

Almost exactly 28 years ago, on January 19, 1969, a group of us went to Orly airport in Paris to say goodbye to Averell Harriman, who was leaving his post as chief negotiator to the Vietnam Peace Talks on the day before Richard Nixon's inauguration. Harriman was 76 years old, and that day in Paris was to be his last as a U.S. government official. Now, at the same age and in the same city, his widow has gone out as she would have wanted to, just as she was ending a successful mission for her nation.

TRIBUTE TO CASEY MILLER

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a third subject matter I raise here in morning business today is one that did not get national attention except for those who may have been interested. But I want to pay tribute to a neighbor of mine, Mr. President, a neighbor and a friend, a woman who truly revolutionized the way we speak and write in this country. Casey Miller is her name.

Throughout her life, Casey Miller promoted and venerated the role of women in our society by fighting to eradicate gender-specific language from everyday speech.

Postal worker, artisan, police officer, and restaurant server are just some of the words that enter the glossary of modern English because of Casey Miller. While many falsely see these words as political correctness gone awry, they in fact represent a genuine effort to place America's women on the same linguistic standing as men.

Her book, "The Handbook of Nonsexist Writing" is still considered the standard reference guide on how to correctly utilize language in order to properly address and speak of women. Too often in everyday discussions we use the words "man," "men," and "he," as if they were interchangeable for all people. But these words only describe the role of the male gender and they demean to many women the significant position of women in our society.

As the English novelist Thomas Hardy once said, "It is difficult for a woman to define her feelings in language which is chiefly made by men to express theirs." The fact is that "the man on the street" may be the woman with a strong opinion. Things that are "man-made" are often built by women. The "man of the house" is by no means always a man. And the "land where our fathers died" is the same land of our mothers.

Through Casey Miller's writings, more and more Americans became aware of the implicit discrimination in our language and the distinct individuality of women in our society. Though she was not a household name, Mr. President, for most Americans, her impact on the way we write and speak has been profound. For all of her efforts she deserves the appreciation of women and men across this country of ours.

Besides her groundbreaking work on behalf of women, Casey Miller was an active and vital participant in humanitarian and philanthropic causes.

Through Childreach, the U.S. branch of Planned Parenthood International, Ms. Miller served as a foster parent for dozens of children in poor and disadvantaged countries. What is more, she shared her good fortune with others, generously donated to her alma mater Smith College, the NAACP, and the Humane Society.

On a personal level I rise here, Mr. President, to talk about Casey Miller who passed away a number of days ago not just because she was a pioneer in the feminist movement, served our country in uniform in previous conflicts, but she was a dear friend, and she happens to have been my next door neighbor in Connecticut. More than just being an activist and someone who made a significant contribution through a particular avenue that she sought, she was a wonderful, wonderful, friend. I cannot tell you the countless breakfasts, lunches, and dinners, so lively across the lawn. I could spend an evening with Casey Miller and Kate Swift, her lifetime friend and partner.

For millions of us across the country, Casey Miller has had an impact—you may not know her name—for the way we speak today, for the changes that have occurred. Even in our own legislative body Casey Miller made a significant contribution.

Mr. President, I just wanted to rise this morning and pay tribute to my neighbor. I will miss her very, very much. She was a wonderful friend, a great person, an individual who proved, once again, that one person can truly make a difference in our society.

I ask unanimous consent that two editorials about Casey Miller be printed in the RECORD.

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

CASEY MILLER, 77, A PROMOTER OF USING NONSEXIST LANGUAGE

(By Lawrence Van Gelder)

Casey Miller, a writer and editor who was a pioneering advocate of nonsexist language, died on Sunday at her home in East Haddam, Conn. She was 77.

Kate Swift, her close friend and co-author, said the cause of death was chronic obstructive lung disease.

Beginning in the early 1970's, Ms. Miller and Ms. Swift co-wrote numerous books and articles on English usage and its relationship to the status of women. Writing in a climate of increasing sensitivity and opposition to language that relegated women to secondary status, Ms. Miller and Ms. Swift waged a forceful campaign against what many considered sexist language. If not all their proposals (like "genkind" to replace mankind) found their way into everyday usage, the women nonetheless helped to raise awareness of oppression by language.

Ms. Miller and Ms. Swift were the authors of "Words and Women," published in 1976 by Doubleday and 1991 by HarperCollins, and "The Handbook of Nonsexist Writing," published in 1980 by Lippincott & Crowell and in 1988 by HarperCollins. They also wrote many articles on sexism in English that appeared in national periodicals and in more than 30 anthologies and textbooks.

They achieved widespread recognition as authorities on the subject of linguistic dis-

paragement of women with "One Small Step for Genkind," a 1972 article in The New York Times Magazine that was reprinted in college textbooks as recently as last year.

In it, they wrote: "Except for words that refer to females by definition (mother, actress, Congresswoman), and words for occupations traditionally held by females (nurse, secretary, prostitute), the English language defines everyone as male. The hypothetical person ("If a man can walk 10 miles in two hours . . .), the average person ("the man in the street") and the active person ("the man on the move") are male. The assumption is that unless otherwise identified, people in general—including doctors and beggars—are men.

"It is a semantic mechanism that operates to keep women invisible; 'man' and 'mankind' represent everyone; 'he' in generalized use refers to either sex; the "land where our fathers died" is also the land of our mothers—although they go unsung. As the beetle-browed and mustachioed man in a Steig cartoon says to his two male drinking companions, "When I speak of mankind, one thing I don't mean is womankind."

Ms. Swift said yesterday that the idea for the article grew out of their first collaboration as editors in 1970, on a sex education handbook for high schools that talked about the nature of man and man's behavior and used the pronoun "he" in ways that made it impossible to know whether the author was writing about both males and females or only about males.

"We began to think this was a field that needed to be written about and explored," Ms. Swift said.

Their articles on the subject first appeared in New York magazine and in the first issue of Ms. magazine. The New York Times Magazine article appeared on April 16, 1972, and "got an awful lot of negative comment," Ms. Swift said.

Casey Geddes Miller was born on Feb. 26, 1919, in Toledo, Ohio. She received a bachelor of arts degree in 1940 from Smith College, where she was a philosophy major. During World War II, she served for three years in the Navy, working in Washington in naval intelligence.

She was on the staff of Colonial Williamsburg from 1947 to 1954, when she became the curriculum editor of the publishing house of the Episcopal Church, Seabury Press. Ten years later, she became a free-lance editor, working at her home in Greenwich and after 1967 in East Haddam, where she formed her editorial partnership with Ms. Swift.

She is survived by her sisters, Kate R. Gregg of Falmouth, Me., and Caroline S. Cooper of Gilmanton, N.H.

TAKING ON "MANKIND"

Gender-neutral phrases like postal carrier and police officer roll off our tongues nowadays as if they had always been a part of our linguistic consciousness. But we know that's not true. Until a few years ago, the English language was loaded with male-biased terms.

A turning point came in 1980, with the "Handbook of Nonsexist Writing," today considered the standard reference on how to avoid degrading women with words. Its co-authors were Casey Miller and Kate Swift of East Haddam.

Ms. Miller died Sunday at the age of 77.

In dozens of magazine articles and two books, Ms. Miller and Ms. Swift made a strong case for banishing gender-biased words from our everyday language.

Many of their proposals—such as eliminating suffixes -ess and -ette and replacing loaded words like "craftsman" with the neutral "artisan"—have been widely adopted.

The two authors drew attention to other sexist expressions, from founding fathers to working wife to old wives' tale, arguing that prejudices in language reflect the mostly white, Anglo-Saxon patriarchal society in which our grammar and vocabulary developed. Such terms are destructive, Ms. Miller and Ms. Swift wrote, because they perpetuate stereotypes demeaning to women.

Theirs were persuasive arguments.

A graduate of Smith College, Ms. Miller's lifelong passions were words and language. As a lieutenant during World War II, she helped to break codes used by Japanese in the Pacific. Later she worked in publishing before moving to East Haddam in 1967 to begin her career as a freelance editor and writer.

Although hers was not a household name, Ms. Miller has left a more lasting legacy than others who have achieved celebrity status: Changing the way Americans write and speak.

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleagues for allowing me to digress. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Senate continued with consideration of the resolution.

Mr. ASHCROFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I thank my colleague from the State of Connecticut. Mr. President, I am pleased to have an opportunity to make some remarks about the balanced budget amendment. It is my understanding the minority leader may come to the floor to speak, and if he does I am happy to interrupt my remarks to provide him an opportunity to make whatever remarks he plans to make.

Mr. President, when we discuss the balanced budget amendment, we are usually talking about the impact of runaway spending on our economy or on our future. These are fundamental considerations, but I think there is another consideration that we must not lose sight of, and that is, perhaps, more fundamental and more profound than the economic implications of the balanced budget. A protracted deficit spending empowers the central Government with the means to undermine our basic liberties. What I really mean to say is that unlimited spending by Government promotes unlimited Government, and unlimited Government means limited freedom. There is a relationship between the size of Government and the number of its prerogatives and the size of individuals and the number of their prerogatives.

For how we tax and spend, really, in fact, determines whether we are prosperous or poor, free or enslaved, good or evil. I believe if we want to be free, we have always to be careful about the size of Government.

Now, the acknowledgment that we can control Government by controlling its power of the purse is not new. From the very beginnings of this Republic there has been a clear understanding

that if you could control the purse, if you could limit spending, you could limit the encroachment of Government upon the freedom of individuals. Money is and money has always been the source of Government's most basic power. History bears testament to this truth.

The Magna Carta, which was signed grudgingly by King John a few centuries ago—I might add, no relation, King John, but the name is still in current use—prescribed that the monarchy could not impose taxes, and King John grudgingly signed this, the monarchy could not impose taxes without the consent of the Great Council. Charles I was executed because he tried to spend money without the consent of the Commons. And our own Declaration of Independence talks of injuries and usurpations, not the least of which was George III's imposition of taxes without representation, taxes without the consent or participation in the decisionmaking by colonial residents.

Mr. President, deficit spending has wrested power from the people. It has taken power from the next generation and brought it to this generation, the power to decide how the resources of our own children will be spent. It has deposited this power in the Halls of Congress.

We are not only taking the freedom of this generation when we spend in deficit, we are taking the freedom of the next generation, so that we have a compound problem here. The extent and reach of Government encroaches upon the capacity of individuals to live freely, not only in the present time but because we are funding this overreaching of Government with deficit spending, it encroaches upon the freedom of the next generation.

This is an inversion of the will of the Framers of the Constitution. It is an invasion of the social contract in which our forefathers developed this country. It takes the power from the people and puts it in the hands of the Congress. And really what Congress' enterprise ought to be is empowering people. It is time to return to the people the ability to control their own lives, their future and their destiny and to begin to assure the next generation that we will not have exercised their prerogatives, we will not have made their choices about how to spend their resources, but that we will, indeed, protect some of that prerogative which they rightfully have which they ought to enjoy. Another way of saying this is that it is simply immoral to tax unborn generations of Americans in anticipation of their existence in order to satisfy our undisciplined consumption that is a result of deficit spending.

Mr. President, Congress today does not have to vote to raise more revenue in order to spend more money. We have gone through a transition from tax and spend, which is an arguable proposition, to borrow and spend, which is certainly a very questionable proposition. We now are in a category of

steal and spend, because borrowing without the intention or capacity to pay back by those who are doing the borrowing is something that is categorized in the law as something far different from borrowing. People who go to borrow without the intention to pay back are stealing. Most State statutes call it stealing by deceit. When we in this generation borrow without the intention or capacity to repay those moneys which we have borrowed, we, in fact, are stealing from the next generation. We cannot have their consent to take their resources because they do not exist yet. We are taking resources from our children and grandchildren at a time before they are even born. We are borrowing without the intention to pay back. We have gone from tax and spend to borrow and spend, and I dare say, now we find ourselves in the moral reprobate position of stealing from the next generation to spend.

I spent some time as attorney general of my State. I had the privilege of serving the people of Missouri for 8 years as attorney general. It is the attorney general's responsibility to uphold the convictions of individuals who have violated the law. Among those are people who abuse children. I think child abuse is reprehensible. It is beyond my comprehension how someone would abuse a child, let alone his or her own child.

But most of the people who abuse children would not think of stealing from children, or stealing from their own children. I find it to be abhorrent and immoral, and it is very unwise that we would take from our own children the capacity that they ought to have to be free, and that we would somehow wrest from them the decisionmaking capacity of free citizens in the next generation to decide how to deploy the resources that they generate. We would have already made the decisions, we would already have consumed the benefits, and we would send to them nothing more nor less than the bill—the debt to be paid.

We owe our children so much more than that. Tax and spend was bad; borrow and spend was worse. When we got to a situation where we could not repay that which we had borrowed, it became stealing by deceit, and steal and spend is morally reprehensible and must be curtailed, it must be stopped.

The ability to take resources of the next generation is unique to the Congress. No father can create debts which are visited upon his or her son or daughter. No mother can create a debt that can be visited upon her son or daughter. The law simply does not allow the debts of a parent to be imposed upon a child. Only in one universe can this happen, and it can only happen when the people of this country, through their Congress, create a debt which will be visited on those who are yet unborn, will be used as a set-off to garnishee the wages that are yet unearned. It's time that we stop.