Now, I suppose it sounds like we are opposed to protecting valuable wetlands. Well, I think the litmus test of that is our vote for the antiswampbusting, antisodbusting provisions in the 1985 farm bill. There were no efforts to repeal those provisions. In fact, even in the 1990 farm bill, there was some expansion in this area.

But I think we ought to be cognizant of the fact that it is not good for agriculture, it is not good for our general economy, and it surely is not conducive to the family farmer. He should not be expected to confront a faceless bureaucrat every so often, with changes in the rules every few years, so that farmers can never be certain if their conduct is allowed under the current regulatory scheme.

I am also opposed to the promulgation of a memorandum of agreement by four Federal agencies that will significantly affect the ability of private property owners to improve their land without the benefit of input from the people affected by the agreement.

My bill basically accomplishes two things. First, it will allow those property owners affected by the memorandum of agreement to have some input through congressional hearings on the wetlands policy. At the very least, Congress should ensure that the concerns of the private owners are heard before they are deprived of the use of their land.

The second purpose of the bill is to stop the bureaucracy from acting based upon the flawed memorandum of agreement. It is my sincere hope that this Congress will reform Federal wetlands policy. This policy should be based upon sound science, recognize the constitutionally protected right of private property, and, above all, institute a large dose of common sense into the program.

And where a real opportunity to instill common sense into this program was missed by the bureaucracy, is when the agreement was not promulgated under the Administrative Procedures Act. That process allows the publishing of whatever the bureaucrat wants to regulate, but it institutes upon them a discipline and a hearing process to make sure that there is input from all segments of the regulated community.

Now, in my State, we do not try to sneak things over on the people. This process of ignoring public input is foreign to the thinking of the commonsense approach of mid-Americans who are law-abiding citizens, who want to work with their Government, who want to keep the economy or the environment sound.

And so I beg for 6 months to slow the process down, to alert the family farmers of America to what is going on. That it is affecting their right to farm, and to do it in a businesslike fashion, and to allow the Agriculture Committee, under the extremely capable leadership of Senator LUGAR, to review this whole process and to work it into the farm bill. That is just 6 months. Surely there is nothing wrong with that. Nothing is going to happen in the next 6 months that is going to be catastrophic to this whole process. I think that it is a commonsense approach.

So this bill stops the Government from finding new wetlands on farms until this reform can be put in place.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

DEMOCRATS, GET REAL

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am pleased today to bring to the attention of my colleagues a thoughtful opinion piece by our colleague, the Senator from Maryland, which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, January 22. She presents a road map that I believe can help all Senators, on both sides of the aisle, as we develop our priorities in this new Congress. I ask unanimous consent that Senator MIKULSKI's column be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 22, 1995

DEMOCRATS, GET REAL

(By Barbara A. Mikulski)

Democrats need a new attitude and action plan to focus on solving real problems. This attitude and plan must promote a shared national vision to create good jobs and give help to those who work hard, play by the rules and practice self-help. We need to create a new state of mind that—as Americans—we can solve our nation's problems together.

Democrats must stop being angst-addicted. We have too often substituted agonizing for action, and it has paralyzed us. To connect with middle-class Americans, we must think clearly and act decisively. Democrats must focus on the day-to-day needs of everyday Americans—their jobs, families and opportunities. We also need to look at our country's long-term needs. We need to generate jobs with pay worth the effort and education. We need to create a national readiness that is based on competence and character.

Democrats must focus on being politically effective, not necessarily politically correct. We cannot use words from a dated vocabulary. Political labels such as ''right,'' ''left,'' ''liberal'' and ''conservative'' have become cliches. Labels and stereotypes that go with them have little meaning.

Being politically effective means helping those who are middle class stay there or do better. Being politically effective means helping those who are not middle class get there through hard work and practicing self-help. Worn-out sound bites about the economy and crime weaken our credibility and play into the hands of those who demonize our ideas by blaming the victim, the government or both.

Democrats must figure out what works. We must be advocates for people and not automatically defend every government program. Let's look at the mission of these programs. When they serve their mission and help people, great. When they don't, let's get rid of them. We cannot be a rescue squad for every line item. Often, the good intentions of good people have gone astray. Tinker Toy reforms ultimately created other problems.

One example is federal housing policy. We thought that if we gave people housing, we would give them opportunity. Begun during the New Deal, most federal housing programs were meant to provide short-term shelter for people temporarily out of work. But a series of complicated rules and boutique programs has rewarded the wrong kind of behavior and made housing projects Zip codes of pathology. Few residents can find work. Crime and substance abuse are high.

Some blame the victim. Some identify with the victim. But Democrat's addition to other people's misery does not solve their problems or substitute for national policy. While we must acknowledge the pain of the impoverished, we must also require them to take charge of their own lives. We must find ways to reward those who work or get into a program for self-sufficiency.

We must ensure that welfare rules do not destroy the family. Democrats should stand up for the family—and that includes men. We need to end the ''get the man out of the house'' rule, which has pushed men out of the house so a family can qualify for public benefits. Shortsighted intentions have created rules that dismantle families, emasculate men and deny their children a full-time father. Being a dad is more than writing a child-support check.

We've heard a lot about angry voters. Actually, I think voters' anger stems from bewilderment and disillusionment. This bewilderment and disillusionment is based on the fact that their personal experience does not reflect what statistics tell them. People are told that they are fortunate to live in an economy of low unemployment, low inflation and rapid growth. Yet, people are one downsizing away from unemployment, their friends have been laid off, and their standard of living continues to decline. At the same time, people feel less secure in their homes, neighborhoods and workplaces Children are killing children with guns carried around in school backpacks.

America's future deserves more thought and effort than partisan bidding wars over tax cuts. It deserves more than the pursuit of ''faddish'' ideas floated by think tanks. Americans deserve real solutions to the complex problems of an increasingly complex world.

Democrats must join together to create this new attitude, both within the Democratic Party and within the country—to reward hard work, family stability and playing by the rules. Together, we can begin to address the very valid concerns Americans have about their futures, the futures of their families and the future of their country.

AUSCHWITZ IS SYNONYMOUS WITH EVIL

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, perhaps more than any other word, Auschwitz is synonymous with evil.

Fifty years ago today, Russian soldiers liberated Auschwitz.

The horrors of Auschwitz are incomprehensible and undescribable.

Over 1 million people lost their lives at Auschwitz—the largest of the Nazi death camps. Ninety percent were Jews. Hundreds of thousands were children.

Auschwitz represented the German's campaign to exterminate a people—the Jews. They almost succeeded—killing two out of three Jews in Europe.

As a Polish-American, I carry the images of Auschwitz in my heart.