

supposed to be doing, I always ask: 'Have you told these people? Have you explained to them what you expect?' Very often I find they haven't gotten the guidance and direction they should have gotten.

"People constitute our most important resource," Cooke concludes, "and so often, we treat them like dirt."

Cooke practices what he preaches, say three senior executives who have worked at the heart of his 11-member Pentagon management team.

Doc "is very good at getting along with people, no matter who they are," says Arthur H. Ehlers, who recently retired from his post as director of organizational and management planning in Cooke's office after 25 years.

Cooke has always maintained good relationships with members of Congress and with leaders in the executive branch, says Walter Freeman, another longtime top aide who is director of real estate and facilities for DoD, "and it's not because he treats them differently from anyone else."

Leon Kniaz, another key assistant who recently retired after a decade as director of personnel and security, elaborates. Cooke, he says, "has always had an open-door policy and listens well to people. There isn't anybody who walks into that office and talks with Doc who doesn't think that he or she has become a personal friend . . . [Cooke] is people-oriented, and I think that comes through."

Yet Cooke is no pushover. "He doesn't just tell people what they want to hear," says Kniaz. "He knows how to say no, and I've heard him do so in meetings where participants were expecting him to say yes."

And when Cooke is fighting for a cause in which he believes, he fights hard, his associates agree. Perhaps nowhere in his career is this more evident than in the stubborn campaign he waged to launch the current renovation of the Pentagon.

#### A BUREAUCRATIC COUP

Cracks in the walls, corroded pipes and frequently overloaded electrical circuits attest to 50 years of neglect in the upkeep of the Pentagon by the General Services Administration, the agency charged with maintaining and leasing most federal buildings. (See "Operation Renovate," February.)

"For years," says Freeman, who joined Cooke as a tenant of the Pentagon in 1983, "Doc tried to get GSA to renovate. But it was a very expensive job, and DoD was paying big rent to GSA and was sort of cash cow. So GSA was reluctant." Although the "rent" DoD paid GSA to look after the Pentagon injected hundreds of millions of dollars into the Federal Buildings Fund each year, GSA would not finance the sweeping renovations needed. Cooke saw that the only way out of the dispute was to stage a coup.

"Doc went to Congress and asked that the ownership of the Pentagon be transferred to DoD," recalls Freeman, "so we would be, in effect, our own landlord and could do the job ourselves. He set up what became known as a 'Horror Board,' and took it with him every time he would go up on the Hill to testify."

The Horror Board was a flat panel to which Doc affixed examples of Pentagon decay. "There would be pieces of rusting pipe, damaged wiring, pieces of asbestos and all sorts of things that showed the building was falling apart," Freeman says. "New exhibits would appear periodically, and Doc would point to these things and say: 'Just look at this. See how bad conditions are.' Finally Congress agreed, and one Member said, 'All right, Doc, but you aren't bringing that thing up here again, are you?'"

Now, Freeman points out, the Pentagon Reservation is owned by the Office of the

Secretary of Defense, and an orderly, 12-year renovation project is under way. "I can't think of anyone else who could have, or would have, done this," Freeman says. "There's even a special Pentagon Renovation Revolving Fund established to pay for the project." Estimates put the cost of the Pentagon overhaul at \$1.2 billion.

#### AFTER HOURS

Somewhere in between saving the Pentagon's buildings and planning the never-ending reorganizations of Defense management structures, Cooke has found time to be an active member of good-government groups and a leader of community service projects.

He also has played prominent roles in government-wide initiatives. He was, for example, a leader in the President's Council on Management Improvement (PCMI) while that group was active, and he currently chairs the Combined Federal Campaign's Washington-area coordinating committee. For years he's been a supporter of the Public Employee Roundtable—contributing a key staffer through an Intergovernmental Personnel Act assignment—and he often reflects with pride on the Roundtable's success in spreading the annual celebration of Public Service Recognition Week to dozens of communities. Today, if asked, he'll acknowledge with a chuckle the little-known fact that his office provides a good share of the funding for Vice President Gore's National Performance Review.

Cooke has been a leader in two professional groups in the field of public administration—the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) and the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA).

Sometimes, with Cooke's encouragement, these groups combine in support of a single project. This was the case with a 1992 initiative to reach out to students at Anacostia High School in one of Washington's poorest areas. The idea was to set up a Public Service Academy, with the goals of sparking students' interest in public service careers—and in their academic work. NAPA the National Capital Area Chapter of ASPA and the PCMI were among those who offered early support. "I'm very pleased with that venture," Cooke says, beaming. "There's nothing else like it in the area."

Federal agencies lend three managers to the Academy each year to work with the faculty in establishing curriculum, arranging visits to and internships at government offices, coordinating special events and offering counseling to students and their families.

While Anacostia High has a graduation rate of only 55 percent, 90 percent of the Academy's students graduate. Of the 28 seniors who matriculated from the Academy this June, 25 were accepted by colleges, and 3 found jobs. "I think that's pretty good, by just about any standards," says Cooke.

Cooke also works to secure further education for government workers. Anita Alpern, a distinguished adjunct professor at American University's School of Public Affairs, notes that Cooke has been a strong supporter of the Federal Executive Institute and of American University's Key Executive Program, a master's program in public administration for government employees. "And," she says, "he does all this as a firm believer that education should not stop after you've got a job, it should continue so you can do that job better."

Cooke explains the volume of his extra-curricular commitments: "I don't think you can do the best job if you just put in your 40 hours and go home. I know that I can do better here in my office because of the extra time I spend networking and learning from others outside my office."

#### THEY CAN KEEP THE GOLD WATCH

For now, Cooke has no plans to retire, which is good news for his friends at the Pentagon. "I don't know anyone who would not shudder at the thought of Doc retiring," says Freeman. "And why should he? He's doing what's fun for him and good for the country. Why should he turn to something that's not so interesting?"

Federal management is still Cooke's passion. "There are not many higher callings," he says. He's passed this belief onto his three children, all of whom have federal careers.

Cooke's response to public cynicism about government is to say that, "on balance, our [governing] system has worked well. There have been enormous innovations, especially at state and local levels. We do face serious problems in our society today, but many of them have little to do with government per se."

Cooke maintains an external optimism. Citing, as he often does, classic philosophical literature, Cooke borrows from Voltaire as he says: "This is the best of all possible worlds because it is the only possible world. We just have to keep working on it."

#### THE LEADERSHIP AWARD

The NCAC/Government Executive Leadership award was established five years ago to recognize distinguished careers in the federal service. The award is cosponsored by the National Capital Area Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration. The roster of winners:

1995—David O. Cooke, director of administration and management and director of Washington Headquarters Services, Department of Defense

1994—June Gibbs Brown, inspector general, Department of Health and Human Services

1993—Thomas S. McFee, assistant secretary for personnel administration, Department of Health and Human Services

1992—Paul T. Weiss, deputy assistant secretary for administration, Department of Transportation

1991—Robert L. Bombaugh, director, Office of Immigration Litigation, Department of Justice

#### THE MINIMUM WAGE BILL

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, yesterday, I voted for legislation to increase the minimum wage from \$4.25 to \$5.15 per hour over the next 2 years. Though this is a necessary increase, regretfully, Senators did not have a chance to vote for an ideal package.

First, it is essential that employers be given adequate time to prepare to implement the proposed increase. For this reason, I voted for the Bond amendment, though I felt delaying the increase to January 1, 1997, was too long. In my view, a reasonable effective date for the increase would have been September 1, 1996.

As passed by the Senate, H.R. 3448 would be effective retroactively to July 1, 1996, leaving employers with no adjustment period. This is unfortunate, in my view.

Second, I also believe a training wage is crucial for those entering the work force, particularly given our efforts to reform the welfare system. While many of my colleagues contend that increasing the minimum wage will encourage welfare recipients to obtain gainful employment, I am afraid the increase

will actually reduce the availability of new positions.

Congress has spent the better part of 2 years developing and refining welfare reform legislation. All of the major bills include tough work participation programs. And most would require the States to have 50 percent of their welfare recipients off of the rolls in the next 6 years. Even if another 15 to 20 percent are granted hardship exceptions, the States will still be hard pressed to find enough jobs to meet the strict work requirements imposed by this legislation.

In my State of Rhode Island, approximately 20,000 families are now on public assistance. If 20 percent of these families are exempt from the work requirement, that leaves 16,000 families who must find their way off of welfare in the next 6 years. Even if Rhode Island must find jobs for only half of these families, we are talking about 8,000 entry-level jobs. Given the stagnant economy within my State, that could prove a very difficult requirement to meet.

Despite the fact that these new workers will undergo intensive job training and must also learn important life skills, such as being punctual for work, most former welfare recipients will qualify for no more than entry-level positions. While there may be a few exceptions, most will have to prove themselves before they will be given greater opportunities in the workplace.

To retain some incentive for employers to hire and train welfare recipients, I believe a strong and effective training wage at the current minimum of \$4.25 per hour should be included in H.R. 3448.

Despite my concern that the Bond amendment contained a 6-month training wage, which in my view is too long, I voted for it. In contrast, the Kennedy alternative would have provided only a 30-day training wage, limited to those under 20 years of age. This provision would not have given employers the needed incentive to take a chance on hiring a welfare recipient.

As passed by the Senate, the training wage included in H.R. 3448 has a duration of 3 months, but unfortunately is limited to those under 20 years old. I would have preferred no age limitation on the provision to ensure its full utility in moving people from welfare to work.

Third, in my view, small businesses should have some form of exemption from the minimum wage increases proposed in H.R. 3448. Very few employers who own small businesses qualify for the current exemption, which is flawed and unworkable.

For this reason, I voted for the Bond amendment. This amendment would have enabled employers with gross incomes of less than \$500,000 to continue paying the current minimum wage of \$4.25 per hour, while larger businesses would have been required to comply with the increase.

Regrettably, as approved by the Senate, the final version of H.R. 3448 con-

tained no change in current law with respect to the treatment of small businesses. And hurting America's small businesses, Mr. President, places big hurdles on the road to economic recovery.

In summary, I am hopeful that some of these problems can be reviewed and corrected before H.R. 3448 becomes law.

#### RIGHT TO WORK FOR LESS

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today the Senate will take up the Right to Work Act. This legislation hurts union members by giving nonmembers a free ride to get union-negotiated benefits without contributing their fair share—or any money at all—to defray the costs. By repealing parts of the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act which give each State the right to determine whether union security agreements should be permissible in that State, this bill would make such agreements unlawful in all States. Mr. President, this is bad public policy.

Currently, the National Labor Relations Act allows States to prohibit union security clauses but does not preempt State law if a State chooses to allow such agreements. That permits employers and unions to agree, if they wish, that employees will be required to give financial support to the union. My State of Massachusetts has chosen to permit such agreements, and workers are the beneficiaries. What the workers in my State of Massachusetts get from this is higher wages, greater benefits which protect them and their families, and a higher standard of living.

This bill unfairly tilts the playing field in favor of employers and against labor unions. Under Federal law, the union is responsible for representing employees in the bargaining unit even if they pay nothing toward the union's expenses. Under right-to-work legislation, these employees get union-negotiated higher wages and benefits as well as union representation during grievance proceedings without contributing a dime. Giving nonmembers a free ride to get union-negotiated benefits without contributing to defray the costs is unfair, and in the long run will weaken the ability of unions to obtain favorable wages and benefits for all workers in a unionized company.

Republicans are insisting on preempting State law despite the fact that only 21 States have seen fit to enact right-to-work laws since they were deemed lawful, 18 of these prior to 1959. And just last year legislatures in six States, Colorado, Maryland, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, and Oklahoma, defeated statewide right-to-work bills. It is noteworthy that three of these are Republican-controlled legislatures.

Mr. President, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to force their sense of judgment and propriety on my State of Massachusetts and take away a free choice that my State ought

to have and has always had. Simply speaking, if a State does not want right-to-work laws then these laws should not be imposed on it because some people here in the Senate more greatly value their own judgment on this issue than they do the judgment of the people of Massachusetts. I might point out that most of the Senators voting to do this voted against raising the minimum wage yesterday. This goes too far, Mr. President.

The Republicans' decision to couple the right-to-work bill—which has never been subject to hearings or markup—with the TEAM Act underscores their true disinterest in helping working Americans. And as they decry the role of big government in the lives of working Americans, the Republicans go ahead and tell the people of Massachusetts that they know better, that they know what the people of Lowell or Lawrence or Springfield or Boston or Hyannis want.

Right-to-work laws have not brought economic bonanzas to States that have adopted them. Not 1 of the 21 right-to-work States has a pay level above the national average and not 1 ranks in the top 15 States for annual workers' pay. This bill ought to be called the right-to-work-for-less bill.

Union security clauses are negotiated by a democratically elected union and the employer. Coming on the heels of Independence Day, opposing this bill is the right thing to do for the American worker, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 11:30 a.m. having arrived, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 1745, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1745) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Senate has completed many long hours of debate on S. 1745, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997.

I would like to thank the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, my good