

Members of the Senate of a horrible loss. On Sunday, February 26, 1995, Matthew Eli Puccio, a young gentleman from New York City, was involved in a terrible accident that took his life.

Matthew shall be remembered fondly by his parents, teachers, and friends as a young man of exceptional character and kindness. His departure is felt by us all.

Matthew's mother, Carol L. Ziegler, recently sent to me a short paper that Matthew had written for a school journalism assignment. In this paper, he discusses term limits and his personal opposition to the issue. I believe that many of my colleagues in both Houses of Congress will find Matthew Puccio's paper of interest, and I ask that the text be printed in the RECORD.

The text follows:

Over the past few years, some politicians, primarily Republicans, have proposed term limits be set for Members of Congress. Term limit means that a Member of Congress can be elected only a certain number of times. To be exact, since 1990, 23 million people in 16 States have voted for this law to be passed. Most of these people in 16 States have voted for this law to be passed. Most of these people want term limits to increase electoral competition. They want change every now and then. If this law were actually passed, it would be a mistake. What if a Member of Congress is doing a good job? Take New York Senator, PATRICK MOYNIHAN, for example. He has just been elected to his third term and is doing a great job in office. Why should they be pulled from office at risk of being replaced by someone who would do less of a job? In this case, what is the need for change? On the other hand, if a Member of Congress is doing a bad job and wants to run again, he could always be voted out.

Setting term limits also takes away a politician's constitutional rights. Why shouldn't he or she be allowed to run for office as much as they want, with the intention of helping their country? If they are not elected, they are not elected, but they should have the chance. On the flip side, this also takes away the people's constitutional rights. Why shouldn't the people be allowed to have who they want in Congress, regardless of how long he has been in office? More specifically, term limits violate the Bill of Rights which list the freedoms of the people. Term limits may seem like an easy answer but it is just unfair. Elections are the people's choice. Anyone should be allowed to be in Congress for as long as they want, as long as they are doing a good job, and the people want to vote them in.●

#### EVERYBODY WINS

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, this month on Capitol Hill an exciting literacy program began with the help of Senators and Senate staff. The children of the Brent Elementary School are now being read to once a week during their lunch hour by volunteers in the Everybody Wins Program. Everybody Wins is a successful literacy program started in New York City, which matches up professionals with at-risk, inner-city school children as reading partners.

During each power lunch session, the reading partners select a book and read

aloud together—an activity that the Commission on Reading calls the single most important activity for building a child's eventual success in reading.

Everybody Wins, started by businessman Arthur Tannenbaum in New York City, is for the first time branching out to Washington, DC, and enlisted the help of the Senate to reach out to their neighbors on Capitol Hill. The bipartisan support in the Senate began when I joined Senator JEFFORDS' efforts to implement the program. All of the Senators on the Labor and Human Resources Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities have since become involved.

Already 7 Senators and over 100 Senate staff members are reading to children during their lunch hours. Many of the Senators who are working with the program are so impressed that they are moving to implement Everybody Wins in cities in their own States. Mr. Tannenbaum's ultimate goal is to have every child in the country read to either by a parent or relative or a volunteer.

I want to commend Mr. Arthur Tannenbaum on his hard work, his leadership in this area, and his strong commitment to improving the lives of children.●

#### THE CALENDAR

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 30, S. 464, and Calendar No. 31, S. 532, en bloc; that the bills be deemed read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, en bloc; and, that any statements relating to any of the bills be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD. This has been cleared on both sides.

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

So the bills (S. 464 and S. 532), en bloc, were deemed read for a third time, and passed, as follows:

#### FEDERAL COURT DEMONSTRATION DISTRICTS ACT

The bill (S. 464) to make the reporting deadlines for studies conducted in Federal court demonstration districts consistent with the deadlines for pilot districts, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed; as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF CIVIL JUSTICE EXPENSE AND DELAY REDUCTION DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.

Section 104 of the Civil Justice Reform Act of 1990 (28 U.S.C. 471 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1) by striking "4-year period" and inserting "5-year period"; and

(2) in subsection (d) by striking "December 31, 1995," and inserting "December 31, 1996,".

#### VENUE CLARIFICATION ACT

The bill (S. 532) to clarify the rules governing venue, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed; as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. VENUE.

Paragraph (3) of section 1391(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking "the defendants are" and inserting "any defendant is".

#### ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 31, 1995

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Friday, March 31, 1995; that, following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date; that the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and, there then be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each not to extend beyond the hour of 10 a.m..

Mr. President, at 10 a.m. the Senate will then resume consideration of supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 1158.

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

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I further ask that at 10 a.m. the D'Amato amendment be laid aside in order to consider an amendment by the Democratic leader.

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

#### PROGRAM

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will again debate the supplemental appropriations bill, and a number of amendments still remain. Therefore, votes can be expected to occur throughout Friday's session of the Senate.

Also, Senators are to be reminded that the official Senate picture of the Senate in session will be taken on Tuesday, April 4, at 2:15 p.m.

If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order, following the remarks of the Senator from Illinois, Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN.

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

The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I thank you very much. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

I would like to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Illinois very much indeed.

#### INVEST IN EDUCATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as we review all options for reducing Federal expenditures, I am very much of the mind that we should not reduce Federal education assistance. In my opinion, education is an investment in our people and in the future strength and health of our Nation. This is particularly true for programs that are targeted to enhance the educational opportunities of those citizens who need our help the most.

It is without doubt that every aspect of our lives depends upon a well-educated citizenry. I fear that cutbacks in Federal education aid diminish achieving that goal, and weaken our ability to retain our leadership in the world marketplace.

As we debate this rescission bill, however, it is also important that we keep things in perspective. While I regret some of the cutbacks that are part of the package under consideration, it is only fair that we acknowledge that the legislation before us is far better than that so recently approved by the House. In education, for example, the cutbacks are a full \$1 billion less than those in the House bill.

In many areas, there is very good news. There are, for example, no cuts in student aid, no reduction in Pell grants, no cutbacks in campus-based aid, and no curtailment of funding for the SSIG Program.

Aid for the vitally important Dropout Prevention Program is continued. Cutbacks in safe and drug-free schools are a full 80 percent less than those in the House-passed bill. There are few, if any, cutbacks in literacy programs that reach out to help those in need of these services. Cuts in library services and construction are very small. And, funds are provided for a new and very important program of aid in civics and economic education exchanges with the emerging democracies of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

Thus, while I may have differences on some of the cutbacks contained in this legislation, I find I can support a majority of the provisions with considerable enthusiasm. I believe we must look carefully at the details of this bill. While some provisions could be improved, most are quite encouraging. I want, therefore, to commend Chairman HATFIELD, the members of the Appropriations Committee, and especially their staff for the very long, hard, and thoughtful work they have put into this legislation.

#### CHANGE OF VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. AKAKA. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I wish to make this request.

On rollcall No. 124, I voted "yea". It was my intention to vote "nay". Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote. This will in no way change the outcome of the vote.

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

Mr. AKAKA. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois, Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, thank you.

#### AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about a subject that has taken a lot of time and attention, particularly in these days, which goes I think to the heart of the American dream and the future that we face as a nation. That subject, of course, is affirmative action.

Mr. President, if I could withhold for just 1 second, please.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, thank you for your patience and indulgence.

Mr. President, I rise this evening to speak about affirmative action. There has been a great deal of discussion about affirmative action lately. Unfortunately, too little of that discussion has focused on the facts. Affirmative action is about working people, about middle-class families, and about jobs.

It is about the basic right of all Americans to have access to education, to have the opportunity to get a good job, to have the opportunity to be promoted when they work hard—to do better than their parents did. It is, quite simply, about ensuring fundamental economic fairness for all our citizens.

We have come a long way in ensuring that economic opportunity exists for all Americans; yet much work remains to be done. That is why it would be extremely shortsighted at this point in time for the Senate to retreat on affirmative action. Before we act, we must consider all of the facts.

We cannot allow cynical political games to be played with an issue of this much importance. And we cannot allow ourselves to fall prey to attempts to make affirmative action a debate about race. It is not. What affirmative action is really about is fundamental fairness. It is about whether each of us will be allowed to fully participate in society, regardless of our gender or race, or will instead be held back by conditions that have nothing to do with merit, or talents and abilities. It

is a debate that lies at the core of our national economic competitiveness.

#### THE TRUTH ABOUT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Mr. President, if we consider all the facts, it is abundantly clear that affirmative action is about equal economic opportunity, not just for minorities, but for women as well. It is about providing a chance to compete for those who may still be limited by a glass ceiling or artificial barriers to participation in our economy. In addition, affirmative action is now a business imperative for our country. In spite of the rhetoric and myths surrounding this concept, the truth is that every American stands to benefit when each citizen is given a chance to contribute to the maximum extent of his or her ability.

Our work force is changed. Our country has moved in the direction of making the American dream of opportunity a dream that is open to all Americans. Affirmative action has played a major role in opening up doors and providing opportunity for the millions of people who did not have a chance to participate in the full range of economic activities this country has to offer. And our society has benefitted as a result.

In 1964, when the first Executive order on affirmative action was issued, there were approximately 74 million working Americans. By last year, that number had grown to just over 123 million. In other words, since 1964, our economy has created 50 million new jobs. Although women and minorities entered the work force in unprecedented numbers, these new jobs were not created by taking away jobs held by men. Rather, they were created by making use of the talents that a diverse work force brings to our economy, and using those talents to help create new economic growth and more, new jobs. Affirmative action is not about taking away opportunity but about creating it.

I would like to take a moment to review the experience working women have had with affirmative action. Because many employers made a commitment to fostering diversity, women made significant inroads into professions that had previously been off limits to them. In 1972, women comprised a mere 3 percent of architects. By 1993, that number had climbed to 18.6 percent. In 1972, women were 10 percent of all physicians, but by 1993, that number had grown to 22 percent. In 1972, women made only 4 percent of all lawyers, a number that grew to 23 percent by 1993. And, I might add, this is despite the fact that the Supreme Court, in *Bradwell versus Illinois*, once upheld a decision by my home State to deny an eminently qualified woman, Myra Bradwell, the right to practice law, solely on the basis of her gender.

Women have made equally significant gains in the science fields. In 1972, women comprised a dismal 0.8 percent of all engineers—less than 1 percent! But by 1993, that number had grown to 8.6 percent. In chemistry, women's