

Hill in 1974 as chief counsel to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. In 1981, "Mack," as he is known among his friends and colleagues, became chief counsel and staff director of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, where he served through the 103d Congress. For the past 3 months he has served as the minority staff director of the committee, retiring from that position last Friday, March 31, 1995.

During his tenure, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee worked in a bipartisan manner to improve the medical care, compensation, and other benefits to our Nations' deserving veterans. Mack Fleming earned the respect of Members of Congress and staff because of his professionalism, knowledge, and ability. He worked with all sides on the issues, to ensure that all views were heard and to build consensus where possible.

As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I appreciated Mack's expertise, experience, and skill as we worked together on many issues. The Congress benefited from his service and his leadership, and I know he will be missed.

I congratulate this fine public servant, a man of integrity, capability, and character. I extend my best wishes to his wife, Elizabeth, and their children—John, who attends Clemson University, and Katherine, who practices law in Texas. I wish him well in his retirement, as he and his wife return to Seneca, SC, where I am sure they will enjoy the views, recreation, and quieter life on the shores of Lake Keowee.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business, not to extend beyond the hour of 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

Under the previous order, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] is recognized to speak for up to 20 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. FRIST, and Mr. DORGAN pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 103 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I listened to the statement made by the Senators from New Mexico and South Dakota and others about character. I do not know all the aspects of this resolution, I just know some of the things I have heard here on the floor, but I kept hearing reference made to values

and we have to start teaching values to our young people.

I agree with that. I think our young people ought to learn values. But, you know, perhaps we ought to look at ourselves first as teachers. Perhaps we ought to start looking at the Congress of the United States. What values are we sending out to the American people? What are the young people of America—what kind of values are they getting from the U.S. Government? That is what I want to speak about this morning, the Contract With America. Its 100 days are up this week, and I want to talk about that Contract With America.

Now, I think I want to talk about it in the context of values and character, because the values that are being sent across America from the Government of the United States is simply this: If you have it made and you have a lot of money, the Government is there to help you and make you more comfortable. If you do not and you are at the bottom rung of the ladder, forget it. You are out in the cold.

Values? You want to talk about a resolution dealing with values? Let us talk about the Contract With America and what values it represents. With any contract you have to ask, who benefits and who loses? Who wins and who loses on a contract? The answer now is crystal clear. The winners are the billionaires, the super wealthy, the special interest Washington lobbyists. They get the credit card. They have the night out on the town. They go to the fancy restaurant. The losers are the hard-working middle-class, children, students, pregnant women, the elderly, the disabled. They get to pick up the bill for the superwealthy. I know that may sound like rhetoric, but the facts are there. Let us look at it. Let us not just get caught up in rhetoric, let us look at the facts.

Here is a chart that we had drawn just to show what is happening in my State of Iowa under the Contract With America, Mr. GINGRICH's contract, the Republicans' contract. Here we are. Two percent of the Iowa population has an income of \$100,000 or more. They get 50 percent of the benefits under the contract. And 86 percent of Iowans have incomes of \$50,000 or less. They only get 20 percent of the benefits.

One more time. If you are in the upper income bracket, 2 percent of the Iowans making over \$100,000 a year, you get 50 percent of all the benefits in the Contract With America. If you are a hard-working, average Iowan making less than \$50,000, you will only get 20 percent of the benefits.

Values? You want to talk about values? Let us talk about values. That is the message that is being sent out around America today: If you are on the top of the heap, the Government is there to help you and make you even more comfortable, give you more tax breaks. You want to talk about values, let us talk about values.

Then we just had a recent example of really giving it to the superwealthy, the so-called Benedict Arnold amendment. Senator BRADLEY tried to close a loophole in the law. The House would not hear of it and they knocked it out. We heard a lot of debate on the floor about that last week. Imagine this, what the House Republican leadership has said is that if you make a billion dollars in America and you get all these capital assets and then you renounce your citizenship, you get a big tax windfall. You do not have to pay a lot of these taxes. You can still live in America 4 months out of the year, you can live on the French Riviera 4 months out of the year, you can live in South America 4 months out of the year, you can jet all around the year but you do not have to pay your taxes and you can still own your property and stuff in America. That is why I call it the Benedict Arnold approach, the Benedict Arnold amendment. You can turn your back on the country that made you rich.

What the Contract With America says is, hey, we are going to give you a big tax break, the Benedict Arnold approach. The middle class has to pick it up.

Students. What is happening with students? Under the Contract With America, 94,000 students will pay more for their college loans. That is a tax on students. No one is talking about it. We are taxing students in America as much as \$3,150 in additional cost to each student if they require payment of interest while in school and we do not have the grace period before they get a job.

You know, old NEWT GINGRICH and I have a little bit in common. We went to college on the National Defense Educational Loans. I went to a window in the school, got the money, borrowed the money, went to college, but I went to the military after college. Mr. GINGRICH did not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes has expired.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator has an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I spent 5 years in the military. Mr. GINGRICH did not. That is all right. So I did not have to pay it back then. So then I went to law school and I did not still have to pay it back. It was after I finished law school that I started to pay back the loan, and the interest started at that point in time. I think that is what Mr. GINGRICH said he did, too. He just did not go to the military, but he had the same benefit. But he is saying what was good for me is not good for you. He wants to close that now. He said, "Students, as soon as you start borrowing money you have to pay interest on it right away." That is a tax on students any way you cut it. I am saying it was good for me and it ought to be good for

other students, too. I think we ought to invest in students and not shut the door. So what they are doing is they are wiping out opportunities for our kids to go to college.

Now they want to take away the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. They want to zero that out. You know, you could make arguments on that. I happen to think public broadcasting is a benefit here in America. There is good programming, good intellectual programming, good stimulation for our kids from "Sesame Street" and "Barney" and everything else. They want to pull the plug on that. But they want to continue to spend about \$300 million a year for Radio Free Europe.

One more time. They want to cut public broadcasting in America, the Contract With America, but they turn around and want to have public broadcasting in Europe called Radio Free Europe. If you want to start a radio station in Europe, FM, AM, TV, go right ahead. You can go to Bulgaria, Romania, Lithuania, Latvia, Ukraine—if you want to start a radio station, they will let you, no restrictions. We have this Radio Free Europe now, almost \$300 million a year. Guess what, they are broadcasting on shortwave. Who listens to shortwave? People there are listening to FM and AM and television. They are getting satellite TV. They are watching CNN and we are pumping \$300 million a year into shortwave broadcasting on Radio Free Europe. The Contract With America says we will keep that up but we will cut public broadcasting in America.

If that makes sense, please someone explain it to me. Europe is free, the borders are down. Whatever value Radio Free Europe had when the Iron Curtain was up, that certainly is gone now, and we ought to bring that money home and put it in public broadcasting here.

So, again, who wins and who loses on the contract? Big business and their special interest lobbyists have been invited into the committee rooms to write the laws that will benefit them. There are articles in the paper about every week, every Thursday, Republicans in the House sit down with all the corporate lobbyists, high-powered lobbyists, not only to write the legislation but to plan out how they are going to get it passed.

I saw a headline in the paper a few weeks ago where NEWT GINGRICH said they were going to end business as usual when they took over. They did. They ended business as usual. But they did not tell us they were going to bring in big business as usual, because that is what is running us now—not business as usual; big business as usual.

The last thing that I want to point out is that a few years ago—this is where this whole thing breaks down. You talk about values. A few years ago Senator LEAHY and I were instrumental in putting in competitive bidding in the Women, Infants, and Children Program to mandate that infant formula

companies had to enter into competitive bids to supply the States with infant formula. Before that they did not do that. We got it through. As a result millions more women, infants, and children are getting infant formula, healthy food, to guide a good start in life at no extra cost to the taxpayer because we have competitive bidding. Just last year, for example, the average monthly rebate to my State of Iowa was \$630,000 a month because of competitive bidding.

The Contract With America wants to take that away and put it back in the States, and do not require competitive bidding.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article from the Wall Street Journal outlining how four giant pharmaceutical companies can make over \$1 billion a year in windfalls if they do away with competitive bidding.

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

FOUR DRUG FIRMS COULD GAIN \$1 BILLION  
UNDER GOP NUTRITION-PROGRAM REVISION  
(By Hilary Stout)

WASHINGTON.—Four pharmaceutical companies stand to gain as much as a billion dollars under a Republican bill that overhauls federal nutrition programs for children and pregnant women.

The companies sell infant formula to the Women, Infants and Children (WIC) program, a federal initiative that provides formula as well as milk, beans, rice and other nutritious foods to poor children and to pregnant and breast-feeding women. Since 1989 the companies have been required by law to enter into a competitive bidding process in order to sell formula to WIC, resulting in rebates to the government that are expected to reach \$1.1 billion this year.

A bill that cleared the House Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee on a party-line vote last week would turn the WIC program over to states in the form of a "block grant," and with it repeal the cost-containment competitive-bidding measure. An amendment to restore it was defeated by the committee. The legislation now moves to the House floor for consideration.

The four companies, the only domestic makers of infant formula—Ross Laboratories, a unit of Abbott Laboratories; Mead Johnson, a unit of Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.; Wyeth-Ayerst, a unit of American Home Products Corp.; and Carnation Co., a U.S. subsidiary of the Swiss conglomerate Nestle SA—fought the competitive-bidding measure fiercely when it came before Congress in the late 1980s. Until then, they were collecting retail prices for the infant formula they sold to WIC.

Sen. Patrick Leahy of Vermont, the senior Democrat on the Senate Agriculture Committee and the lawmaker who led the effort to enact the cost-containment measures, threatened to filibuster the bill yesterday if it reaches the Senate. "It is really obscene," Sen. Leahy said. "The most conservative of people should, if being truthful, like the competitive bidding. . . . It's just rank hypocrisy."

If the bill reaches the Senate floor, Sen. Leahy continued, "I've spent 20 years building bipartisan coalitions and working on nutrition programs. If it's necessary to discuss my whole 20 years' worth of experience in real time, I'll do it."

In 1993, the latest year for which figures are available, the WIC program spend \$1.46 billion on infant formula but received \$935 million in rebates. That cut the overall cost of providing formula to \$525 million, nearly a two-thirds reduction. Moreover, the states, which administer the program, were allowed to use the rebates to add more people to the WIC program.

The action on WIC comes as a liberal-leaning research group, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, released a study questioning the continuing effectiveness of some of the infant-formula rebates. The center's analysis found that in the last year, despite the cost-containment requirements, the cost of infant formula purchased through WIC has almost doubled in many states.

Since last March, the study said, 17 state WIC program have signed rebate contracts with at least one of the major formula manufacturers. Under those agreements, the average net cost of a 13-ounce can of concentrated infant formula was 60 cents, compared with a 32-cent average price under rebate contracts signed during the previous 15 months, the study said.

The Federal Trade Commission has been investigating the infant formula makers' rebate and pricing practices, and at least one state, Florida, has filed suit against the manufacturers.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, again, who wins and who loses? Kids lose, low-income women who rely on the WIC Program lose, and our States are going to lose because they will not get rebates. Students are losing. Working families are losing. But, if you are on the top of the heap economically, this "contract" is for you.

So it is not a Contract With America. This is a contract with corporate America. This is a contract with big business America. This is the contract with wealthy Americans. But it is not a contract for the average man and woman in America.

So, again this resolution, I guess, is probably all right about American values. But I believe that we ought to be looking at ourselves and the kind of value signals we send with this Contract With America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Democratic leader, or his designee, is now recognized to speak for up 30 minutes.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] is the designee and will be able to speak up to 20 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, it is 30 minutes. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Leadership has 30 minutes but it is the Chair's understanding that you were designated 20 minutes of the 30 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia, Senator ROCKEFELLER.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank my colleague, and I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I try not to say I am shocked very often. I try to reserve it for when I really am. Today, I really am shocked. On Friday, we actually watched Senators, led by Majority

Leader BOB DOLE, think they need to retaliate against the simple idea coming from this side of the aisle—that cutting Government spending does not mean waging an assault on education and our children.

I am speaking of the amendment from the Democratic leader.

With our pro-education amendment, we are asking every Senator to think very hard about what's right and where our true values should lead us. This amendment gives every Senator a chance, before it is too late, to leave politics at the door and to cast a vote for the basic principle that education and children must not be the victim of this Senate.

The citizens of this country expect us to make choices. With the rescissions bill before us, we are coming up with the funds to pay off recent costs for natural disasters and other emergencies. The bill also cuts a range of Government programs to reduce the Federal deficit even more. Both are essential steps.

But, Mr. President, reducing the deficit and taking care of natural disasters do not mean that this Senate has to rob the schools, the children, and the spirit of the Nation. Any fourth or fifth grade teacher would give this bill a D at best for being that dumb.

The amendment offered by the Democratic leader is our chance to make this bill a lot more worthy of passage. I urge every Senator, on both sides of the aisle, to resist the urge to be too stubborn or too partisan to vote for this amendment. It is never too late to improve ourselves or our work. It is always a good idea to think about the consequences of our actions.

We face one of the clearest choices imaginable between the amendment offered by the Republican leader and the one offered by the Democratic leader. The Republican choice is to cut education even more, and to kill off national service completely.

The Democratic amendment says protect our schools, protect the children, keep national service alive.

Vote for the Daschle amendment, and you are voting to continue supporting what Americans say over and over and over again they support, and care deeply about:

Help for elementary and secondary schools trying to give the best education possible for children from hard-pressed families; the Goals 2000 effort to raise academic standards in over a thousand schools; the funding for schools to teach children and teenagers about the dangers of drugs and alcohol; Head Start, and its special role in getting children off on the right foot; the training that's taking place all over the country to help high school graduates who aren't yet planning to attend college, but need that extra boost to make it in the workplace; and last but not least, the country's new and exciting national service program, that

has inspired and excited thousands and thousands of young people to serve their communities with the promise of a college scholarship to follow.

Mr. President, vote against the Daschle amendment, and you are snuffing out a flame of hope for children and families in every town, city, and schoolhouse in this country. This is not rhetoric. These are not abstract numbers. We are not talking about throwing a few bureaucrats out of work or closing some government offices. We are talking about a bill that wants to yank \$1.3 billion away from education and children and national service.

This amendment says put the \$1.3 billion back into our schools, back into drug education, back into national service, back into getting teenagers ready for the demands of adulthood.

As Chairman of the National Commission on Children, I have traveled to many of the States of my colleagues. To San Antonio, TX, where I saw a principal of a school use Head Start funds and title I funds to cause children to giggle and parents to smile as learning took place in every classroom. Vote against this amendment, and dim the lights in that school in San Antonio. We visited Kansas City, MO, where law officers and parents told us with fear and frustration about the drugs on the streets and in the schoolyards. Vote against this amendment, and start surrendering to the drug traffickers. We went to Minnesota where corporate executives told us about their desperate need to get young workers with better reading and math skills. Vote against this amendment, and tell those employers to start thinking about locating in countries where education is more valued.

Then, there's my own State of West Virginia. Where families and communities face incredible odds every day. Where children are what counts, and education is the key. Where the programs covered in this amendment make the difference. Where schools depend on these funds to have a math teacher or a drug education class or a schoolwide campaign to get grades up. There are not a lot of wealthy families in West Virginia. But wealth is not supposed to determine whether a child becomes a scientist or a professor or even a Senator. Education is. That is the American promise. That is the American dream. Vote against this amendment, and start snuffing out that promise, that dream.

I can hardly believe that national service is on the firing line of this bill, already mowed down by the House Republican leaders. Should the President really apologize or hide the fact that he is proud of helping to reignite the flame for national service? For the idea that we can promote rights and responsibilities? A program that is already the story of thousands of AmeriCorps members, working in housing projects, shelters, classrooms, health clinics,

neighborhoods—for a minimum amount of money to live on, and a college scholarship as a reward for service.

AmeriCorps is taking hold in West Virginia. Young people and older participants are helping a mobile health van to bring primary health care, like checkups and shots, to children in rural areas. They are working at domestic violence shelters where women and children seek refuge from this terrible danger in too many homes.

National service is the idea that led me to West Virginia, and changed my life forever.

Vote for this amendment, and national service stays alive in our communities. Vote against this amendment, and let the American people know that we are giving up on this idea once again. Let us wait another 30 years to celebrate service with college scholarships and stipends.

When I joined the Senate, one of my very first bills was the one that helped create the drug education program threatened in this bill. The police officers, the teachers, and the parents of West Virginia led me to push for this special help. As a result, police officers are now in classrooms, telling children about what it is like in prison. Peer groups have developed in countless schools to make it clear that drugs are not cool, whatsoever.

If we are serious about values, where is the logic in going after something as basic as drug education? What signal does that send? It makes no sense.

Mr. President, I heard the Republican leader bemoan the effort from this side of the aisle to fight for kids. I am sorry if that's slowing this bill down. I am especially sorry to see it cause a cruel counterpunch in the form of a Republican-led amendment, instead of the admission that we should take a breath, and remember just how much the citizens of this country support and care about education and children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Presiding Officer and I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming wishes to speak in morning business for 7 minutes. I would be happy to accommodate him, providing that it does not come out of our time and we retain the balance of our time following his presentation.

Mr. SIMPSON. May I suggest that order take place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the Senator from Wyoming speaks, the Chair would inform the Senator from North Dakota that the Chair was in error. The Senator was allotted 30 minutes, not 20. The Senator has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield 2 minutes of my time to my friend from Nebraska, Senator KERREY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] is recognized for 2 minutes.