

been the lack of a sound process for selecting which IT initiatives to fund and for overseeing their development." It is precisely because of the great significance of this issue that I joined in developing this amendment.

Mr. President, this amendment strikes at the heart of these problems by repealing the so-called Brooks Act which has controlled the way government buys and manages information technology for the last 30 years. The Brooks Act never worked as it was intended. Its reliance upon the submission of reams of paperwork through layers of bureaucracy has not worked in the past. And, its tight bureaucratic controls are clearly not relevant to today, with information technology advancing exponentially in a highly competitive market.

Our amendment re-engineers this process, replacing red tape with a reliance on thorough, up-front investment planning and hands-on management practices which focus on bottom line results. The new process is modeled on the best practices used by America's most successful businesses. That model requires Government managers to focus like a laser on anticipating difficulties and then fixing them before they become problems. The amendment enables government agencies to accomplish these goals without additional paperwork or bureaucracy. Yet, this new process preserves the advantages and safeguards embodied in the Competition in Contracting Act.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I have four major concerns that must be more fully addressed than the current amendment will permit. First, the amendment may be interpreted as consolidating bid protests affecting information technology along with those from all other procurement. I am not satisfied that the case for such dramatic change has been made. There is much debate about this kind of consolidation and several alternative approaches have been proposed. I intend to fully consider each of these and will keep an open mind during the next 2 months, as I work on a comprehensive procurement reform bill.

Second, the current amendment does not address the excessive layers of bureaucracy in the Federal buying system which hang like a dead weight around the necks of Government program managers. This is a government-wide problem not unique to information technology and not addressed by this amendment.

Third, I believe that we must do a better job of educating and training the entire acquisition workforce—not just those involved in information technology. I do not agree with those in the administration who believe that we can fix acquisition horror stories with an interagency review team. It is no replacement for well trained program managers, who have the skills and experience to prevent horror stories from occurring in the first place.

Lastly, I am convinced that we must move boldly to dismantle the existing network of perverse personnel incentives which strangle the entrepreneurial spirit of Government program managers. We must move to paying people for good performance, rather than for growing the size of their program.

Mr. President, while the current amendment highlights important issues of good management in Government, we know that most of these problems are not unique to information technology. They beg a broader solution. Happily, last year's acquisition reform bill established the framework for solving these matters. This framework simply needs to be strengthened. To achieve that purpose, Mr. President, the Governmental Affairs Committee, in cooperation with the Armed Services and Small Business Committees, has reassembled the bi-partisan staff-level working group which produced last year's round of substantive acquisition reform. Our group has been charged with reviewing the entire spectrum of Government acquisition. We are assessing all acquisition reform legislation currently pending and have received input from many other sources. The end result of our efforts will be a broadly-gauged new bill which calls for major Governmentwide acquisition reform. We plan to move that bill forward in the fall with the intent of enacting a Governmentwide comprehensive acquisition reform bill in the next several months. ●

SCHEDULE

Mr. DOLE. I also say, with reference to the schedule next week, in a moment I will introduce the Work Opportunity Act of 1995. That debate will begin in earnest on Monday morning, at 10:30 a.m. From 9 to 10:30 there will be a period of morning business. But at 10:30 a.m. we will start serious debate on the Work Opportunity Act of 1995. I assume there will be a number of opening statements. Amendments can be offered. Votes can be expected on Monday. I do not know how long the opening statements will take. Of course, if we are able to go back to the DOD authorization bill we would have votes on that on Monday.

So I urge my colleagues to stay in close contact with their offices. I assume there will not be any votes prior to—4:30, 5 o'clock will be my best guess. It will be my hope we can complete the welfare reform measure, the Work Opportunity Act, next week. That is, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday. There will not be a Saturday session next Saturday.

I guess, if necessary, if we were near completion, we will come back then on the following Monday and try to complete action on the Work Opportunity Act of 1995. I have had a discussion with the distinguished Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE. I have indicated to him that is our hope.

Also, there are a couple of appropriations bills we would like to, in our spare time, resolve next week. One is the Interior appropriations, which can be done in a matter of hours. And the other is the DOD appropriation bill, which will not be taken up until we complete action on the DOD authorization bill. That is a very, very big money bill. That might take as much as a day.

Now, obviously, I do not believe we can do all of those things next week. I hope to be in a position on Monday or Tuesday to advise my colleagues what to expect for the remainder of next week and the following week.

COMMENDATION OF JILL MAYCUMBER

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I rise to thank Jill Maycumber who is departing my staff after nearly 5 years of outstanding service to me, to the Senate, and to Kansas.

Like many Senate staff, Jill began her Senate career as an intern in my office. She quickly proved herself and became a key member of my staff.

For a time, Jill served as our receptionist—no doubt about it, the toughest job in Washington. But her outstanding people skills and deep desire to help Kansans made Jill the right choice to head my regional office in southeast Kansas.

When the massive floods struck the midwest in 1993, Jill Maycumber tirelessly crisscrossed the State, inspecting damage, and coordinating Federal assistance to flood victims. Hundreds of Kansans who have needed a helping hand knew who to call. They have Jill Maycumber to thank.

Earlier this year, Jill returned to Washington to help run my Senate office—not an easy task as my colleagues can attest. But most importantly, Jill took the extra time to greet thousands of constituents, always making sure that their visit to Washington and to my office was a special event.

I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Jill Maycumber for her outstanding service to the Senate and to Kansas. Jill can be very proud of what she has accomplished—she has truly made a difference.

I extend my heartfelt thank you and best wishes to Jill in her new career.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of Calendar 125, H.R. 4, the welfare bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which