

bill to the floor for a vote in a Senate that is controlled by the Republican Party.

I think the American people see through this. I think they understand that this is not a fight over the Bill of Rights, it is a fight over the rights of Americans to be well represented.

Mr. REID. I say we need more people like the Presiding Officer. He has joined with us in many bipartisan matters. I hope the conversation we have had today does not in any way reflect upon the Senator from Oregon, who has worked with us on a number of issues. I am sure it has caused him a problem on the other side of the aisle.

The reason I mention that is everyone thinks McCain-Feingold is a bipartisan bill, and it is, in the sense that JOHN MCCAIN has stepped way forward on this to talk about the need for campaign finance reform. But the people willing to help him on the other side of the aisle, the majority of them, are few and far between.

On a number of issues we have talked about today, with rare exception, the Senator from Oregon has been willing to join in a bipartisan fashion to pass legislation. As my friend from Illinois has said, it is possible we could do this. All we have to do is what is right for the American people and get rid of these very high-pressure lobbying efforts—for example, the health insurance industry, which is preventing us from moving forward on something like a Patients' Bill of Rights.

Mr. DURBIN. At this point, I acknowledge my colleague, Senator FITZGERALD of Illinois, who also voted for the Patients' Bill of Rights. He has publicly stated he thinks it is the best approach. I think it takes extraordinary courage sometimes to break from your party on these issues.

The presiding Senator from Oregon has showed exceptional leadership and courage on the hate crimes issue. This was not an easy issue, I am sure, for him; it was not for any of us. He stood up on that issue. I will remember that for a long time. It was exceptional. We want to make sure we continue in that bipartisan spirit. I hope even in the closing days we might reach out and find some bipartisan common ground to deal with some of these important issues.

I see some of my colleagues have come to the floor, and they have been very patient in waiting for me to finish my remarks. I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary order before the Senate?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business. Senators are permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am following up on the Presidential debates of the other evening. I was thinking about what Governor Bush was saying about his Medicare plan. He was referring to Vice President GORE and saying: You are engaging in "Mediscare"—

"Mediscare." You are trying to scare the seniors.

The more I have looked at Governor Bush's Medicare proposal for prescription drugs, I have come to the conclusion that if his plan ever comes into effect, the senior citizens in this country ought to be scared. They ought to be scared about this.

Here is the difference between what Vice President GORE wants in terms of prescription drugs and what Governor Bush wants. In my right hand I have a Medicare card. Under the prescription drug policies of Vice President GORE, this is all you need to get your prescription drug. You have a Medicare card, you go to your doctor, he prescribes the drugs, you go to your local pharmacy, and you get your drugs filled. That is all you need—your Medicare card.

Under the Bush proposal, which goes out to the States, they have to pass legislation, and if you make over \$14,600 a year, you get nothing. So in order to qualify for prescription drugs under the plan advocated by Governor Bush, you would basically have to meet all of the requirements for Medicaid in terms of showing your income, assets, everything else.

I want to put together the sheaf of papers you would have to fill out if you were an elderly person and you wanted to get prescription drugs under the Bush plan. This is what you would fill out. It looks like about 40 pages of paperwork. First of all is the tax return. You have to take that in and show them how much you made. Then you have to do all the documents, including instructions, applications, certificates, estate recovery—of course, if you have some estate and you have some assets. There is an insurance questionnaire. This is the type of paperwork you would be faced with under the Bush proposal.

Under the Gore proposal: One simple Medicare card.

I sum it up by saying what the seniors of this country want is Medicare; they don't want welfare. That is exactly what Governor Bush is proposing in his Medicare prescription drug proposal.

#### JUDGESHIPS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, an issue I will be talking about every day is the issue of judgeships and the fact that we still have our judges bottled up, especially Bonnie Campbell, who has now been waiting 217 days to be reported out of the committee. Yet we just had some judges approved this week who were nominated in July, had their hearing in July. They were approved. But Bonnie Campbell still sits in the Judiciary Committee.

It is not right, it is not fair to her, it is not fair for our judicial system. Bonnie Campbell has all of the qualifications to be a judge on the Eighth Circuit. A former attorney general of Iowa, she did an outstanding job there.

Since 1995, she has been the first and only director of the Office of Violence Against Women in the Department of Justice which was created by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. Again, she has done an outstanding job.

There has been some good news. During that period of time, domestic violence against women, in fact, has decreased. But the facts are we have a long way to go. In 1998, American women were the victims of 876,340 acts of domestic violence. Domestic violence accounted for 22 percent of violent crimes against women. During those same years, children under 12 lived in 43 percent of the households where domestic violence occurred.

We have to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. Last week, the House passed by 415-3 the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. Again, I doubt they would have passed it so overwhelmingly if its only person charged with enforcing that law had done a bad job in running the office. I did not hear one comment on the House floor, nor have I heard one here, that in any way indicates that Bonnie Campbell did not do an outstanding job as head of that office. She did do an outstanding job and everyone knows she did. So now we're hearing that the Violence Against Women Act will be attached to something else and pass the Senate that way.

Yet perhaps the one person in this country who understands this issue and this law better than anyone else is Bonnie J. Campbell, who has directed that office for the last 5 years. We need people on the courts and on the bench who understand that law and can apply it fairly across our Nation. That is why we need Bonnie Campbell on the Eighth Circuit.

Right now we have quite a lack of women serving on our circuit courts. Frankly, the number of women on our circuit courts is appalling. We need more women on our circuit courts. And we need to confirm them here. Of the 148 circuit judges, only 33 are women—22 percent. That, in itself, is scandalous.

Bonnie Campbell should be added to that list.

Again, it doesn't seem right that Bonnie Campbell would get a hearing back in May and then remain bottled up in Committee. Lets go back to the presidential term of George Bush. During that time, every single district and circuit nominee who got a hearing—got a vote in Committee. And all but one got a vote on the Senate floor.

Yet we are not allowed to vote on Bonnie Campbell's nomination on the floor. So as I said, it is not fair to her. It is not fair to the judicial system. It is not fair to the advise and consent clause of the Constitution to hold her up.

Mr. President, I will again, today, as I will do every day, ask unanimous consent to discharge the Judiciary Committee of further consideration of this nomination.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Judiciary Committee from further consideration of the nomination of Bonnie Campbell, the nominee for the Eighth Circuit Court, that her nomination be considered by the Senate immediately following the conclusion of action on the pending matter, that the debate on the nomination be limited to 2 hours equally divided and a vote on her nomination occur immediately following the use or yielding back of that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). Is there objection?

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, again, every day I will come out and ask unanimous consent to get Bonnie Campbell's name out of the committee and on the floor for a vote. Yet the objections come from the Republican side of the aisle. Why, I don't know. As I said, no one has said she's not qualified. If someone wants to vote against her to be on the Eighth Circuit, that is that Senator's right—obligation, if it is a vote he or she feels in conscience that he or she must cast. But, again, I say, give her a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask unanimous consent to wrap it up in about 2 minutes.

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

Mr. HARKIN. So it only seems fair and right we bring her out here and have a vote. If people want to vote one way or the other, that is fine. But it is not fair, 217 days.

I will end my comments again by saying the standard bearer of the Republican Party, Governor Bush of Texas, has stated there ought to be a 60-day deadline on judge nominations, in other words 60 days from the day nominated to the time they get a vote in the Senate. I endorse that. Bonnie Campbell has been sitting there 217 days. Let's bring her out for a vote.

I will yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

#### ECONOMICS

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, as my colleagues know, I will be leaving the Senate at the end of my term. I want to put a few thoughts on the record over the next few days, depending on the time available.

I have four grandchildren—three grandsons and one granddaughter—Ronnie Elam, Brett Elam, Blake Caldwell, and Addison McGillicuddy. The comments I am going to make today really are from the perspective of thinking about them and their future and the desire to see that they will grow up in a country and in a world where their opportunities will be equal to, if not better than, those of their parents, their grandparents, and their great-grandparents. I want them

to have a better understanding when they reach that point when they have their own families.

As people look back on the last several decades of the 20th century, I want, at least from my perspective, to be able to put on the record what I believe happened from both an economic and foreign policy perspective, and from a national security perspective. So that is what my comments will reflect today, my thoughts with respect to economics primarily and some that will reflect my feelings with respect to national defense.

So I would like to talk about economics, a topic that has been one of my passions as a Member of the Congress. Economic policy was the very reason I ran for the House of Representatives back in 1982. As many of us may recall, our country remained in a deep recession at the time, still struggling to recover from the economic policies of the 1970s. Although it was still being phased in, President Reagan's economic program was under attack by our friends across the aisle. But, to me, the Reagan economic program was a bold reaffirmation of the very purpose of America.

Many people have noted the happy coincidence that the year 1776 saw the publication of two of the most important documents in world history, Adam Smith's "Wealth Of Nations" and Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence. These works share the theme of freedom. Smith made the case for free trade and unfettered markets, as Jefferson put in words the concept that government exists to protect individual liberty.

These documents rebutted, refined, and transcended the prevailing views of 1776 Great Britain. For over a century, these principles held firm and the United States stood tall as a beacon of hope and opportunity for people from all points on the globe.

Ours was a society without a rigid class structure, a society that promised equal opportunity for all based on individual enterprise and hard work, not government privileges and connections. America had no large bureaucracies intruding upon every sphere of commercial life. We relied on the willingness of individuals to shoulder the risk and responsibility that is part and parcel of private enterprise.

But this distinctly American way was challenged by two worldwide crises in the 20th century. First came the Great Depression. Although gross government mismanagement of the money supply and counterproductive trade policies were the cause of this crisis, government was put forward as the cure. This led to the proliferation of alphabet agencies seeking to steer every aspect of the American economy, as government assumed a new income redistribution role.

The second crisis was the rise of totalitarianism on the European Continent. The United States won World War II, but in the process of saving Eu-

rope from one brand of tyranny, an equally evil force came to occupy half of Europe, and the war effort was used as the justification for price controls and economic intervention that was unprecedented in the United States.

The welfare state in America grew by leaps and bounds. Once it was conceded that the Government is the guarantor of income, each successive call for new and bigger programs became harder and harder to resist. At the same time, the consolidation of the Soviet bloc presented the largest threat to freedom in human history, presenting new and costly challenges for America as the beacon of freedom. Exaggerations of Soviet economic success fueled the call for greater Government involvement in the U.S. economy. Over time, high tax rates and regulatory excesses accumulated like barnacles to slow the once mighty ship of American private enterprise.

It is hard for younger Americans to imagine how bleak our Nation's prospects appeared before Reagan assumed the Presidency. Recurrent, simultaneous bouts of high unemployment and high inflation confounded most economists, who viewed the two as a trade-off. It was thought that to reduce unemployment you had to accept inflation and to reduce inflation you had to accept higher unemployment. Producers and consumers suffered from an energy crisis. And real household incomes were shrinking as fast as "bracket creep" was raising everyone's tax bill year after year. The response of the incumbent administration was hardly inspiring—ranging from suggesting "voluntary" wage and price controls to preaching that we must learn to live within limits. In short, the American establishment was telling the American people to accept the notion that they no longer controlled their own economic destinies.

Starting in the 1970s, the media aggressively advanced the notion popular in intellectual circles that America's free enterprise system was failing. This view persisted through the 1980s. The best-seller lists were crowded with books telling of the decline of America and predicting that Japan would be the economic juggernaut of the 21st century. Even in the 1992 campaign, Bill Clinton and AL GORE were extolling the virtues of the European economic systems, of social democracy and industrial planning. We hear echoes of this approach today, with candidate AL GORE's Government-knows-best mentality. GORE proposes to micromanage and fine-tune the economy, social engineering through tax credits designed to make people behave the way the Washington bureaucrats want them to—such as buying "fuel-efficient" eighteen-wheeler trucks.

Ronald Reagan's "Program for Economic Recovery" was the opposite of the Government planning approach advocated by the critics of capitalism. Reagan rejected the idea that policymakers could fine-tune the economy,