

the people who want to have the town meetings can but with some limitations so that one or a few Senators do not take too much of the fund. Therefore, we could move in the direction of encouraging these open house town meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for raising this issue because it is a very legitimate issue, and I think it is a legitimate issue for the legislative branch subcommittee to deal with. We did not deal with it in subcommittee and in full committee. It becomes a challenge to try to find the money right now in terms of an offset within the bill.

The point the Senator from Pennsylvania makes is an extremely valid one. There are people who, in rural areas particularly, do not really have any sense of opportunity to interact with a Senator unless that Senator physically goes to those counties. Then when you try to notify the people that you are coming, you have a real challenge because they do not have the mass media coverage. Yes, they may get a major newspaper from a major metropolitan area, but they do not read it for hometown announcements. If you try local newspapers, many times they do not do the job, either.

The problem we have in terms of the reactions from members of the Rules Committee is that the Rules Committee has attempted to create the opportunity for this in terms of flexibility for the overall budget and saying to a Senator, "You have a pot of money you can use either for franking or for stationery, for travel, or some other item," and they are opposed to earmarking a particular amount of money for this particular purpose.

If we sit down with members of the Rules Committee and lay out the importance of what it is the Senator from Pennsylvania is highlighting and talk it through to find some creative way, I think we can move in that direction. I pledge to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I will work with him to see if we cannot do that because I agree absolutely with the end he is trying to achieve.

I think it is very important that we try to help Members communicate with their constituents in a meaningful kind of way.

As I understand it, from the Senator from Pennsylvania, this is not talking about a mass mailing of campaign literature, as we are accused of doing under newsletters and use of the franking. This is talking about simply a notice that would go out under the frank with respect to town meetings.

I am very sympathetic with that and would be happy to work with the Senator and the Senators from the Rules Committee and, of course, Senator FEINSTEIN, to see if we can't find a way to devise something that is not overly expensive—because I agree with the Senator, not every Senator would want

to use it—but that at the same time we could provide an opportunity for those Senators who would be willing to do the town meeting.

So I am happy to deal with the Senator to see if we can't find way to work this out.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, in response to Chairman BENNETT's suggestion, I would like to assure the Senator from Pennsylvania, as a member of the Rules Committee, I would be very happy to take a look at this and see what the problem is. The ranking member of the Rules Committee was here and is familiar with the subject. I believe he would be agreeable, as well, to take a look. And we will see what the problem is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah and the Senator from California for those statements. Let us proceed on that basis.

Picking up on what the Senator from Utah said, it isn't a political mailing touting what any of us may think he or she has done. It is notice that the Senator is going to have his or her body at a given place.

As open house town meetings go, that can be a fairly high price to pay, to go out and face the music and face the constituents because they do keep track of our votes. But they have a very hard time following us if they live in Coudersport in Potter County or live in the northern tier of Pennsylvania or a southern tier county such as Fulton. They don't necessarily get any of the major newspapers and are outside television range. They may see some national television, but that is not an effective way for Senators to communicate with the people of their States.

When you appear at a town meeting, there is a feeling that something is going on that is positive. We Members of Congress in the Senate and the House are subject to a lot of criticism as being "inside the beltway" and not being accessible. People don't know what we are doing. And then we are going to these fundraisers where people have to make contributions to have access to us.

This is something which is not very healthy for a democracy. So let us proceed.

I will not offer an amendment at this time. I will see if we can work it out, starting with the chairman and ranking member on this subcommittee, and moving over to the chairman and ranking member on the Rules Committee, to try to structure a program which would accomplish the purpose and be affordable.

I thank the Senator from Utah and the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. I think, as I said,

he has raised an issue very much worth pursuing and one that we will, in all good faith, go forward on, to see if we can't work out some kind of solution that can get us where it is we need to be.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENTS—EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the 40 minutes of debate with respect to the nominations begin at 2:20 p.m. today, with the votes to occur at the expiration of that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that Executive Calendar No. 454 be added to the list of nominations to be confirmed following the votes on the FEC and judicial nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—Continued

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we come to the time where we have another 25 minutes before the time comes for voting. I had been expecting the Senator from Alaska. He is still tied up in a previous meeting. So we will look forward to hearing from him.

It has been an interesting experience for me to serve as chairman of this particular subcommittee on Appropriations. There are those who say this subcommittee does not matter very much because its dollar allocation is the lowest of all of the subcommittees in the Appropriations Committee, with the exception of the District of Columbia. I disagree. I think this subcommittee, in fact, can have as much impact on the Government as some of the others that have greater amounts of money to spend because of its area of jurisdiction.

I will take a little of the time here to express my gratitude for the opportunity of chairing this subcommittee and for those with whom we work. The subcommittee deals with the Architect of the Capitol. That is a term that most people in the country do not understand. They would think of the Architect of the Capitol as the person who sits down and draws the lines on paper that produces the building of the Capitol. That is what architects do.

They do not realize that the Architect of the Capitol is charged with the responsibility of maintaining the Capitol. In this situation, I have been able to go around and meet those people who oversee the activities that go on with respect to maintaining our operation. They work for the Architect of the Capitol, and they are concerned with such things as the air-conditioning, the cleaning, the repairs, the restoration of the Brumidi paintings about which the Senator from West Virginia spoke.

We take it for granted that this beautiful place will always remain beautiful. It takes a virtual army of people working behind the scenes to see that this is, in fact, the case.

I have spoken of my business experience. I remember one company where I worked where a particular manager was under very heavy pressure from top management to show improved results on the bottom line. This manager was determined to do that. Pretty soon the reports started coming in that the bottom line was getting better and getting better, and he basked in the glow of the approval that he got for his tough measures and his great turnaround procedures.

Then the bill came due, and we discovered what he had been doing. He had been increasing his bottom line by cutting back on his maintenance budget. And all of a sudden the facilities over which he had responsibility began to show the deterioration. In that company, we ultimately had to pay enormous capital costs to restore the facilities to the level they should have been at by virtue of significant day-to-day maintenance. Yes, he could make the bottom line look better temporarily by shutting down the day-to-day maintenance, but, overall, he cost us a great deal of money.

That is the responsibility of the Architect of the Capitol: To see to it that, overall, this entire complex works. It is not only the Capitol. He has the responsibility for the Senate office buildings and the House office buildings.

We have watched the renovation of the Dirksen Office Building go forward under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol. I am happy to be able to report that it is on time and under budget. For those who say that every Federal program is a boondoggle, this is one that is moving forward. As an occupant of a Dirksen Building suite in the renovated area, I can tell you that this office space will be good for the next 30 or 40 years before it has to be done again. It is being done properly, it is being done intelligently, and it is being done within the allocated budget.

Something that I did not know anything about until I became chairman of this subcommittee is the Botanic Gardens.

I have all my life driven by the Botanic Gardens without ever going in and without ever having any understanding of what went on inside. The Architect of the Capitol came to me when I got this assignment and said: Let's go down and take a look at the Botanic Gardens. Well, one walk through the Botanic Gardens made it clear that there had been a lot of delay and neglect of ordinary maintenance. This was a major mess.

Now, under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol, the Botanic Gardens are being raised up to the level where they should be. One may ask: Who cares about the Botanic Gardens? I asked the somewhat impudent question: How many Americans come to the

Botanic Gardens? How many see this? Well, if it were in a city other than Washington, DC, it would be a major tourist attraction. There are literally millions of Americans who go through the Botanic Gardens every year. It had been allowed to deteriorate and had to be brought up to proper standards.

I could go on and on about the work of the Architect of the Capitol. It is significant work, and it requires a great deal of effort. I am delighted to be involved in understanding that.

I see other Members coming to the floor. I want them to know I am not filibustering, but I don't want the time to go just in a quorum call, when I have an opportunity to express my gratitude for the assignment that I have. If anyone has something they want to say, just give me a signal and I will conclude quickly.

Absent that, I will talk about the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress Thomas Jefferson building is one of the hidden jewels, architecturally, in this town. I always tell tourists from Utah, when they come and visit me in my office, to go see the Jefferson building. They say: Well, we are going to go see the major sites. We are going to go to the Vietnam War Memorial. We are going to go to the Lincoln Memorial and the Jefferson Memorial and the new FDR Memorial, and so on. I only have so much time.

I say: I don't care how limited your time is. If you have any time at all, walk down the street and walk into the Jefferson building.

This is the most beautiful building on Capitol Hill except for the Capitol itself. It represents in many ways the story of America.

My favorite story about the Library of Congress and the building is one that is told about Boris Yeltsin, when he walked into the Jefferson building. He stood there and looked around, and then turned to his guide and said: How did you Americans get a building like this? You didn't have any czars?

Well, maybe we didn't have any czars, but we had the Army Corps of Engineers, and we had the American spirit 100 years ago that said America has arrived. America is going to take its place as one of the major nations of the world. In that spirit of enthusiasm and excitement, they built the Jefferson building to house the Library of Congress. That building came in under budget and on time. It stands as a reminder of the spirit of manifest destiny that we associate with Theodore Roosevelt. The building was finished before Theodore Roosevelt became President, but it was in that era that it happened. That is a reminder that all Americans ought to have as part of their history.

It has been magnificently restored by the Congress, and by this subcommittee. Admittedly, it was restored prior to my being involved with the subcommittee, but it is something we in Congress should be proud of because it is part of the heritage we leave to our children and our grandchildren.

They can come to Capitol Hill—yes, the Capitol and the continuity of democracy that is represented here—but there is also the commitment to knowledge and spreading that knowledge that is represented by the largest and finest library in the world. It exists to serve the Congress. It is sustained by the Congress. It is part of the responsibility of this particular subcommittee.

I am delighted with the opportunity of serving in this capacity. I appreciate the support we have received not only from the full committee but from all of the Members of the Senate as well.

I see my friend from Connecticut is here. I am happy to yield the floor.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, if I may, I commend our colleague from Utah for the job he and the ranking Democrat, Senator FEINSTEIN of California, have done on this bill. I echo his sentiments about the role we play as custodians of these buildings.

I noted earlier that all of us on a daily basis greet students who come to the Nation's Capital as part of the graduation programs of various schools. I had the wonderful privilege earlier today of meeting a group of students from Woodstock, a school in Connecticut, as part of their eighth grade graduation.

It is a violation of the rules of the Senate to identify anybody who is in the galleries, and I won't do that. I am not going to identify any school groups in the gallery. If you happen to notice somebody dressed in green up there, you might notice someone who might come from that school along the way. They are very attentive students and interested about these buildings. As I explained to them, these are their buildings. We are mere custodians of them.

I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Utah and the Senator from California. We are doing what we can to see to it that they are secure and well cared for so that future generations will be able to enjoy them as much as this generation does.

I thank the Chair and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 2603, the pending legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001, as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

I commend the distinguished subcommittee chairman, Senator BENNETT, and the distinguished ranking member, Senator FEINSTEIN, for bringing a balanced bill to the floor. The bill supports ongoing Senate operations and those of the congressional support agencies we depend upon, such as the

Congressional Budget Office, the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, and the General Accounting Office. It also sustains a commitment to increased security for the entire Capitol complex and the thousands of visitors we receive each day.

The bill as reported to the Senate provides \$1.7 billion in new budget authority and \$1.45 billion in new outlays for the operations of the Senate, joint items, and our related agencies. The House will add the funding for its operations to its version of this bill. When outlays from prior-year budget authority, funding for House items, and other actions are taken into account, the bill totals \$2.6 billion in both budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2001.

The Senate bill is at the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation for budget authority, and it is \$4 million in outlays below the 302(b) allocation. The Senate bill is \$54 million in budget authority and \$53 million in outlays above the FY 2000 level. It is \$216 million in budget authority and \$169 million in outlays below the budget request.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Senate Budget Committee scoring of the reported bill be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

S. 2603, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 2001—
SPENDING COMPARISONS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL
(Fiscal Year 2001, \$ millions)

	General Purpose	Mandatory	Total
Senate-reported bill¹:			
Budget authority	2,500	97	2,597
Outlays	2,498	97	2,595
Senate 302(b) allocation:			
Budget authority	2,500	97	2,597
Outlays	2,502	97	2,599
2000 level:			
Budget authority	2,449	94	2,543
Outlays	2,448	94	2,542
President's request:			
Budget authority	2,716	97	2,813
Outlays	2,667	97	2,764
SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:			
Senate 302(b) allocation:			
Budget authority			
Outlays	-4		-4
2000 level:			
Budget authority	51	3	54
Outlays	50	3	53
President's request:			
Budget authority	-216		-216
Outlays	-169		-169

¹ Includes adjustment for House-only items not considered in Senate.

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

LITTLE SCHOLARS CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Utah, Senator BENNETT, for his excellent work on the FY 2001 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill and the attention he and his staff have paid to my concerns. I would like to engage in a brief colloquy with Senator BENNETT on one of my priorities, the issue of extending health and retirement benefits to employees of the Library of Congress' child care center.

As the Senator knows, providing quality and affordable child care is a

very important issue to me. I was, therefore, shocked to learn that child care workers in the Legislative Branch are not all afforded the same benefits. While employees of both the Senate and the House child care centers receive Federal health and retirement benefits, employees of the Library of Congress' child care center, the Little Scholars Child Development Center, do not. I ask Senator BENNETT if he agrees that employees of all Legislative Branch child care centers should be provided benefits in a consistent manner?

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator from Vermont for bringing this issue to my attention. Like him, members of my staff have also had their children enrolled in the Little Scholars Center and speak highly of the staff and quality of the care there. In this competitive job market, it is very important that Legislative Branch child care centers be able to attract and retain quality staff. I share the Senator from Vermont's goal that health and retirement benefits are extended to employees of the Library of Congress' child care center as soon as possible.

I inform Senator JEFFORDS that I have received a copy of a memo, dated May 24, from Teresa Smith, Director of the Library's Human Resource Services, to John D. Webster, Director of the Library's Financial Services, committing to working out a fair and equitable agreement on the issue of extending benefits to employees of the center with the governing board of the child care center. Rest assured, my staff and I will be monitoring the Library's progress towards this goal with the intent that this issue be resolved before the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I thank Senator BENNETT for his attention to this important matter and am pleased that he shares my belief that the Legislative Branch should set an example of high child care standards for the rest of the Federal government to follow.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum of which I spoke be printed in the RECORD.

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

MEMORANDUM

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, MAY 24, 2000.

To: John D. Webster, Director, Financial Services.

From: Teresa Smith, Director, Human Resource Services.

Subject: Little Scholars Child Development Center.

The purpose of this memorandum is to respond to your request for information regarding the Little Scholars Child Development Center (Center) and to provide preliminary comments regarding the draft legislation that would provide Federal benefits to the Center's staff.

The Center began operations in 1993 and has an enrollment of 100 children (13 Library of Congress, 29 Senate, 17 House, 17 other

Federal, 24 public). The Library and the Library of Congress Child Care Association (LCCCA) have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to run the Center. The Library and the Architect of the Capitol are responsible for providing facilities and certain administrative support services to the LCCCA. The LCCCA is responsible for hiring the Center's staff and running the program. The Center has a staff of 28 with a payroll of approximately \$650,000. The LCCCA pays for current payroll taxes (FICA) and health benefits costs.

Human Resource Services (HRS) and Office of General Counsel are now working with the LCCCA to update the MOU. We are committed to working out a fair and equitable agreement in a timely manner and are ready to meet with the LCCCA as soon as arrangements can be made.

HRS believes that the proposed legislation is premature because a number of issues should be discussed prior to submitting any legislation and the MOU update needs to be finalized first. For example, the proposed legislation is based upon the Senate child care model, which operates in a different administrative environment than the Library. The Library uses a contractor to handle benefit accounting and does not have a direct accounting relationship with the Office of Personnel Management. In addition to the estimated increase in the Library's government contributions for LCCCA staff of \$130,000, the Library would need to significantly change its administrative operations to handle the legislation which may be avoided with a further evaluation of the alternatives. With more time, HRS and the LCCCA may be able to work out a better model for use at the Center. The Library believes that other changes to the Center's legal authority may be appropriate, which would be accomplished more effectively at the same time as any other proposed changes and after an analysis of the practices of other day care centers.

In summary, HRS believes that the proposed legislative change is premature and would like to first have the opportunity to work through the MOU issues and then on a joint request for legislative changes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no other amendments be in order to the bill. I further ask consent that following the vote in relation to the Mikulski amendment, the bill be advanced to third reading, a vote occur on the question of third reading, and following that vote, the bill be placed back on the calendar.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the previous agreement be modified to allow for those two back-to-back votes to begin at 10:45 on Thursday morning, with the same 10 minutes in order prior to the 10:45 a.m. vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.