs. Alice Stutts Jaynes, Jackson, MS; a special cousin, Mr. Renalda Jaynes of Jackson, MS and additional relatives and friends.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, in conclusion, let me simply say that one mark of the courage and interest in the political development of our State was illustrated by Mrs. Lyells' active and conspicuous participation in the development of the modern Republican Party in Mississippi.

As an African-American, she took a stand and defended it with grace and with dignity and with intelligence, in a way that reflected credit on many of us who were actively involved in trying to build a new political party as a vehicle for political expression for our State and the citizens of our State at the national level. For that, I also will be forever grateful to her and to her family.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). The Chair would like to make an announcement.

On behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, appoints the Senator from Wyoming, [Mr. THOMAS], to read Washington's Farewell Address on February 22, 1995.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to address the Senate.

UNFUNDED MANDATES GRIDLOCK

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, in order to properly frame some observations that I made last night and at the risk of being redundant in some of the comments I made on this floor yesterday, let me just make some reflections as to my feelings on unfunded mandates that come from quite a few years back.

Back in 1967, one of my closest political allies and friends, who later became Senator David Boren, and I came to Washington from the State legislature to protest the mandates that came from Lady Bird's Highway Beautification Act of 1965. We made a list of what it would cost the private sector in terms of screening. We made a list of the violations, of what we perceived to be violations of the 14th amendment, property rights, people having their property taken away from them in such areas as outdoor advertising signs and others. But primarily because it was the cost to the municipalities.

The leverage they used at that time was that if you do not comply with the mandates of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, we will withhold several million dollars of your Federal highway matching funds.

Now, keep in mind, these are funds that emanated originally from the State of Oklahoma, went to Washington and were coming back. Of course, Oklahoma, having been a donor State for quite a number of years, does not get as much money back as it sends to Washington. So I guess what they were saying to us from the Federal Government, in its infinite wisdom, was we have passed a law that says you in Oklahoma cannot have the money you sent to Washington unless you comply with these mandates.

That was my first exposure to mandates. I mentioned yesterday also that there are many fine Members of this honorable body who have differences of opinion philosophically and ideologically. Certainly the very distinguished Senator from California, [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], and I differ on many issues, but we have one thing in common in our background, and that is we were both mayors of major cities.

I remember when we were both serving on the U.S. Conference of Mayors Board of Directors our major concern at that time was unfunded mandates.

Whether it is in the State of Kentucky or the State of Georgia, regardless of who you go to, if you talk to your mayors and your county commissioners and your State legislators and the private sector, they will say the major problem we have is not necessarily crime; it is not welfare; it is unfunded mandates. Because while we are facing fiscal problems here in Washington, the problems are even more severe at the local level.

A lot of people do not realize the genesis of the problem that we have in these mandates. I think it goes back to the Great Society days when we decided Government was going to take on a role that perhaps was outside the boundaries of what our Founding Fathers thought the Government should be doing. At least if I have any understanding of the 10th amendment to the Constitution, it says that powers will be reserved to the States or to the people other than those specifically delegated to the Federal Government; that we have become very greedy at the Federal level, and that this greed emanates from the desire of politicians, an insatiable appetite to give things to people in return for their votes. And realizing that there is not an adequate amount of money there, they, of course, impose those financial hardships on political subdivisions below them. And that is where we have found ourselves today.

I hope that all of the American people were watching what was happening last night and what has happened over the past 6 days. I asked our staff to advise me as to how many hours have we been debating the unfunded mandates bill. According to their calculation, it is 47 hours—47 hours of debate on something that really is not that complicated.

Yes, we can get into the finer details and the amendments that perhaps might make it more workable, and I think our distinguished majority leader, Senator DOLE, has gone far beyond the expectations of the American people in being fair. Those of us who are freshmen—and I think I can speak in behalf of all 11 of us who are newly elected who just came off the campaign trail and listened to the people and were there on November 8 when the mandate came out—do not look at this Contract With America in the cute reference that many other people try to put it, in a demeaning sense. It is a very real thing. People are sick and tired of the games we are playing here in Washington, and for the last 6 days we have been playing games. We have not been legislating. We have been playing games.

I know that a lot of Americans out there are applauding at a statement like that because that is what is happening, and they are sick and tired of it. We have a man who ran for President of the United States, elected in 1992, who used throughout his campaign the word ''gridlock.'' We are going to come to Washington and we are going to change; we are going to eliminate gridlock.

We have created gridlock, Mr. President, in the last 6 days and we have done it willfully. We have created gridlock to stall an issue. And I am going to make a prediction in the Chamber of this Senate that is going to offend a lot of people, I am afraid, Mr. President, but it is something that I think has to be said. I believe that this issue has been stalled for a very good reason. First of all, why would they stall an issue on unfunded mandates? Who is opposed to unfunded mandates except for a few liberal people who want to keep the ability to pour money into social programs or other programs and then let the States and the cities and the counties and the people pick up the tab.

Now, that is a philosophy that is out there, and there are some of those who want to do that. But this is not a Republican or Democrat program; it is not a conservative or liberal program, because if you look at the Senator from California, as I mentioned, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, she is very supportive of this because she has sat in a mayor's seat and knows what it is like to have to pay for these mandates that come down.

Yesterday, in the Chamber, I outlined that in only three cities in Oklahoma the unfunded mandates exceeded $35 million, and this is over a period of time. It is just incredible that you could have this. It is not just in Broken Arrow and Tulsa, OK, and in San Francisco. It is throughout America. So it is something that everyone now wants to do something about. The liberals are for it. The conservatives are for it. Organizations like the U.S. Conference of Mayors are for it; the Municipal League is for it; the NFIB is for it. All organizations out there are for this. And yet it has been stalled and stalled and stalled and stalled. It is a bill, a resolution that could very well have been deliberated for 2 days and passed as everybody wants it.

The reason I do not believe it was passed is because there is a deliberate effort to stall the vote on this until after the State of the Union Message that will take place next Tuesday night. And when that happens, I predict in the Chamber of this Senate right now that the President will stand up, even though he may not like the idea of passing an unfunded mandates bill, which I personally do not think he really wants but he heard that the American people did want it on November 8, and he is going to say, ''And I am going to ask this Congress, I am going to ask this Senate to go back into session and pass the unfunded mandates bill.'' And we will. And it is a bill that we should have passed a week before.

Is this gridlock? Yes, it is gridlock. I think it is intentional gridlock. One time someone put the pencil to how much it costs us to keep this body in. I wish I could recall those figures right now, but it is very, very expensive. So there was a tremendous cost to the American people. There is a lot of inconvenience to a lot of people. There were late nights. There was a dialog. We talked on this floor about every conceivable subject that you could talk about and finally got around to making a few comments about unfunded mandates.

So I am saying, yes, it is going to happen, but it is not going to happen until after the State of the Union Message. I think that is a very sad thing.

Do you know where I got the idea of gridlock and where I am coming up with this? It came from someone who talks to a lot of people. It is my barber. A lot of times we have this beltway mentality here where we talk to bureaucrats and we talk to think tank people and we talk to each other and we forget that there is a real world out there with real people who are sick and tired of what is going on up here. I think we will all have learned a lesson as a result of this.

So, Mr. President, in conclusion, I say I hope the American people have been watching for the last couple of days, because what they saw is something we are going to bring to an end. I think I speak in behalf of certainly all 11 of the freshmen Members of this organization when I make this statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kentucky.

UNFUNDED MANDATES

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I admire my new-made friend from Oklahoma. I, too, was Governor. I came to Washington about the so-called unfunded mandates. It was a little easier to take care of then than it is now because we had 12 years of Republicans who ran us from $900 million to over $4 trillion in debt in 12 years. It is a little tough for us now to carry that load.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FORD. Not now. I did not disturb the Senator when he was speaking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. FORD. Then we hear something about gridlock. If the Senator had been here 2 years ago, you would have been part of gridlock—and I say ''the Senator'' rather than ''you''; I want to be careful of my language for the RECORD—because the Republican side would not let us go with pieces of legislation we thought were important. Now they have become part of the Contract With America. The same pieces of legislation, basically, that were filibustered in the last session of Congress are now in the Contract With America. Surprising, is it not? Surprising.

We stand here in the last few days, last couple of weeks, and act like the world has stopped.

We forgot aging in the bill that came out of committee. It would have gone on and we would have excluded aging in the amendment. And the manager of the bill from the Republican side, the majority side, was a cosponsor of that amendment when he found out about it. So we have made some contribution.

We had an amendment last night that was defeated, but utilities—and your State ought to be very interested in utilities—wanted that very badly, because the mandates to private enterprise stick and they do not stick on public entities under this legislation. So it is the business-oriented group here, I guess you would say, who have said to business: We are going to stick it to you. Because the mayors and commissioners out there are raising Cain, we are going to let them off the hook.

So we have incinerators: Private and public. The public does not have to take the mandate but private will, regardless of what it costs.

Landfills: Public and private. The private will have to get stuck with all that.

Schools—think about schools, the mandate on schools. Private will have to be stuck with it; public will not.

Hospitals; in my hometown we have two fine hospitals. Those fine hospitals want to come together—one is public and one is private—and come with an HMO, to merge and try to give better service at lower rates in my community. We better be careful because the private hospital might have to carry out some mandates that the public hospital will not have to.

Why jam this thing through when all those problems are there that should be worked out? We wake up: Oh, I did not know it was in the bill. I will guarantee not a Senator here, with few exceptions, can tell you everything that is in the bill. You get up here and talk about, oh, we are just gridlocked. It may be gridlock, but a couple of things—real, I think—have happened. One, the utilities woke up and business woke up about what is getting ready to happen to them, for one. That is one. Then we found we left out the elderly; we exempted everybody but the elderly. AARP, I am sure, did not know it. But last night it was 99 to zip when you found it, and that was because we said let us look at the bill. And Senator LEVIN, from Michigan, was the individual who found it, brought the amendment up, and the Republican floor leader became a cosponsor of that amendment. That was helpful.

You can stand here all you want to and say we have to get it through because the American people want it. But when small business and major businesses are being hurt, they are not able to be competitive with public—we have local incinerators and private; we have landfills, public and private; we have hospitals, public and private—and you are putting a heavier burden on business and taking it off of their competitor, which is government, I think you ought to take a step back and see what you are doing on this.

We on this side have given you an opportunity to do that. If you want to continue to make the mistake, continue to make the mistake of putting horrendous burdens on business and not on the public entities, then go ahead. When this Senator, 8 years ago, introduced unfunded mandates legislation—the threshold was $50 million then and it has not changed—I got two Senators, two Senators who would be cosponsors.

How times have changed. You said back, I guess in 1967 or 1968, you were here. Where were you when I needed you 8 years ago? Where was all this euphoria for unfunded mandates legislation? I introduced it a year later—nothing happened. So I dropped it. Maybe I should have carried it on. I would have been a part of the Contract With America. But I was there 8 years ago. I was there 7 years ago. The threshold is the same. Now you want to change some from $50 to $100 million. Things are beginning to change. And there are now some changes being made in the bill, I think for the better.

You can fuss at me all you want to. You just give me the devil. Devil take the hindmost, you know? But I am doing what I think is right, and two changes have made this bill better.

It does not go into effect until 1996. Why is the urge here to get something