HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, January 24, 1992*

The House met at 11 a.m.

Rev. W. Douglas Tanner, Jr., executive director, Faith and Politics Institute, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, we open this day in the life of this Congress mindful that this is the beginning of a new season, a season in which the direction of our Nation will once again be debated and substantially determined.

We are conscious that the adversarial nature of political campaigns encourages divisiveness at the cost of unity, that the timing of an election encourages the pursuit of short-term advantage at long-term expense, that those decisions most critical to justice and mercy easily become contaminated by fear and self-service.

In this same season, our role in directing the course of this Nation requires the best that is within us.

Lead us, we pray, in this election year, to know the difference between wise policy and foolish politics, and guide our choice between the two with courage and grace. Amen.

POSTPONEMENT OF APPROVAL OF JOURNAL UNTIL TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 1992

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, January 22, 1992, the approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings will be postponed until Tuesday, January 28, 1992.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MONTGOMERY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3489. An act to reauthorize the Export Administration Act of 1979, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 3489) "An act to reauthorize the Export Administration Act of 1979, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GARN, and Mr. MACK, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 102-138, the Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, appoints Dr. Merle Goldman, of Massachusetts, and Mr. Gene Mater, of Virginia as members of the Commission on Broadcasting to the People's Republic of China.

JAPAN CONTINUES TO FOSTER ILLEGAL TRADE PRACTICES

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, when an American buys a $15,000 car made in the United States, our Government receives more than $6,000 in tax revenue and more than $24,000 in an economic multiplier ripple effect. On the other hand, when an American buys a Japanese import for $15,000 our Government receives less than $400 in tax revenue and no multiplier effect. It is simple mathematics. When an American buys a Japanese import our economy loses over $29,000.

What bothers me, Mr. Speaker, and maybe someone should have a discussion with the Vice President, for some reason he keeps defending the illegal trade practices of Japan. I think it is time for the Speaker to ask the Vice President, maybe he should ask Nintendo why Americans cannot buy a baseball team in Japan. Maybe the Vice President should ask Japanese officials, especially those of the Sumotomo Corp., why American companies do not get contracts in Japan.

The truth of the matter is Japan is still fostering illegal trade. Our country is going bankrupt. Everybody is apologizing. So is Japan. They are bashing America on one hand and apologizing on the other with promises, promises, promises.

Maybe the administration and the White House will figure this out when U-Haul of Tokyo backs up to the White House next year and starts taking their furniture out.

RESOLUTION URGING DEDICATION OF PENTAGON FUNDS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP ACCOMPANYING BASE CLOSURES

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, next week I intend to introduce a sense-of-the-Congress resolution that will urge the President and commend him at the same time for proposing, and we should be supporting, the proposition that Pentagon funds, perhaps 1 billion dollars' worth, should be dedicated to the cleanup of the environment that accompanies the base closures which we all support.

In our own district, there is a serious problem in the old Olmstead Air Force Base, which is now the Harrisburg International Airport complex. A cleanup of that situation there will do two things, and this can happen at every base closure across the country. Environmentally it will bring back to a stable environment the hazardous waste and other materials that have been stored there and have been polluting the area. That is good news for the environment. Second, it will encourage and give incentive for economic development in the very same areas where base closures will be turned into private business enterprises that will create jobs and stimulate the economy.

We applaud the President for his initiative in seeking these Pentagon funds for base closures, and we urge that the Members of the Congress join in the sense-of-the-Congress resolution which we will introduce next week.

COOPERATION BETWEEN THE WHITE HOUSE AND THE CONGRESS ESSENTIAL IN SOLVING AMERICA'S PROBLEMS

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday night just a few feet from where I am standing, the President of the United States will address a joint session of Congress, the country, and the world in the speech called the State of the Union Address.

A little historical note. For over 100 years, from the Presidency of Thomas Jefferson to that of Woodrow Wilson, the Presidents did not personally visit with Congress. They prepared an annual address and submitted it in writing to Congress.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

In any event, next Tuesday, the President will give a State of the Union speech. In this morning's Post it was suggested that in fact this will be not so much a State of the Union as a state of the Presidency speech. In a sense, will the President be able to identify the problems facing this Nation and also delineate the solutions to those problems.

One way or the other, solutions will take cooperation. I certainly hope the President can identify the problems. I certainly hope that he will receive cooperation from us and from the Nation in solving the problems, because the perils of not cooperating are just too great to contemplate.

So when we visit next Tuesday with the President, we will be visiting in a spirit of trying to solve America's problems.

□ 1110

BEST WISHES TO PAGES ON GRADUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAUGHLIN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, today is a happy day and today is a sad day. It is a happy day because this evening our pages will graduate and visit with one another and with their families in a very happy sense and reminisce and talk about their experiences on the Hill during this semester that they have been our pages.

But, it is a sad day for those of us who have had the honor of commissioning pages and to work with them, as in the case of this gentleman from Kentucky, who has had that particular pleasure and honor, because they are leaving to return to their homes.

I just would mention to those who might be observing the proceedings today who may not be familiar with the page program, it is a program which is steeped in history, and yet it is as modern as tomorrow.

It is steeped in history because it began many years ago when it became quite clear that this body, this assembly, needs assistance in very special ways and in ways that only young people can fulfill.

But, it is also as modern as tomorrow in the sense that these young people, who have been with us as our friends and assistants for these many months, will go out into the world, of course first completing their schooling, but go out into the world and accomplish for the world what needs to be accomplished, which is to solve many of the problems of health care, of economic matters, of hunger, to really try to make the lot of the world better and the lot of the people in this world better.

So just as we have welcomed these young people last August and September when they came from the far-flung points of the country, we Members today in person, and certainly in absentia, take this moment to extend to them our thanks and our heartfelt appreciation for what they have done for us in making this House work.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, as does the Chair, too, just a few months ago when this Chamber, as well as the other body, worked literally all night long—all through the evening into the hours of the morning, and I think even early afternoon—before we completed the work of the first session. In attendance in various groupings through that night and the morning and the afternoon were our pages. So they have seen this place up close. They have seen the Members in very close proximity.

They take with them back home to the various towns and places in which they live our admiration for the job they did, certainly our love and affection and our very best wishes that they have success in the classrooms, and even more important than success in the classrooms—these young people are the cream of the crop and, therefore, their success in that setting is established—is success in the sense that they will use some of what they have learned on Capitol Hill in these last few months, particularly that if people do come together and put their wisdom and their talents and energies together, then collectively they do have a chance to at least nibble away at the edges of the problems of the world. We may not solve them with the silver bullet as it is said, but at least, when it is all over and at the end of the day, we have done a little something to make this place better. That is what we wish for these young people, these outstanding, fine young men and women one of whom I would name, my own page, April Patterson from Louisville, KY.

We wish for them continued good health, continued good fortune and great success in helping all of us solve the problems of the world. The departing pages are:

DEPARTING PAGES FOR FALL 1991-92

Lucy Abbott.
Roni Abdul-Hadi.
Leslie Biltekoff.
Lindsay Campbell.
Alisha Clester.
Michael Connors.
Kelly Creeden.
Michael Demetriou.
Sonal Desai.
John Dinusson.
Sean Dooley.
Kevin Eckstrom.
Heidi Eichhorn.
Julie Flahive.
Bryn Floyd.
Michael Froehlich.
Emily Goldwasser.
Margaret Hauselt.
Jonathan Hinze.
Christopher Hoff.
Stacy Hooks.
Desiree Humphreys.
Thea Iacomino.
Nathan Just.
Paul Kelley.
Michael Margolis.
Robyn McCoy.
Fritz Musser.
Mark Paige.
April Patterson.
Kelly Pfaff.
Christopher Reed.
Jade Riley.
Michael Romansky.
Meg Rothman.
Claire Shamblin.
Keysha Smith.
Rachel Sontag.
Dax Steele.
Tyson Taylor.
Matthew Thompson.
Samantha Tompkins.
Amy Turnbull.
Lambert van der Walde.
Brandon Vasquez.
Laura Ward.

GETTING AMERICA BACK ON TRACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, early next week, this House will be back in session to do business. There is nothing more urgent than putting America back on the track of gaining employment, helping our gross national product to expand and generally getting America back to work.

During the Christmas recess all of us have had the opportunity to hear from our constituents. We also have heard from people who are economists in the sense that they deal with the economy either in an academic way or in a hands-on way, such as bankers, retailers, and realtors.

I do not know about the rest of you, but I have taken advantage as fully as I can of the opportunity to be outside the beltway, to find out what it is that has happened with our economy and to try to draw some conclusions, concerning the best way to address these problems once again.

I have listened intently. I have listened to other Members of this House. I have listened to those who were involved in academia, who study economic trends, and I have listened to my constituents. I have heard there are many things that many different people believe ought to be done to address the ills, to address the problems that are involved with unemployment, to address the problems that are involved with people who are afraid that they are going to become unemployed, that they are going to lose their jobs.

I read in a newspaper back in New Jersey recently that over the last year, 1 in 5 Americans has lost a job, and hopefully regained one somewhere else, but in some cases that has not happened, either.

There are a number of different ideas about what we ought to do to address

this problem. I have listed a few, because I think they are important, too.

I heard someone say not long ago, a Member of this House, that we have got to do something about the deficit. That is absolutely true. We have a deficit situation today that is different than it has been in the past. When I was elected to this House in 1984, the deficit was much less than it is today. In 1980, we thought it was horrible that we had about a $60 to $70 billion deficit. At the end of this year, it is projected that our deficit is going to be somewhere in the neighborhood of $400 billion.

Yes, deficit reduction is important. Somebody else said that we cannot do business in our country because there is too much government regulation. I agree.

The bankers who we deal with and who we talk to on a daily basis today will tell you that they are afraid to do business because of the regulators. One banker told me not long ago that the regulators were like hawks sitting on their shoulders and the minute they do one thing wrong, the hawks are there to pounce on them.

So banking reform and regulation is certainly something we need to deal with, and regulation throughout our regulatory structure has become a burden. We need to do something about that.

Tort reform, the President mentioned as the No. 1 item in a news conference not long ago, that we need to address the subject of liability reform and tort reform, because throughout our society, whether it is in the area of medical care and medical malpractice insurance, products liability insurance, automobile insurance, you name it. One of the problems that our business has in being competitive with those that we compete with overseas is that we are subject to very, very high insurance rates, and something needs to be done about that. Tort reform is important, too.

Education and retraining, to retrain our work force as technology changes, to retrain our work force to be better able to compete in terms of international trade, again is important, and I agree with that.

Foreign trade, the President just got back from Japan. He did that I suspect to demonstrate that we need to do something to affect the balance of trade. We have talked about that for many years. It is important, too.

We just passed in this House and the President signed into law a public works bill known as the Transportation Act that hopefully in the months ahead will begin to put people back to work, and that is important, too.

Something else has been mentioned along with these things, and that is to reinstate a system in our Tax Code that is an incentive to put people back to work, that is an incentive to help business grow, and that is important, too.

□ 1120

When I look at this list of things that I have been able to kind of compile, at least for myself, I look at deficit reduction and Government regulation, banking reform, tort reform and education, and the just-passed transportation bill and any number of other things that this House has tried to deal with over the years.

So I think, for example, that coming back into session at the end of January, and solving the deficit problem by March is wishful thinking. I would like to think that we are going to do that in the first quarter of the year to help the economy, but I am a realist. If we think we are going to do it through Government regulation, which is something that is important, on which we all agree, but if we think we are going to come back in the first quarter of the year and solve the regulatory problems, I think it is just wishful thinking.

I think if we are going to really reform the banking system in the first quarter of the year or if we are going to do anything quickly about tort reform or any of these other things that we tried to deal with in the past, I just think it is wishful thinking, but I think there is hope, there is something that we can do, because it has been done in the past.

In the last few days, during the holidays, in the last part of December, I had some time that I could reflect on the things that I have seen and heard during the previous month or so. I began to look at what happened in other recessions.

How do we get into them and how did we deal with them and how did we fashion programs to help ourselves get out of them?

I went all the way back to the 1950's, with the help of my staff and with the help of some individuals and other organizations such as the Heritage Foundation and the Republican Study Committee—and I began to look at those recessions in order to determine what caused them.

I went all the way back to 1950 and looked at the economy. During the 1950's, we were just coming out of a wartime economy due to the Korean war and World War II. During those periods of time, in order to finance those wars, we had raised taxes.

During the Eisenhower administration, the Federal Government was trying to adjust from a wartime economy that had been a long-term thing relative to a peacetime economy, and that peacetime economy was different than it had been in the decade of the forties. But one necessary change that we were able to identify, in retrospect, that was not changed during the fifties, was the high level of taxes. So we began to look at, or Congress did, and in 1960, when the recession began to find its way out of the doldrums and into the early sixties, the economy was still very sluggish, America was not working, the rate of unemployment was on its way up.

Let me just read one quote from the 1960's which demonstrates the thinking of the leadership of our country, about what we ought to do about that recession.

This quote says:

> I am convinced that the enactment this year of tax reduction and tax reform overshadows all other domestic problems in this Congress, for we cannot lead for long the cause of peace and freedom if we ever cease to set the pace at home. I am not talking about giving the economy a mere shot in the arm to ease some temporary complaint. This tax cut will increase the purchasing power of American families and business enterprises all across our country. It will encourage initiative and risk-taking, on which our free system depends; induce more investment, production, capacity use; it will help provide 2 million jobs we need to create every year and reinforce American principle of additional reward for additional effort.

Reinforce the American principle of additional reward for additional efforts.

If that sounds like something that would have been said during the last decade, it may surprise some people that it wasn't. I might surprise some of you to say that was from the State of the Union Address in 1963, and it was John F. Kennedy suggesting to the Members of this House at that time that what we needed to put the economy back in shape, to create jobs, 2 million jobs a year was his goal, and to do it by adjusting the Tax Code to create incentives for people to go back to work, to have money in their pocket to spend on consumer goods.

Unfortunately, John Kennedy did not live to see the fulfillment or the enactment of his program. It was done by this Congress and by LBJ, Lyndon Baines Johnson, when he became President.

But that program did go into effect. As John Kennedy suggested, we reduced the maximum tax rate from 91 to 70 percent and the lower tax rate, or the lowest tax rate, from 20 to 14 percent, to give Americans a boost, to give them more money to spend.

But, in addition, and of no less importance—perhaps of more importance—the corporate tax rate was reduced from 52 to 48 percent.

Now that may sound like just a small amount, but 4 percent, if you were to tell or if I were to tell or if any one of my colleagues were to tell business entrepreneurs across our country that we were going to provide a way for them to get 4 percent more capital, 4 percent more money to spend on capital goods or to pay their employees or expand their businesses, it would be something that would be quite significant.

As part of the package back then, they also broadened the existing investment tax credit, something we are talking about doing again today.

And the results were quite dramatic. Let me recite to you a couple of numbers, that show what happened. In 1963 growth rate of the gross national product was 4 percent. The next year, the new tax program went into effect, and immediately the rate of the gross national product rose to 5.3 percent; the next year, in 1965, it rose to 5.9 percent; and the next year, 1966, it stayed at 5.9 percent, almost a 6-percent growth in gross national product.

Now, if you want to look at one other indicator which I have identified, you can look at growth in jobs as demonstrated by unemployment rates. In the 1950's following the Korean war, the average rate of unemployment was about 4.4 percent, but then it grew in 1963 to 5.7 percent. In 1964, the year after the tax changes went into effect, the rate of unemployment dropped to 5.2 percent, and in the next year 4.5 percent, and finally by 1966, 3.8 percent.

I think that that is a dramatic lesson that we can learn.

Let me talk about another recession for just a few minutes. Let me talk about the recession that came on in the late 1970's and took place during the early 1980's. It was not unlike John Kennedy's statement when he was trying to fashion a program to get us out of the prior recession; another gentleman who happened to be of the opposite political party said, in his election campaign in 1980, "I think I know what is wrong with the economy. I think taxes are too high."

This time it was not the result of a wartime economy and taxes in place to support, it, it was brought on by the increases in taxes that were necessary to support our Social Security System, and it was a result of something called bracket creep, increased taxes because inflation made taxes go up and took dollars out of Americans' pockets, sending the dollars here for bureaucrats to spend instead of letting Americans spend the dollars themselves.

But the fact of the matter is that once again we had slid into a recession that was symptomized by double-digit inflation, by unemployment rates that went through the roof, and by interests that topped out at 21 percent.

That was the misery index.

Ronald Reagan said much the same thing John F. Kennedy said during his campaign and in his State of the Union Address in 1963.

Finally, in 1981, Ronald Reagan said these tax reductions which he had proposed are essential to restoring, strengthening our growth in the economy by reducing the existing taxpayers' burden which discouraged work, discouraged savings, and discouraged investment.

Individuals, he said, are the ultimate source of all savings and investment. Lasting economic progress, which is our goal, depends on our success in encouraging people to involve themselves in productive behavior. As we went back into session, as the Congress at that time went back into session and that tax package started to take form, on a bipartisan basis—this House was controlled at the time by the Democrat Party and the other House was controlled by the Republican Party. As a result of that bipartisan effort in 1981 and 1982 and 1983, just as the 1963 package went into place, individual taxes were reduced in 1981 by 5 percent, 1982 by 10 percent, and 1983 by 10 percent.

□ 1130

The maximum tax rate on capital gains was reduced from 28 percent to 20 percent to encourage growth. Income tax brackets—remember bracket creep—income tax brackets were increased to do away with the possibility of bracket creep, and one of my favorites, a 25-percent tax credit was put into place for research and development activities that took place in the private sector. And, just as in 1964, the economy began to turn. Again in 1984 the economy began to turn.

I will point out a couple of statistics, and I will try to do it quickly because I know statistics get boring. But if one looks at the poverty level during those years leading up and through that recession, an interesting trend can be seen. The poverty level in 1988 was 11.4 percent. It grew in 1979 to 11.7 percent, to 13 percent in 1980, to 14 percent in 1981, to 15 percent in 1982, and the poverty level topped out in 1983, the year before the tax changes took effect, at 15.2 percent. In 1984 the tax changes went into effect, and the poverty level began to drop to 14.4 percent, to 14 percent the following year, to 15 percent the following year, all the way down to 12.8 percent in 1989.

And if one looks at another parameter of growth, and looks at growth and GNP, in 1980 we had a negative, two-tenths of 1 percent decrease, a negative growth, if there is such a thing in our economy. In 1981, a 1.9-percent increase in growth, but then in 1982 we were muddling along, and we lost another 2½ percent in terms of a negative growth. But in 1984, the year after the tax cuts took effect, people started to go back to work, and earn pay checks and pay taxes to this country. All those healthy things started to happen. And in 1984 the growth in the gross national product was 6.8 percent, and it continued to grow throughout the 1980's, and the 1980's have been named by most people as the period of time in which we had the longest sustained period of peacetime economy growth in the history of our country.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are lessons to be learned from history. There are lessons to be learned from what we have done, or what this House, and the other House and the administration have been able to do in the past to put us back to work. But there is another lesson to be learned as well because through the 1980's, as we prospered, we began to do other things as well.

I have heard opposition Members say, "Yeah, but look at where we are today, look at where we are today," and I agree. It is important to look at where we are today, but it is also important to look at how we got here.

Mr. Speaker, we got here, in my opinion, because we did not let well enough alone in terms of what we did in 1981, 1982, and 1983 to put ourselves in a growth mode. In 1986, we began to change that. We had something called tax reform. It was something that was talked about all across the country. It was going to simplify the Tax Code, going to make the Tax Code fairer, and we were going to reform taxes.

And we reformed taxes, and I think it would perhaps take on a different meaning and a different name today as we look back at what was passed in 1986, because during those years, during that Tax Code reform period, not only did we reform and change the Tax Code; essentially what we did was did was increase taxes. We increased the maximum rate on capital gains back to 28 percent. We eliminated the investment tax credit that has been put in place during the previous period. We cut the value of depreciation allowances by lengthening asset lives of capital assets. We restricted IRA investments. And, as a result of the 1986 changes which finally went into effect fully in 1988, the economy began to become sluggish, and GNP growth started to tail off.

Mr. Speaker, we started to find out that we were not creating the same number of jobs that we had in the previous years before those tax changes went into effect, and so we can look at those tax changes as something that at least were a significant part of leveling off the wonderful growth that we had had during the years of the eighties.

But we were not finished, because in 1990, when we passed another change in the Tax Code, which was part of something known as the Budget Reconciliation Act, we changed things again, or maybe I should say we changed them some more because we increased or extended 25 taxes. We increased individual income tax rates, we phased out personal exemptions, or began to, we limited the itemized deduction on our income tax rates, we extended the telephone excise tax so that today, when Americans open their telephone bill, another line item appears there. It is a tax that comes to Uncle Sam. We increased the Medicare wage cap so that that 1.4, almost 1½ percent, now extends on up the code, and we did something that I believe today is the best example of bad tax policy the Congress of the United States has ever passed.

Mr. Speaker, we created something called a luxury tax, to make the rich people pay more of their fair share. It seems very simple. We will just put a surtax on the things rich people buy. We will tax boats, we will tax expensive cars, we will tax furs, jewelry, and all those things.

Guess what? At least in my State it backfired. New Jersey was at one time the third biggest boat-building State in the country. A large part of our economy was based on that. People were working productively. There were skilled craftsmen building expensive boats. Guess what? People that could afford to buy those boats looked at what we had done, and they said, "Well, I didn't get so that I could afford to buy an expensive boat by doing foolish things, and I've got a $500,000 boat, and I'd like to upgrade to a $700,000, but I think Uncle Sam tells me, if I do so, I've got to pay a $70,000 tax, and I didn't get so I could buy an expensive boat," said those people, "by doing foolish things, and so I'm going to go float around the Atlantic Ocean on my $500,000 boat, and I'm not going to buy the new one."

So, Mr. Speaker, we went from being a very big boat-building State to a State just like all the others in the country who build no boats today. That is a good example of what we did to America with the tax changes that took place in 1986 and with the tax changes that took place again in 1990, and so those are three lessons that we can learn from history.

There are some things that we can do. I believe that just as we did in 1963, and just as we did in 1981, and 1982 and 1983, we can change the Tax Code again because we are back where we were then, again because of Tax Codes that do not encourage things to happen for the economic good, for the creation of jobs for Americans. We can change things. We can change the income tax rates again that we did wrong. We can reduce the capital gains tax, as we did in 1981. We can create incentives to save again with changes in the IRA Program. We can reinstate the passive loss rules. Another problem that we have, of course, is banking reform and the RTC.

□ 1140

In my opinion, before the RTC problems are going to resolve themselves, people have got to want to buy real estate again, and we can do that by changing the passive loss rules. And we can provide investment tax credits to people who want to invest, and we can do a lot of other things, including repeal of the luxury tax that has put hundreds, if not thousands, of my friends and neighbors, my constituents, out of work.

I would once again suggest that these are not just things I thought of. They are not solely Republican ideas, they are not solely Democrat ideas. John F. Kennedy recognized what could be done. At that time I am reminded that they called it Keynesian economics. Ronald Reagan had some of the same theories. At that time it became known as supply-side economics. But the theory or the principle is the same.

Today, we find ourselves as in 1983 suffering from a malaise of entrepreneurs who are not anxious to invest, as they were in 1983 and as they were in the late 1970's. So we can make those changes.

Let me just conclude by suggesting that there are those who would argue that this will not work. There are those who will argue that if we do this, somehow we are going to put our economy into worse shape. And the thing they point to is that there are deficit problems with the way we spend money in this House, and that by reducing tax rates or by putting incentives back in our Tax Code, we are going to increase our deficit dramatically.

I would just like to point out very quickly in conclusion that that is not true, in my opinion, and I think it was proven not to be true in both instances I have talked about here this morning. The Treasury said to John Kennedy: "If you put those tax cuts, those tax incentives, into place over a 6-year period, it will cost our Treasury $89 billion."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the 6 years came and went, and at the end of the 6-year period we had not lost $89 billion; we had gained $51 billion. Why? Because it put people back to work, and when people went to work, they had paychecks again. My boat workers, if they had been unemployed at the time, would have been back to work. If that terrible injustice had been created back then and had been straightened out, they would have been back to work. They would not only have been back to work bringing paychecks home and buying things, they would have been paying taxes, and as they pay taxes, good things happen in the economy and good things happen to the revenue that comes into Washington, DC, to deal with our problems.

The same thing happened in 1983, in 1982, and in 1981. There were those on this floor who had doubts. In fact, I have been reminded recently that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, said this back when Ronald Reagan's tax plan and the Kemp-Roth tax package were being debated:

> Make no mistake about it, this is the President's bill. It outlines a bold and risky economic strategy. Only time will tell whether the risks involved were worth taking.

Mr. Speaker, the result has been the longest sustained period of economic growth in the country's history.

So as we look at this, we can see that there are good things that can happen if we follow this path. On the revenue problem again, in the 1980's it was said: "You can't do this. You are going to lose money beginning in 1984." Well, our revenue stream began to grow because once again people went back to work. After the recession of the late 1970's and early 1980's, people went back to work and began to earn money again. They began to pay income taxes again, and our revenue stream increased between 1984 and 1990 each year an average of $60 billion a year.

So, Mr. Speaker, again these ideas are not new. These ideas are things that are tested over time, that have been successful over time. Next week, when we get back to work, I hope to address the problems of our economy. These lessons from history will be something that we can look at in fashioning new economic policies that will be good to take us into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point my paper entitled "A Strategy for Economic Growth," as follows:

A STRATEGY FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH

(By Congressman Jim Saxton)

Economic cycles and downturns are an unfortunate part of our system. Over the years, we've had our ups and downs. Downturns occurred during the '60s, the late '70s and early '80s, and now again in the early '90s.

A decade ago, the economy was in trouble. In some respects, it was much as it is today. Unemployment was high, as it is today, but so, too, was the rate of inflation—and interest rates reached unparalleled heights, causing a "credit crunch."

It is clear that while there are some similarities, there are also a number of differences. For example, today there is a different type of "credit crunch." While interest rates are low, loans are too seldom made because of bank regulatory structures. In addition, because of the lack of investor and consumer confidence, credit is not in demand as people feel the need to conserve.

The President speaks of a number of initiatives which will help with economic remedies. In a recent press conference he outlined a series of issues which he believes need attention in order to help the economy grow. He spoke at length about deficit reduction, government regulation (local, state and federal), banking reform, tort reform, education, foreign trade (the need to drive down trade barriers), the just-passed transportation bill (a jobs bill) and tax incentives.

Each of these issues is complex, and each is a subject which has been the topic of discussion for most of modern political history. Congress has dealt with all of them, some successfully, but most rather unsuccessfully.

We can learn much by looking at the last decade of Congressional activity. Some things have worked well, and others have not. Need anyone be convinced about our disastrous efforts in deficit reduction, reduction in regulation, banking reform, tort reform, balance of trade or progress toward a Republican Congress?

However, there is one course of action which has been proven effective. Taken in conjunction with all the factors which the President mentions, it is clear that the only item which stands out as historically successful in changing the course of the economy is tax incentives.

I don't speak just about tax cuts, I talk about tax incentives—incentives to make the economy grow—incentives intended not just to cut the economic pie differently by reducing taxes on some and raising them on others, but incentives to make the entire pie bigger.

This is not a revolutionary concept. It was used in the 1920s, then again, in the early '60s, when John F. Kennedy said in a speech to the Congress:

"I am convinced that the enactment this year of tax reduction and tax reform overshadows all other domestic problems in this Congress. For we cannot lead for long the cause of peace and freedom if we ever cease to set the pace at home. . . . I am not talking about giving the economy a mere shot in the arm to ease some temporary complaint. This [tax cut] will increase the purchasing power of American families and business enterprises. . . . It will, in addition, encourage the initiative and risk-taking on which our free system depends; induce more investment, production, and capacity use; help provide the two million jobs we need every year; and reinforce the American principle of additional reward to additional effort." (*The State of the Union Address, 1963*)

And, it worked:

Kennedy Tax Cuts (1963)—All tax bracket rates reduced:

Selected rate cuts:

Cut 91 percent bracket to 70 percent;

Cut 75 percent bracket to 62 percent;

Cut 50 percent bracket to 42 percent;

Cut 30 percent bracket to 25 percent;

Cut 20 percent bracket to 14 percent.

In addition, and of no less importance, the corporate tax rate was reduced from 52 percent to 48 percent and the existing investment tax credit was broadened.

Note: Tax cuts were passed after President Kennedy's death.

Results:

Real GNP growth: 1963, 4.0 (before tax cuts); 1964, 5.3 (after tax cuts); 1965, 5.9 (after tax cuts); 1966, 5.9 (after tax cuts).

Unemployment: 1950's 4.4 percent (average); 1963, 5.7 percent (before tax cuts); 1964, 5.2 percent (after tax cuts); 1965, 4.5 percent (after tax cuts); 1966, 3.8 percent (after tax cuts).

Note: Created 4.1 million new jobs.

Revenue Growth:

Treasury Prediction—$89 billion (loss over 6 years).

Actual Results—$54 billion (increase over 6 years).

You and I know that we have been beneficiaries of tremendous growth during the decade of the '80s. And again, we can point with certainty to tax incentives which served as the basis for the decade of growth, this time under the leadership of Ronald Reagan. Not unlike John Kennedy, President Reagan recognized that the behavior of people and businesses is influenced in economic terms by their long-range expectations. In 1981 Reagan said to Congress:

"These rate reductions are essential to restoring strength and growth to the economy by reducing the existing tax barriers that discourage work, saving, and investment. Individuals are the ultimate source of all savings and investment. Lasting economic progress, which is our goal, depends on our success in encouraging people to involve themselves in this kind of productive behavior." (*Congressional Quarterly: Almanac, 97th Congress*, Volume XXXVII, 1981, p. 19–E)

And yet, not everyone agreed. Representative Dan Rostenkowski, in debate on the Reagan tax package, said, "Make no mistake about it . . . This is the President's bill. It outlines a bold—and risky—economic strategy. Only time will tell whether the risks involved . . . were worth taking."

You and I can now be the judge. Today, a decade later, we look back on the longest period of peacetime economic growth in history. Let's consider the facts:

Fact No. 1: As a result of unwise economic policies of the '70s, the poverty rate rose from 11.4 percent in 1978 to 15.2 percent in 1983. However, after 1983 when the Reagan tax cuts took full effect, the poverty rate plummeted to 12.8 percent in 1989.

Percent of all persons below poverty level

Year:	Poverty Rate
1978	11.4
1979	11.7
1980	13.0
1981	14.0
1982	15.0
1983	15.2
1984	14.4
1985	14.0
1986	13.6
1987	13.4
1988	13.0
1989	12.8

Fact No. 2: As the table below shows, before the tax cuts of the early '80s took effect, every income class lost income, especially the bott m fifth of households. However, as the table illustrates, all income groups benefited after the tax cuts kicked in. Thus, as President Kennedy once said, "A rising tide lifts all boats."

PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY INCOME CLASS

[In 1990 dollars]

Year	Bottom fifth	Second fifth	Middle fifth	Fourth fifth	Top fifth	Top 5%
1978–82	−8.2	−5.4	−5.2	−3.8	−1.1	−3.2
1982–89	+12.6	+10.7	+11.1	+13.0	+20.5	+28.8

Source: "Money Income of Households, Families and Persons in the U.S.: 1990;" Bureau of the Census, August 1991.

Fact No. 3: The rate of economic growth increased at a rapid pace after the tax cuts of the early '80s went into effect.

Growth rates expressed as percent of GNP in constant dollars

Period:	Percentage
1980	−0.2
1981	1.9
1982	−2.5
1983	3.6
1984	6.8
1985	3.4
1986	2.7
1987	3.4
1988	4.5
1989	2.5
1990	1.0

Fact No. 4: Many opponents of the tax cuts of the early '80s assumed that since the tax rates for wealthy taxpayers declined from a high of 70 percent, the "rich" must have paid less in tax revenues. And, since the "rich" paid less, the "poor" paid more. However, as the table below shows, the "poor's" tax burden, which is the percent of total taxes paid decreased from a high 7.5 percent in 1981 to a low of 5.7 percent in 1988. This shows that the assertions levied by opponents of tax cuts of the early '80s were incorrect.

TAX BURDEN BY PERCENTILE

Wage earner year	Top 1 percent	Top 5 percent	51–95 percentile	Bottom 50 percent
1981	17.6	35.1	57.4	7.5
1982	19.0	36.1	56.5	7.4
1983	20.3	37.3	55.5	7.2
1984	21.1	38.0	54.6	7.4
1985	21.8	38.8	54.1	7.2
1986	25.0	41.8	51.6	6.6
1987	24.6	43.1	50.8	6.1
1988	27.5	45.5	48.7	5.7

Source: A U.S. Senate staff report and the Internal Revenue Service.

If John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan can agree in concept with regard to economic growth tax policy, and if in the cases of both presidencies the concept worked, then why are we where we are today?

First consider the provisions of the tax cuts of the early '80s.

TAX CUTS OF THE EARLY '80S—MAJOR PROVISIONS

Reduced individual income tax rates: 1981–5 percent; 1982–10 percent and 1983–10 percent.

Reduced maximum rate on capital gains from 28 percent to 20 percent.

Indexed individual income tax brackets.

Extended the period an individual can defer taxes on proceeds from sale of primary residence.

Allowed partial exclusion of foreign earned income.

Created Accelerated Cost Recovery System for depreciation.

Allowed expensing by small businesses of new or used machinery and equipment.

Allowed 25 percent tax credit for research and development.

As previously demonstrated, the economy began to grow in '82 and '83, and continued to grow until it began to soften in '88 and '89. What caused it to soften in '88–89? One need look no further than the Tax Reform Act of 1986 which took effect in 1987–88 to understand why. The positive effects of the policies put in place in the early '80s were undone and counteracted.

1986 TAX REFORM ACT—MAJOR PROVISIONS

Increased the maximum rate of tax on capital gains.[1]

Eliminated the investment tax credit.[1]

Enacted a passive loss limitation provision.

Cut the value of depreciation allowances by lengthening asset lives.[1]

Created corporate and individual alternative minimum taxes.

Restricted IRA investments.

Enacted strict foreign tax provisions.

Then, with the economy showing signs of a downturn and under pressure to reduce the deficit, Congress in 1990 passed the largest, most far-reaching tax increase in the history of our country.

1990 TAX INCREASES—MAJOR PROVISIONS

Increase in individual income tax rates.

Phase-out of personal exemption.

Limit on itemized deductions.

Repeal of deduction for cosmetic surgery.

Increase in excise tax on motor fuels.

Increase in "gas guzzler" tax.

Increase in tobacco excise taxes.

Increase in excise taxes on alcoholic beverages.

Creation of Luxury Tax.

Expansion of excise tax on ozone-depleting chemicals.

Extension of Leaking Underground Storage Tank excise tax.

[1] Stephen Entin, resident scholar at the Institute for Research on the Economics of Taxation (IRET), estimates that these three changes alone deprived the economy of some $300 billion in investment capital over the last 5 years.

Increase in Airport Trust Fund excise taxes.

Increase in harbor maintenance excise tax.

Extension of telephone excise tax.

Revised treatment of salvage value for insurance companies.

Amortization of acquisition costs of insurance firms.

Compliance provisions for foreign-owned firms.

Retiree health provisions.

Increase in interest rate applicable to corporate underpayment of tax.

Corporate tax provisions.

Extension of Social Security to certain State and local employees.

Extension of unemployment surtax.

Increase in Medicare wage cap.

Extension of statute of limitations for collections.

Change in the treatment of U.S. beneficiaries of foreign trusts.

The problem with the economy then, as I see it, is multi-pronged.

To facilitate long-term recovery, we must address all of the issues the President talks about: regulation, banking reform, tort reform and all the others. I want to be part of that, and I will be heard!

But, for now, we should deal with those areas which will produce immediate yet lasting results, areas such as tax incentives, with which we have had past success.

EXAMPLES OF TAX INCENTIVE PROPOSALS SUPPORTED BY MANY MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

Cut income tax rates

Do you remember the tax cuts of the early '80s—the tax cuts that gave Americans more to spend? The increase in spending provided a much needed boost to the economy.

Senator Bill Roth, the architect of those early '80s tax reductions, has suggested reductions again, and I agree. He and I have each sponsored bills to provide for such a stimulus.

Similar legislation worked effectively in the early '60s during the John F. Kennedy Administration. It worked again when initiated by the Reagan Administration. It is needed now to give the economy a boost and put America back to work.

Reduce capital gains rate

If you were asked to make an investment—perhaps a risky one—and someone told you they were going to take almost a third of your profits when all was said and done, would you make the investment?

Probably not.

Yet that is what our capital gains tax policy does. That's why we need to change it. We need to encourage investment and expansion, not discourage it.

We are part of a large global market and must compete with foreign governments. Germany has no capital gains tax, and Japan's is a mere five percent. Ours is 31 percent. If we expect to compete on a level playing field, we should reduce the capital gains rate.

Create super IRA's

The foundation of any nation's economy is the savings from which investors can draw necessary capital. Unfortunately, Americans have been saving less and less over recent years—much less than Japanese citizens—and the results are showing in the lack of investment capital.

A Super IRA would induce Americans to save by making withdrawals for a first home or for a child's education tax exempt.

Reinstate passive loss provisions

The existing passive loss limitations create a tremendous deterrent to investment in housing. Current law limits deduction of losses and credits generated by passive activity. A passive activity generally is defined as any activity in which an investor's interest is primarily financial. This provision has contributed to a serious decline in investment in housing as the value of syndicated investment has fallen dramatically. It is argued that this contributed to the S & L crisis, as well as the lowest level of multi-family housing production on record.

Provide investment tax credits

Current law allows an investor to depreciate the value of a product over its useful life. By allowing investors the chance to take a tax credit (5%, 7%, 10% or whatever) in the first year, along with the usual depreciation over its useful life, an incentive to invest in productive equipment is created. Additionally, by targeting the tax credit toward specific industries and/or products (American companies, trucks, etc.), the tax credit can help jump-start a floundering sector of the economy, and the economy as a whole.

Repeal the tax on boats and cars

One component of last year's budget agreement which backfired was the "luxury" tax on items such as boats and automobiles. Touted as a way to make the rich "pay," the luxury tax has done nothing but put hard-working Americans out of work. Instead of paying the tax, people simply have stopped buying new luxury boats and cars.

In New Jersey, the boat building industry has been hit especially hard by the effects of the luxury tax. Once prosperous boat-building yards are closed for all practical purposes, and people are out of work.

The luxury tax must be repealed so that we can get American industry back on its feet and put Americans back to work.

CONCLUSION

It is important to conclude by addressing two issues. One issue might be called a myth. That myth is very simply a common belief that increasing taxes increases revenue to the federal government; and, therefore, that decreasing taxes decreases revenue to the federal government.

Strangely enough, just the opposite is true. When economic growth takes place, tax revenues increase. That was demonstrated in the '60s, and it was demonstrated clearly again in the '80s, after the tax cuts of '81, '82 and '83. Revenues began to grow in 1983 and continued through the end of the decade. People were back to work, they were earning more money, and they were paying more taxes, which resulted in an additional average of $60 billion in revenues each year.

The deficit issue is therefore not a result of decreased revenues, it is a result of increased federal spending or outlays. The graph which follows demonstrates vividly how expenditures outgrew even increased revenues during the decade of the '80s.

The second issue is that we recognize that one way government can quench its thirst for tax dollars is by limiting growth in government spending, and by searching out and cutting waste.

It is estimated that next year's budget deficit will be between $370 and $400 billion. This means the federal government will be spending $1 billion a day more than it takes in. This year's deficit alone is larger than the entire 1976 federal budget ($372 billion).

When I was elected to Congress in 1984, I immediately became a supporter of a constitutional amendment to require a balanced federal budget, and I continue as a strong supporter of this concept.

Additionally, during last year's budget debate, there was a proposal which I helped to advance known as the "four percent solution." In essence, it would provide for a spending plan which would have limited increases in spending to approximately the percentage of increase in the cost of living. It would have required no new taxes, and would have moved us toward a balanced budget. Unfortunately, this approach was put aside and, instead, the huge tax increases of 1990 were enacted.

Modern history has shown us that our tax code can be a useful tool in helping to formulate economic policy. With the second half of the 102nd Congressional Session ahead of us, we can, and should, adopt policy based upon hard lessons learned.

STIMULUS FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAUGHLIN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, my subject today is also the economy, and I will not take the entire 1 hour.

As we return from our recess and as we await with anticipation the President's State of the Union Message, and because members of my party have been ardently working on a middle-class tax package that will provide an instant stimulus to the economy to get us out of this economic mess and this recession we are in, I would like to suggest, as a Member of this body, some alternatives, some options, and a plan which I have developed with some of my advisers that hopefully will be considered in the days ahead. Some of these ideas are not entirely new. What this represents is a compendium of what I consider to be some good ideas that have already been discussed but that I believe this body should consider.

I would divide my discussion into three parts: What we can do for an instant stimulus for the economy; second, what we should do in terms of long-term economic growth; and then, third, what we might do for middle-class tax relief, for those who earn between $20,000 and $80,000 a year, those who have been burdened with taxes and spending and to whom in reality this package is geared because they have been the forgotten ones among those who have benefited in the last few years.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, our economy is in a mess, and it needs more than just a jump start to get it going. It needs a major overhaul. What I am proposing is a 10-point plan that hopefully will be considered. My plan is broad based, with components for both immediate stimulus and long-term economic provisions. Again, it is geared toward the middle class, in the belief that sustained economic growth is only going to occur by providing tax relief and boosting purchasing power for the majority of Americans.

I will also be offering specific numbers and specific ideas on savings, on how we are going to pay for some of these programs. First, for instant stimulus it seems to me we should reduce the payroll tax for both employers and employees. That is the best anti-recessionary tool we have. A reduction will lower the cost of doing business and free up more money for expansion and job creation. It also increases the take-home pay for every worker in America. Every extra dollar that gets sent home is another dollar that will be recirculated in the economy.

This reduction would be a temporary 2-year reprieve, paid for by future military cuts to provide an instant stimulus to our sinking economy. For 2 years the cost of this program would be $26.6 billion.

Second, the Federal Reserve must push interest rates lower. The credit crunch now squeezing small and mid-sized companies is a major obstacle to economic recovery. While banks should remain wary of repeating the mistakes of the 1980's, that caution cannot come at the expense of denying credit to small business, those companies that create the bulk of new jobs in this country.

For long-term economic growth we should make the research and development tax credit permanent. Businesses that need to make long-term research commitments are being disadvantaged by the temporary nature of the pro-research tax policy. We ought to do everything we can to encourage research and development. It is the only way we are going to succeed in an increasingly competitive worldwide marketplace. This would cost for 5 years $6.2 billion.

Third, we need to make sure individual savings are encouraged. This can be achieved by allowing more people the opportunity to deduct up to $2,000 in contributions to individual retirement accounts.

Let us expand the program so that individuals making up to $50,000 or couples up to $100,000 can qualify. The cost of this program would be $10 billion over 5 years, which also, by the way, takes into account the costs associated with IRA which I will discuss later.

Our Nation's burgeoning budget deficit is one of the most damaging long-term drains on a healthy economy. It does no good to encourage individual savings only to have the Federal Government gobble them up. We have borrowed so much money over such a long period of time that long-term interest rates have no hope of coming down unless our long-term debt is reduced. As debate gets under way on an economic growth package, we have to ensure that it is budget-neutral. Furthermore, given the failure and irrelevance of the budget agreements that we have passed over the years, serious consideration needs to be given to a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, as painful as this might be and as radical a solution as it might be.

□ 1150

Government spending needs to be cut. A lot of existing programs have outlived their usefulness. Given new international realities and pressing domestic needs here at home, it is appropriate to achieve additional savings by cutting the defense budget by 5 percent annually. The close to $80 billion in savings can be achieved without jeopardizing our strong national defense.

I believe this is a modest cut. It has been suggested by the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, an additional 5 percent over 5 years.

We have had a defense budget of $300 billion every year, with $150 billion of that $300 billion essentially going toward the defense of Europe against the Soviet Union. That threat has ended.

No, we cannot recycle these dollars immediately into the economy, but it should be done on a gradual basis so that those in defense positions are not left on the unemployment line, so that our defenses are not weakened. But clearly, we have a defense windfall saving that should be applied immediately.

Another initiative: The current trade negotiations between the United States, Mexico, and Canada have much promise for improving economic growth and our trade deficit. Let us put together a good deal for America that protects the environment, that protects American jobs, that will increase commerce among the three countries, create jobs here at home, and expand export markets for American-made products.

Every time we increase exports it is more jobs for America. With Mexico, Mexico is a good partner. They want to buy our goods. They want to be our economic friend.

As we move ahead in an era where trade blocs are forming because the GATT talks, the international economic trade talks, are collapsing, let us protect ourselves and have a hemispheric-wide free trade zone, a free trade agreement, from Canada down to South America and Argentina, to be able to compete against Europe, which is uniting this year, 1992, with monetary standards, with lowering trade barriers, and a common currency, and by the Far East-Pacific Rim trading bloc, led by Japan.

It is only natural that economic competition is going to be the wars of the future. Military conflicts will decline compared to the economic disputes that will occur among nations. This makes sense to do as we proceed in developing long-term economic growth.

For middle-class tax relief America families should be given a tax credit for each child up to 18 years of age. This is the least the Government can do to help middle-class families whose earnings have stagnated while basic costs like education, housing, and health care have increased in the 1980's.

This tax cut will offset to some degree the burden families now face in meeting these basic needs.

There have been proposals of everything from a $300 tax credit to each child up to 18 years of age, $1,000 tax credit for each child, or $2,000.

This is going to cost us. For instance, if we proceed with the $300 tax credit, that will be $73 billion over 5 years.

Another initiative that we should consider is first-time home buyers should be able to withdraw savings from their IRA's without penalty. One of the biggest obstacles in home buying is coming up with the down payment.

In addition, I believe that parents should be allowed to withdraw savings from their IRA's without penalty to help pay for their children's college tuition.

In addition, we need to make the Nation's wealthiest pay their fair share to Uncle Sam. The tax policies of the 1980's have demonstrably shifted the tax burden onto the middle class and away from our Nation's top income earners. That needs to change in the 1990's.

We should increase the top marginal tax rate from 31 to 33 percent for those individuals who make more than $200,000 a year. We would save $48 billion over 5 years.

Now, that is only fair. Yes, we are taxing those in the upper income bracket, but simply to correct a mistake that was made in the tax cut fever of the 1980's that cost this country enormously. The rich got away with paying less tax than the middle class.

What we are trying to do is just make that equitable, raising the rate from 31 to 33 percent. That is modest, and that is only fair.

Quite clearly, more tax relief is needed for America's middle class, ignored by many of us over the last decade. Making our tax system more progressive for Americans who make between $20,000 and $80,000 a year has to be an immediate priority and objective. It is only a matter of fairness. It is a matter for economic growth.

Even Henry Ford, the early 20th century titan of the auto industry, understood that if he wanted to sell more Model T's, he needed to pay a decent wage so workers could afford them. That wisdom would serve us well as America prepares for the 21st century.

Most important, the plan that I have outlined does not increase the Federal deficit, and may actually save a few dollars.

I estimate my tax cut proposal would cost approximately $116 billion over the next 5 years. However, my combination of tax savings and spending reductions would save approximately

$128 billion, which would give us a net gain of $12 billion.

While these figures represent ballpark calculations, I am confident that the overall plan that I have outlined would be budget neutral, which must be a critical component of any economic plan.

Mr. Speaker, I think, like many other Members of this body, I am willing to consider a capital gains tax cut. But it should not be just a bonanza for the wealthy, for the corporate structure. It should be targeted once again to the middle class. It should apply to new investment, new job opportunities.

I think this is something that is credible. But not the proposal the President has outlined, which I think is clearly a bonanza for the wealthy. But a capital gains tax cut closely targeted, geared to the middle class, geared to jobs and new investment and new opportunities, clearly is in order.

Mr. Speaker, some other ideas. I think that if we look ahead in the future we have to start investing in mass transit. We have to create State, Federal, and local partnerships, to build light rail lines for urban and rural areas lacking mass transit. We have to support high-speed rail for passengers and freight.

These programs would reduce pollution, gridlocks, and dependence on oil imports. These are some new investments that we look at for the future.

We should also boost research and development. Let us have more resources to support private research into new technologies, to provide special assistance and resources for research into alternative energy sources, including solar electricity, wind, biomass, and geothermal. We clearly do not have an energy policy in this country.

□ 1200

A good energy policy will make us save money and promote economic growth. Let us phase out also subsidies for borrowing. Thanks to the deduction for mortgage interest, we Americans have bought far larger and expensive houses. The result has been high household debt and low savings.

We should consider sharply lowering the cap on mortgage deductions, which currently allow full deductibility for interest payments on debt of up to $1.1 million on two homes. We need to invest in education and job training. We have to guarantee access to college and vocational training for all who qualify regardless of ability to pay. Let needy students pay for their education with public service after graduation or through small paycheck deductions in the future. And we have to once again make smart, as I said before, smart defense cuts.

Carefully planned reductions in the long haul could amount approximately to $50 billion savings a year.

Mr. Speaker, I have outlined a 10-point plan plus a few more ideas. Separately each one of my 10 points would have only minimal effects on the economy, but collectively I believe that my plan will go a long way toward improving the Nation's economic health, both in the short term and over the long haul.

Mr. Speaker, as we move ahead in these important days, I think it is important that we have an economic package quickly, that we do it in a bipartisan spirit. I think the President has to set the tone. If he comes out swinging on the 28th, blaming the Congress for all his problems, gives unrealistic deadlines, and proceeds to act in a partisan manner, I believe that the response from those in the Congress that want to have bipartisanship, that want to deal with the economy, is not going to be positive. So the President, it is in his court, what he does, and we will respond with sound economic planning of our own.

CREDIT CRUNCH RELIEF ACT OF 1992

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Small Business Credit Crunch Relief Act of 1992.

Over the past few months, much talk and concern has been directed toward the effects of a widespread and deepening credit crunch. The simple fact is that lower interest rates cannot help us out of the recession, if banks and other lending institutions do not make loans. Nowhere is this a bigger problem than in the small business sector.

Much of our current unemployment can be attributed to the loss of jobs in Fortune 500 firms as we read almost daily of new layoffs in staggering numbers by these giant transnational corporations. The President has recently recognized this situation by remarking that future employment growth in the American economy must come from the small business sector.

Historically, small business has been the sector of our economy which has been the Nation's job creator. In fact, newly released data from the Bureau of the Census shows that small business' share of employment in the United States increased by 3 percentage points in the period of 1982–87. In other words, more people depend upon the small business sector for employment than they do any other segment of our economy.

In the current economic environment, the SBA 7(a) loan guarantee program is proving its worth as never before in history. Indeed, the program is now becoming so attractive to lenders that it will run out of money sometime this summer, unless emergency action is taken. The present funding level of $3.5 billion annually is wholly inadequate to meet today's needs.

Therefore, I am calling today for an immediate increase of $1 billion in guarantee authority each year for the next 3 years, starting now. This would allow SBA to guarantee $4.5 billion in 7(a) loans this year, $5.5 billion in 1993, and $6.5 billion in 1994.

According to press reports this week, the White House is now prepared to support another increase in continued unemployment benefits. I certainly want to assist the victims of prolonged unemployment. But I believe that a loan is better and cheaper that an unemployment compensation grant. We should permit the small business community to remove American workers from unemployment roles by helping small firms provide an increase in employment in the private sector.

I have written to the President urging his support for an increase in the SBA guaranteed loan programs. The time for action is now. It is time to match rhetoric with substance; it is time to go beyond lip service and actually provide some much needed resources to help small business grow and prosper. For the information of my colleagues, I am attaching a copy of my letter to President Bush.

I urge all of my colleagues to consider the expanded role which can be played by the Small Business Administration guaranteed loan programs in creating additional jobs for this country. I anticipate that the Small Business Committee will hole hearings next month on my proposal, along with the President's budget request for SBA funding.

The text of the letter and bill follows:

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, January 24, 1992.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are all concerned about the deteriorating state of our Nation's economy. Many proposals have been advanced which have an initial high price tag to implement; but as we explore these proposals, I hope the Congress and the Administration can reach agreement on an affective course of action.

As part of this process, I am proposing an extremely cost-effective approach that will provide greatly needed financial assistance to the American small business sector at a time when many firms are being devastated by the ongoing credit crunch. I believe this proposal deserves your immediate attention and active support.

As you have said, it is the private sector, and particularly the small business community, which must lead us out of this recession. Small business has long been regarded as the country's job creator and, if given the opportunity, can assist us once again in economic development and job creation. In order to do, this, however, small firms need access to capital, and in today's economic climate sufficient funding is simply not available from the private sector.

I believe that the Small Business Administration (SBA), through its loan guarantee programs, can help fill this need. Unfortunately, the demand for SBA loan guarantees today exceeds available funds; thus worthwhile small businesses are not receiving the financial help they need, and our citizens and the country are suffering the consequences.

This is a tried and tested program which has proven its worth. It is available only when firms cannot get the needed financing from the private sector without the SBA guarantee.

In other words, the 7(a) program is perfectly designed to address problems associated with the current credit crunch. As a re-

sult, demand for the SBA program is running more than 20 percent above last year's levels—and unless action is taken soon, the program will run out of money this summer.

Therefore, I have today introduced legislation to increase the amount of SBA guarantee authority under the section 7(a) program in the current fiscal year to $4.5 billion this year, to $5.5 billion in 1993 and to $6.5 billion in 1994.

These increases can be provided at a minimal cost to the Federal Government—$330 million over 3 years would enable the private section to make a $100,000 loan to 60,000 small businesses. These costs will, of course, be more than compensated by the returns to our economy and to the Treasury from increased tax revenues which will result from the growth of healthy small businesses.

I believe that it is essential that we begin this process of providing more capital immediately. We cannot wait until the start of a new fiscal year as small businesses are dying daily due to lack of money. The time for action is now. This is an emergency situation. We could provide $100,000 loans to 10,000 small businesses within the next few months at a cost of $55 million. But we must act now. To delay will cause irreparable harm.

I respectfully request that you submit a supplemental request for fiscal year 1992 without any further delay and join with me in calling for larger budget increases for fiscal years 1993 and 1994 for the Small Business Administration's 7(a) program and also for the development company guarantee programs.

With best wishes,

JOHN J. LAFALCE,
Chairman.

H.R. —

This Act may be cited as the "Small Business Credit Crunch Relief Act of 1992".

SEC. 2. Section 20 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 note) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) of subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) For the programs authorized by this Act, the Administration is authorized to make $5,303,000,000 in deferred participation loans and other financings; and of such sums, the Administration is authorized to make $3,500,000,000 in general business loans as provided in section 7(a), $53,000,000, in loans as provided in section 7(a)(12)(B), and $750,000,000 in financings as provided in section 7(a)(13) and section 504 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.",

(2) by striking paragraph (2) of subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) For the programs authorized by this Act, the Administration is authorized to make $6,405,000,000 in deferred participation loans and other financings; and of such sums, the Administration is authorized to make $5,500,000,000 in general business loans as provided in section 7(a), $55,000,000 in loans as provided in section 7(a)(12)(B), and $850,000,000 in financings as provided in section 7(a)(13) and section 504 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.", and

(3) by striking paragraph (2) of subsection (i) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) For the program authorized by this Act, the Administration is authorized to make $7,508,000,000 in deferred participation loans and other financings; and of such sum, the Administration is authorized to make $6,500,000,000 in general business loans as provided in section 7(a), $58,000,000 in loans as provided in section 7(a)(12)(B), and $950,000,000 in financings as provided in section 7(a)(13) and section 504 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.",

SEC. 3. In addition to amounts otherwise authorized by law, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Small Business Administration for salaries and expenses of the Administration to carry out the debenture and loan guarantee programs authorized by section 2 of the Small Business Credit Crunch Relief Act of 1992, the following amounts: for fiscal year 1992, the sum of $6,000,000, for fiscal year 1993, the sum of $12,000,000, and for fiscal year 1994, the sum of $17,000,000.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALLEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes each day, on January 27, 29, 30, 31, and February 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Mr. DANNEMEYER, for 60 minutes each day, on January 28 and 29.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MAZZOLI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RICHARDSON, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RICHARDSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. THORNTON, for 60 minutes each day, on January 28 and 29.

Mr. BONIOR, for 60 minutes each day, on January 29, February 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, 19, 25, and 26.

Mr. RICHARDSON, for 60 minutes each day, on January 29, February 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, 19, 25, and 26.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALLEN) to revise and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. IRELAND.

Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. BROOMFIELD in three instances.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. HERTEL.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. STARK in four instances.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. HARRIS.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, January 28, 1992, at 12 noon.

SENATE—*Friday, January 24, 1992*

(Legislative day of Friday, January 3, 1992)

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Prayer will be led by the Senate Chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Richard C. Halverson.

Dr. Halverson, please.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant.—Matthew 23:11.

Lord, God of Heaven and Earth, these words of Jesus remind us of the greatness of servanthood in the context of eternal values. We thank You for public servants who take seriously their responsibility for and accountability to the people. And we thank You for the servants of public servants who make it possible for them to exercise their mandate.

Thank You for the untiring efforts of those who maintain buildings and grounds. Thank You for the indispensable support from those who prepare and serve meals in the food service departments. Thank You for uniformed police, plainclothesmen, doormen and floormen who walk the delicate line between security and diplomacy. Thank You for the pages, so immediately available in their response to any request made them. Thank You for those in cloakroom and office who serve with such dedication. Thank You, God, for all who labor in the Senate making it possible for the Senators to fulfill their weighty tasks.

Gracious Father in heaven, we are a large family, and not a day passes that some of us do not hurt in one way or another—sickness, discouragement, accident, family problems, personal disappointments, tragedy. We pray for all who are in need today, that they may experience Your loving care and healing and reconciling power.

In the name of Jesus, Great Physician, Prince of Peace. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order. Under the standing order, the majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, the Senate will return to the education bill today. Amendments will be offered and debated. There will be no rollcall votes today.

DEB COTTER

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I want to take just a few moments of my leader time to talk about the people who do much of the work of the Senate, many of whom never appear on the Senate floor but they are people who provide the support and assistance on which all Senators rely.

These are often young people, highly idealistic, many of them living away from home for the first time, trying to succeed at their first job. We all have members of our staffs like that, people whose enthusiasm, idealism, desire to learn and contribute, is enormous and contagious.

All too often, in the rush of daily Senate business their work is not given credit; their value to Senators is not properly acknowledged.

I am reminded of that fact today because Deb Cotter of my staff, a young woman from my hometown of Waterville, ME, is one such person. She is 24 years old, and 2 weeks ago she suffered a stroke which left her partially paralyzed. She is recuperating now at George Washington University Hospital. Her family has come down from Maine to be with her and she is beginning the long and difficult work of therapy that will be part of her recovery.

A shocking event such as a sudden stroke to a vibrant young woman reminds all of us that we owe a great deal to our staffs. Perhaps the thing we owe most often, and fulfill least often, is simply to let them know how much we value their work, their loyalty, their idealism.

Deb Cotter is a graduate of Wells College who joined my staff 16 months ago. Although her college major was in Soviet studies, she cheerfully and willingly turned to working with a wide range of issues which come before the Senate. Like every member of the Senate staff she has worked very long hours, often on weekends, and has put much of her personal life aside when the needs of the office require it.

I urge each of my colleagues to look around their offices, to recognize the staff who offer us such substantial support.

Every Member of the Senate has one or more Deb Cotters in his or her office. Each of us owes those staff persons a personal word of thanks and appreciation.

This is my thank you to Deb Cotter. I look forward to her full recovery and her return to our office as soon as possible.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my leader time and I reserve all the leader time of the distinguished Republican leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the time of the two leaders is reserved.

THE 1991 YEAR END REPORT

The mailing and filing date of the 1991 year end report required by the Federal Election Campaign Act, as amended, is Friday, January 31, 1992. Principal campaign committees supporting Senate candidates file their reports with the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510-7116.

The Public Records Office will be open from 8 a.m. to 9 p.m. on the filing date to accept these filings. In general, reports will be available to the public 24 hours after receipt. For further information, please contact the Public Records Office on (202) 224-0322.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 10 o'clock with Senators permitted to speak therein.

Mr. BENTSEN has 10 minutes reserved and Mr. PRESSLER has 10 minutes reserved.

Mr. MITCHELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, Senator HOLLINGS is present and seeking time on the floor. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that to the extent necessary the time for morning business be extended and that Senator HOLLINGS be recognized for 10 minutes following Senator PRESSLER's remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] is recognized.

EXTENDING UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, after spending the better part of last year

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

marking time and refusing to acknowledge recession, saying recovery was just around the corner, the administration has reluctantly recognized the economic realities.

We witnessed a long overdue change in policy and attitude last year, with the White House grudgingly acceding to the obvious requirement for extended unemployment benefits for the victims of recession.

Recently we have heard comments of sympathy for workers who have lost their jobs and regional economies that have been devastated by economic hard times. There are even indications that this time the administration is not going to have to be dragged into a position of support for further extension of unemployment benefits. Perhaps this is an election year conversion. They have seen the administration's drop in the polls, insofar as responding to some of the concerns and needs of this country and its economy are concerned.

That welcome change is hardly surprising when we consider the toll that this recession has taken on American workers. We hear many people say that people just do not want to work anymore. But that's not reality, if you consider the situation in Chicago the other night when there were 9,000 people standing in line in freezing, numbing weather trying to get 1 of 500 jobs.

Economists, reading the tea leaves, are divining the first harbingers of recovery. But that is small consolation to the men and women who are out of work now. The truth is that labor market conditions today are worse than they were before Thanksgiving, when extended benefits were first provided.

The rate of unemployment has increased from 6.9 percent then to 7.1 percent now. That may not sound like much of an increase, but it has enormous tragic human consequences. That small increase means that from the time that we extended those benefits until December, almost 290,000 more Americans joined the ranks of the unemployed. That is the equivalent of wiping out every job in a pretty good-sized American town.

Every day we pick up the paper and read about jobs disappearing all across America. We are talking about good jobs, skilled jobs, high-paying jobs from some of the largest blue-chip companies in America—companies like Chevron, United Technologies, and General Motors. Since December, layoffs by blue-chip companies have averaged 2,600 per day.

People lose their health benefits when they lose their jobs. If you want hard evidence, human evidence of the toll, this recession is taking, just consider that the number of long-term unemployed Americans has doubled to 1.5 million since the recession began.

There is a cruel irony in the fact that the primary victims of the recession are the hard-working, middle-income Americans who missed the economic joy ride of the eighties. They are the folks who had their taxes go up and saw their incomes go down. They are paying the price of the party they did not attend.

Fathers and mothers have less time today to parent their children. Health insurance benefits have disappeared; housing has been priced out of sight; college education is becoming a real luxury for middle-income Americans.

And today the recession this administration tried so hard to deny has brought millions of American families to the brink of despair and economic disaster.

Perhaps we are seeing the first signs of recovery. I hope so. But all the economists tell us if we have a recovery, it will be a very weak one—nothing like what we saw coming out of previous recessions. We are going to see the gross domestic product increase by only about half of what it did coming out of other recessions.

Earlier this week the CBO issued a report that suggested there would be virtually no improvement in the labor market this year. There is a good chance unemployment is going to remain at 7 percent or go higher. Mr. President, that is bad news for the working men and women of America.

Last year's extension of unemployment benefits provided an important lifeline for the victims of unemployment. But those benefits are going to start running out for 600,000 workers after February 15, and the numbers are going to grow rapidly after that.

We cannot let that happen, and we cannot walk away from this problem. We cannot write off these hundreds of thousands of Americans with expiring benefits. I know it is a time of tight budget restraints and finite resources, but we have an obligation to extend those benefits again. We have an obligation to help sustain those who, through no fault of their own, have lost the jobs that mean hope and security for families from every State and every congressional district.

The Finance Committee will hold hearings on January the 29th, Wednesday of next week, to address this issue and the options on the extension of unemployment benefits. We will be looking at ways to enable the States to pay additional benefits beyond those we approved last year.

I hope we can avoid the kind of situation that occurred last year when the administration stonewalled the extension until the tragedy became undeniable. We are ready to work with the administration and with Senators on both sides of the aisle to find the most effective way to extend these benefits. It is very serious business for hundreds of thousands of Americans living on the cusp of despair. If we extend these benefits in a timely manner, we can offer these American workers a helping hand to help ride out the recession.

Too many of them are in the situation today where if a child gets sick, they are afraid to take that child to the doctor because they cannot pay the bill. So what happens? They wait until the child is too ill and then they rush the child to the emergency room. We have to see what we can do to turn that kind of situation around.

Mr. President, I am encouraged by the fact that we seem to have a consensus on the need to extend benefits. I want my colleagues to know the Finance Committee will be working hard to help build that consensus, and we want to work with the administration and with our colleagues in the other body to extend the benefits promptly, and in a manner that contributes to the process of recovery for our economy and for the millions of Americans who have experienced the pain of recession.

Mr. President, I believe that if we work together—and if we can get some help from the administration—that within a couple of weeks we will have an unemployment compensation bill passing this body and the other body, and being put into effect.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order previously entered, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

TOWARD A NEW ARMS CONTROL REGIME

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I would like to report to the Senate on some of the results of a trip I made to India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka.

Mr. President, should American taxpayers subsidize the development of nuclear or even conventional weapons in Pakistan, India or any other developing country? Absolutely not. Yet, as a result of my recent trip to India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka, I am convinced that this is exactly what would happen should current United States policy concerning foreign assistance be changed.

Back in 1985, evidence was mounting that Pakistan was secretly developing a nuclear bomb. At that time, Pakistan was in line for some $600 million in United States foreign aid.

With the support of the Reagan administration, I offered an amendment that put conditions on future aid to Pakistan. That amendment became law in 1985. Under the terms of the so-called Pressler amendment, as it is now called, United States aid to Pakistan would be cut off unless the President could certify to Congress on a yearly basis that Pakistan did not possess a nuclear weapon. In 1990, the President was unable for the first time to make that certification.

United States foreign aid to Pakistan was halted, and it has not been re-

sumed. This means that roughly $573 million of United States taxpayers' dollars will not go to Pakistan this year. I made this message clear to Pakistani officials with whom I met. Our taxpayers will no longer tolerate the indirect subsidization of an arms buildup in Pakistan.

I might also say that I urged Indian leaders to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. I also urged India to participate in a five-power meeting on nuclear proliferation. Unfortunately, they are refusing to participate in efforts to reduce nuclear weapons and conventional weapons in their theater of the world.

I strongly believe that not only must our current policy continue with regard to Pakistan, but that we also must no longer conduct business as usual with any developing nation that continues to squander resources on the development of nuclear, chemical, or conventional weapons.

Events of the past year graphically demonstrated just what such a business-as-usual approach can mean. We followed that approach with Iraq, another nuclear hopeful state, and ended up at war.

Iraq and Pakistan are not the only nations bent on building massive arsenals of nuclear, chemical, and conventional weapons at the expense of their populations and, I might add, at the expense of United States taxpayers. Libya and Algeria are recent contenders for entrance into the nuclear club. Other nations continue to arm themselves at unprecedented levels.

This year, I plan to propose a series of amendments using the Pressler amendment approach to reduce weapons worldwide throughout the 1990's. I think we can have an arms reduction era, but, to be successful, the Security Council nations, the great powers, also will have to put on the pressure.

Our own country is reducing its nuclear arms and its conventional arms. There is no reason that the countries to which we give aid and extend favorable trade treatment should be increasing their armaments, be they nuclear or conventional.

Under legislation I shall propose, the President would certify whether various nations are reducing their arsenals of nuclear, chemical, and conventional arms. If they reduce their military, as we have reduced ours and are reducing ours, then they would be rewarded with more favorable U.S. aid and trade relationships.

I hope that we also can encourage other nations of the U.N. Security Council to join in this effort. In fact, I would like to see the United Nations create a regime whereby developing countries would be rewarded for reducing armaments and for showing substantial, certifiable results in reducing armaments, especially nuclear armaments. Foreign aid and favorable trade treatment must not be extended to countries which continue to acquire arms at alarming rates. Recipients of our aid and trade should be asked to choose between military expenditures and the needs of their own people.

Mr. President, when I visited Pakistan, it was my judgment that the Pakistanis no longer make any secret about the fact that they have a nuclear bomb. This is a frightening thing. We have the five former Soviet Islamic States. We also have Afghanistan, Iran, and parts of Turkey. I believe that they will all start to look toward the deep warm water port at Karachi as the export outlet for their goods.

The Soviet Islamic States previously had relied on the Soviet European ports or Vladivostok in the east to export and import their goods. But there are good roads going through Afghanistan, built by the Russians mainly, and some in Pakistan built by us, as well as others, that could be used to move their products down through Pakistan to the warm water port at Karachi.

I foresee a possible new coalition of states there, probably eight or nine countries, that could be a new strategic force in the world. There is also a danger that such a coalition could be dominated by Islamic fundamentalism. At least one of the former Soviet Islamic republics has nuclear weapons on its soil. They are supposed to be turned over to Russia. Whether they will be or not remains to be seen. So we could have a new generation of extremist religious states with nuclear weapons.

Pakistan already has a nuclear weapon. Kozakhstan has such weapons. That could be a very destabilizing thing in that part of the world and in the world in general.

Now, the Pakistanis said to me that the termination of United States aid as a result of the Pressler amendment was imposing severe human costs. My response was that, if this is true, the solution is squarely in the hands of Pakistani leaders. They can dismantle their nuclear weapon and the Pressler amendment will not be in effect, and they will be able to receive aid.

It pains me to see the hardship inflicted upon the Pakistani people by leaders who seem to care more about weapons and mass destruction than food for their people. I made it clear to them, and I wish to make it clear to my colleagues, that I have no regrets about offering the amendment in 1985 and will fight any attempts to weaken or repeal it. Indeed, there was a vote on the amendment in the House last year and it stood up very well. So I think anyone who thinks that the amendment will be repealed is not being realistic.

Why, I asked, does Pakistan need a nuclear program. Our experts have concurred with the Indian leadership that, although India exploded a device in the 1970's, it has discontinued an active nuclear program. Pakistani leaders told me that they must do whatever is necessary to protect themselves against aggression from India. After all, they said, India has a nuclear bomb. Why do not the provisions of the Pressler amendment apply to that country as well.

Mr. President, that argument is fatally flawed. Although India is known to have exploded a nuclear device in 1974, there is no evidence that India has sought to develop a nuclear arsenal. I met with the Indian leaders, the Prime Minister, the Defense Minister, and asked them point blank if India was developing a nuclear bomb, and they said flatly no. They have said the same thing to the President of the United States, and our technical experts who check into these sorts of things agree.

So, Mr. President, is it really protection that Pakistan seeks, or is it something else?

Extremist factions have taken hold in several Islamic countries in recent years, including Iran, Libya, and Syria. Such forces are on the verge of victory in Algeria and are threatening to take over in Tunisia and Pakistan. The direction the now independent Soviet Islamic Republics will take is unclear. Should control of these countries shift to religious fanatics, these countries suddenly could find they have much in common, both ideologically and geographically.

This could well be enough for these countries to form, at the very least, a kind of loose-knit confederation. It is true that several of these countries historically have had serious disputs. However, religious fundamentalism may very well provide the tie that binds. Past differences, at least on one level, could be put aside.

The result could be a new nuclear superpower in the world. Ironically, this could occur in a world which for the first time is making meaningful progress toward nuclear disarmament. The world would be at risk like almost never before. We must be vigilant to this possibility. We must ensure that it does not happen. And we most certainly must ensure that its development is not supported with U.S. taxpayer's dollars.

Indeed, India could do much to alleviate tension in South Asia. In my meetings with Prime Minister Rao and other Indian leaders, I made clear my belief that India should agree to attend the five-nation nuclear nonproliferation meeting which has been proposed for the region. I also indicated that India could go far in easing tensions with Pakistan by signing the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. As the largest nation in South Asia, I believe India could do more to reduce the threat of nuclear proliferation in the region.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Chair.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, Wednesday's Washington Post devoted half of its Federal page to listing all the tax relief programs and plans being bandied about in the Congress. Of course, it is an election year and, so everyone is in heat to pass a middle-class tax cut. But this latest bidding war has all the subtlety of a hog auction, and the same whiff of pork.

By all means, we need tax cuts as one element of a larger antirecession package. But we have to come up with smarter tax cuts than a one-shot $350 give-back aimed at goosing consumer spending and buying votes in November's election. Given our love of imports, this kind of consumption-oriented tax cut will motivate everyone to go out and buy another Sony and jump-start Japan. It is not going to jump-start America. So this idea of jump-starting the economy shows just how shallow and misbegotten the various tax schemes are. They are all aimed at stimulating short-term consumer spending, but what good is a jump-start if the battery is kaput?

It took us a long time, Mr. President, to get us into this fix and it is going to take us awhile to work out of it. We have to maturely acknowledge that there is no way we are going to jump-start our way out of an economic crisis that was 10 years in the making.

Let us sober up and agree on three points. One, we have to think in terms of a long-term cure, not a short-term fix. Two, any tax cut must be targeted top encourage both private and public investment and long-term savings. Three, any tax cut must be offset on the spending side. We must not add to a deficit that already will exceed $400 billion in the year 1993.

Mr. President, I rise today to outline just such a plan. The plan calls for spending reductions totaling $26 billion which is then redirected to finance a $26 billion package of investment-oriented expenditures and tax reductions. The aim of this plan is not to apply a jump start. The aim is to install a new battery.

To put first things first, let us look at the spending reductions in my plan. First, we scaled back the Federal bureaucracy 10 percent in the early Reagan years. The distinguished occupant of the Chair led the way. And we cut back our staffs here and the staffs of the various Departments, the White House, Interior, Agriculture, and so on. We must do the same thing now—a 10-percent cut in the Washington bureaucracy, saving $1 billion the first year and $11 billion over 3 years.

By freezing foreign aid at 1992 levels, we can save another $1 billion. Next, a freeze on domestic discretionary spending at 1992 levels—just take this year's budget for next year. Many a mayor will do that this year. Many a Governor will do that—will save $10 billion.

And to make this freeze politically viable, politically realistic, we expressly exempt Social Security, military, and other COLA recipients as well as Medicare, Medicaid, and the other means-tested programs.

I have pursued such a freeze for 10 years, as the distinguished Chair knows, trying to hold the line and head off this recession. But we have to be more realistic. In addition, we must find an additional $10 billion in defense savings below the 1993 cap.

Now, Mr. President, we can get more defense savings, and some have said $15 billion, some have said $20 or $25 billion.

You have to do this in a judicious fashion. All of this is a careful balancing act. If you lay off hundreds of thousands of soldiers, and you throw them right onto unemployment benefits given our sour economy. So we do not want to work at cross purposes.

We have to be deliberate, and in actual outlays, I do not think you can save more than $10 billion in fiscal year 1993. What's more, we can defer selected big-ticket science projects which lack direct commercial spinoffs, saving another $4 billion.

The total spending reduction in this package is $26 billion. My plan takes that $26 billion in savings and uses it to buy a new economic battery. The emphasis is on three priorities: investment in the private sector, investment in the public sector, and holding the line on the deficit.

First, for the private sector, I allocate $19 billion in tax incentives designed to stimulate investment and long-term savings: restoration of individual retirement accounts, reduced capital gains taxes on investments held longer than 3 years, investment tax credits for manufacturing equipment and research and development, and accelerated depreciation on capital equipment.

Second, for public sector investment, my plan allocates $4 billion in new revenue sharing grants to the States to help fund infrastructure modernization and repairs.

I first introduced a bill for revenue sharing on February 1, 1967, for education. Now the States and localities have an unprecedented need for this money. Yet here in Washington people only talk about how we are going to help Russia. I want to know how we are going to help America. And here it is. If you can find $650 million for the hungry in Russia; then we can find $4 billion for the hungry in America. It is not just hunger. This is a full range of critical needs in our cities, counties, States; it is a valid program and it is needed.

In addition, my plan allocates $3 billion for investment in human capital. The lion's share of this must go to Women's Infants, and Children's nutrition, Head Start, and Chapter 1 for the disadvantaged.

Yesterday we were arguing that we are $12 billion shy in fully funding those proven programs that save the Government money. We are $12 billion shy. My plan will put us on track toward full funding over a 5-year period.

No less important will be boosting funding for technical training, as well as technology development. The Administration's Joint Training Partnership Program, with its emphasis on remedial and low-technology skills, is all wrong. The President will recommend it Tuesday night. Forget it.

We need boosted funding for the existing networks of technical training colleges in the states. These technical training colleges are already up and running; they have faculty; and they have broad-based support from State and local governments as well as within the business community. All they lack is sufficient funding to meet the heightened challenge of the recession and foreign competition. Let's not get sidetracked by the failed JTP approach, with its emphasis on low-tech and remedial training. JTP will not train Americans for the jobs of the future.

In addition, let's honestly acknowledge that the Government is already in the business of developing civilian, commercially oriented technology. This is the express mandate of the Technology Administration and the National Institute of Standards and Technology within the Commerce Department. NIST is our embryonic civilian DARPA, and it is high time we gave it sufficient funding to match its counterparts in Japan and Europe. To cite one particular, we need to bolster NIST's five regional Federal manufacturing centers—modeled on the tried-and-true agriculture extension service—which work with businesses to sharpen their technical edge and boost competitiveness; we need more of these manufacturing centers, and we need to expend the scope of those already up and pruning.

Mr. President, this economic plan could not be more simple, either in its design or in its purpose. It is identified savings to the tune of $26 billion. It redirects that $26 billion to find an array of investment-oriented programs and tax incentives, a balanced program of investment in the private sector of $19 billion, and investment in the public sector of $7 billion, and holding the line on the deficit.

The purpose here is not to spend more; the purpose here is to spend wisely. The purpose is to make a downpayment on the new economic battery, to get this country moving again and to keep it moving over the long haul.

I thank the distinguished colleagues and the distinguished Chair.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY].

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, if it would be appropriate, could I have 3 minutes for the purpose of the introduction of a bill as if in morning business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the extension of morning business for 3 minutes? There is no objection.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 2160 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

RUSSIAN AID: SOUTH DAKOTA STYLE

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, before I walked to work Wednesday morning from my Capitol Hill house, I watched Secretary of State James Baker address a conference of nations assembled here in Washington to tackle the formidable task of developing an aid program for the new independent nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS].

The foreign ministers of 47 nations are exploring methods to bring critically needed food aid, medical relief, and other assistance to ease the rigors of another cold winter in the new countries of the CIS. No one could argue this aid is not urgently and desperately needed. No one could argue against the fact that the time to help is now. Unfortunately, that was about all the conferees did not argue about.

French President Francois Mitterrand called the meeting "a bit superfluous."

Germany asserted that the United States was not doing enough.

Even some Americans seem to feel their Government has done enough. A recent Gallop poll showed that 35 percent of Americans feel too many of their tax dollars have been spent on the former Soviet Union.

The roughly six-block walk to the Hart Building is as good for the body as it is for the mind. Along the way, I recalled a letter I received some months back, from a high school economics teacher in Clark, SD. DeLane Isaak's high school student knew exactly how to alleviate the impending food crisis in the former Soviet Union: keep the Government out of it.

Mr. Isaak's class has embarked on a person-to-person, grassroots campaign to aid families and individuals in the Republics. The Clark students sent a 20-cubic-foot box containing cereals and beans to Russia.

They have plans to encourage other individual Americans to help out. Their goal is to have American families adopt families from the new Republics, and share our uniquely American advantages with those who so desperately need it. Above all, they want to assist people, and avoid the bureaucracy and red tape that comes with any Government program.

Mr. President, I fully support the efforts of the 47 nations assembled in Washington this week. Yet it strikes me that all those great minds and nations assembled may not be able to prepare a plan which makes half as much sense as that molded in Clark, SD, by high school students. President Bush has spoken of the progress that can be accomplished by individuals—the thousand points of light. Mr. President, I believe some of those points of light are strongly illuminated in and around Clark, SD, and in many other places. The challenges for us, then, is to simply find these points of light and begin to use their innovative and effective ideas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article describing the Clark students' relief plan that appeared in the September 18, 1991, Clark County Courier, as well as a summary of the proposal itself, appear in the RECORD.

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

CLARK'S ECONOMICS STUDENTS SEND CARE PACKAGE TO RUSSIA

Instead of putting money and worry into missiles aimed at Russia, American dollars and concerns are now being invested in care packages and sent to the Soviet (dis) Union. Well, that may not be occurring throughout the United States, but the friendly gesture is being made here in Clark by DeLane Isaak's high school economics students. They're hoping the token gesture catches fire on a grass roots level.

Isaak and his 20 students just sent a cubic foot box containing cereals and beans to Russia, and they're learning a lesson about economics that probably can't be learned this thoroughly in a textbook.

"We were trying to think of a project for the economics class, and I knew the students were already doing research papers. I thought it became rather redundant, and I wanted to do something innovative . . . something that was relevant and pertinent to the times we're living," said Issak.

Due to the many predictions of an economic crisis occurring in Russia along with the many television stories showing long lines of people waiting to enter empty grocery stores, Isaak and his class are hoping this idea of Americans sending packages to the Soviet people catches on nationally.

Isaak has friends in Russia he sends food to, and said the only things the family had to eat for a full year were potatoes, cabbage and bread. He explained simple items he sends such as cereals, beans and rice are greatly appreciated.

The economics class is well aware that the small box of foods they sent will in no way feed more than a few hungry mouths—but it just might open any minds to the possibilities of Americans sending packages en masse. Isaak thinks it would be great if a family-to-family deal could be arranged between the two nations.

"We could adopt a Russian family, and Americans could correspond with them on a monthly basis with packages of foods," explained Isaak.

The class shot straight for the top with their package project. They addressed their box to Soviet Presidents Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin, thinking the two men might find the idea worth exploring. Isaak also mailed a letter to Vice President Dan Quayle explaining what the class was doing.

The last thing the class wants, however, is for this to become a government project. The students want the food to be delivered on a grass roots level with the endorsement and encouragement of the two governments.

If the food sharing plan comes to fruition and does catch on with the nations, Isaak pointed out it would be best if the Russians sent a plane to the States to pick up the supplies. He and his class have found that postal rates are extremely high to mail a cubic package that weighs about 20 pounds. Air mail would have cost the class $143, so the students decided to send it via surface mail for a little over $40. Still, that's an expensive cost to send about $20 in food.

To pay for this mailing, the students are holding bake sales until the cost has been covered. The food was donated by a local benefactor.

Isaak is thrilled with how his students have responded to this project. "They're very positive about this, and without exception, the students are behind the project. It shows we have a good bunch of students who think of other people. When we help others, we help ourselves," he shared.

The class has no idea to what extent this idea from Clark will be nurtured, and the teacher explained if nothing else comes from this venture, it was still an excellent experience for the class to learn about economics.

"Some people are going to laugh at this, but it's a learning experience. We are indeed our brother's keeper, and it is better to give than to receive," said Isaak.

The students in his class who are involved with this project are Chad Altfillisch, Teena Blewett, Keith Carlson, Judy Fischer, Darin Fuller, John Guest, Jacki Hartley, Jeff Hurlbert, Penny Kruthoff, Alberta Juanto Lacabe, Sheila Luke, Dawn McMillan, Melissa Neal, Chris Olson, Neil Olson, Rudy Ramon, Greg Schuricht, Travis Smith, Tonya Waterfall and Jeff Yexley.

ECONOMICS

Anyone who has gone to bed hungry can appreciate the plight the Russian people are facing as the winter of 1991-92 descends upon them. As recent as last year, many Soviet citizens survived the bitter winter on potatoes, cabbage, and bread. Imagine, potatoes and cabbage and bread three times a day, all winter long.

The economics class decided that something should be done. The class argued that, by sending a token "care" package to President Gorbachev and Yeltsin, perhaps the gesture would stimulate their thinking and they would accept our proposal of adopting Russian families on the grass roots level here in America. Our suggestions included the following:

1. That individuals in the United States personally help individuals and families in the Soviet Union. It would give willing Americans a sense of partnership with their counterparts in Russia. What better way to

experience a real sense of caring for someone less fortunate? By supplying food on a one-to-one, person-to-person, family-to-family basis, our own federal government need not become involved, saving millions or billions of tax dollars to fund the program.

2. We would urge the Soviet government to supply the transportation, thus eliminating the need for additional U.S. tax expenditures to airlift the food parcels to their country.

Class support of the project has been enthusiastic. In one bake sale, sufficient funds were raised to send a package to Moscow ($48.55) via surface mail. (The same package would have cost $143.90 to send via air mail!) Many lessons concerning economics come to mind, including lessons on supply and demand, taxation, utility, distribution of goods, infrastructure, and so on. But perhaps the best lesson of all that will sustain each of us throughout a lifetime is that it is better to give than to receive, for by doing so, we not only help others, but we also help ourselves.

DELANE W. ISAAK,
Economics Teacher.

UNITED STATES MUST RECOGNIZE CROATIAN AND SLOVENIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. BELL. Mr. President, I was pleased to join yesterday with the distinguished minority leader in introducing a resolution urging the administration to recognize Slovenia and Croatia as independent states. The peoples of these two countries have voted overwhelmingly for freedom, but they have paid dearly for their choice.

Regrettably, the Serbian Government and the Yugoslav Federal Army answered these countries' calls for independence with violence and bloodshed. Today's press reports offer new evidence of the horrors experienced by the people of Croatia at the hands of the Serb-led Yugoslav Army. We read that Helsinki Watch, a human rights monitor, issued a letter asserting that Serb forces have tortured and executed Croatian civilians and have wantonly looted and destroyed civilian property.

Mr. President, I believe that much of the horror could have been avoided. For more than a year, many of us in the Congress have been urging the administration to reevaluate its policy toward Yugoslavia—to give up on the notion that the country had to remain intact. Last fall, before Congress adjourned, Senator GORE and I introduced a resolution that called upon the United States to take decisive action—namely to recognize the independence of Slovenia and Croatia—if Serbia continued to construct the European Community sponsored peace talks. Adopting such a policy would have brought us in line with the European Community.

At a hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last fall, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs Ralph Johnson stressed that the United States was not taking the lead on the Yugoslav issue, but that "we have been supporting and intend to continue to support the European Community's CSCE-mandated effort to bring about a genuine ceasefire and political settlement. We believe that collective efforts have the best prospects for influencing the situation.

Mr. President, the United States is miserably behind the curve with regard to collective efforts. Nearly 40 countries, including the 12 nations of the European Community, have recognized the independence of Slovenia and Croatia. The decision by these countries to recognize Slovenia and Croatia seems to have forced the Serbian Government to realize that it cannot impose its will on the rest of what was Yugoslavia. A U.N.-sponsored cease-fire has been in place for nearly 3 weeks, and I believe the European Community's push for recognition of Slovenia and Croatia has played a part in the cease-fire's holding. Regrettably, the United States can claim little responsibility for these positive developments.

Mr. President, I commend Senate Resolution 246 to my colleagues, and I hope that the administration will note its strong endorsement of diplomatic recognition of Slovenia and Croatia.

ON THE 19TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROE VERSUS WADE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, 19 years ago this week, the American people learned of the Supreme Court's momentous ruling in Roe versus Wade—the case which established constitutional restrictions on the State's ability to regulate or restrict a woman's decision to have an abortion. In the year 1973, the Supreme Court asserted that the 14th amendment protects a woman's right to choose for herself whether to have an abortion. In the present year of 1992, I believe that our Government should continue to guarantee women this fundamental right of personal privacy.

Many women in 1973 must have viewed the Supreme Court's ruling in Roe versus Wade as an encouraging turning point in the way our courts recognize the rights of women under the Constitution. The Roe versus Wade decision at last offered a choice to many women who had been victims of rape or incest, but had been denied abortion as a legal option. Roe versus Wade offered a choice to many women whose lives would have been threatened by going through childbirth, but had been denied abortion as a legal option. And Roe versus Wade offered a choice to women who, for a variety of personal reasons, would prefer not to carry a pregnancy to term, but had earlier been denied abortion as a legal option.

In its 1973 ruling, the Supreme Court made a judgment about the risks involved with abortion. The Court concluded that the risk posed to a woman's health from undergoing an abortion during the first trimester of a pregnancy was no greater than the medical dangers of going through the full childbirth process. What protects a woman from risk from abortions is the very fact that, as a result of the Roe versus Wade decision, this procedure can be obtained legally and safely.

In 1992, however, the Court which 19 years ago so carefully analyzed the effects of abortion on women's health is now on the verge of making a decision that could profoundly endanger women's lives. Already, women in several States have found that their freedom of choice has been severely limited. In my home State of Minnesota, for example, according to a study released by the National Abortion Rights Action League Foundation this year, women face a high risk of losing their right to a legal abortion. Minnesota has been ranked as one of the 15 most likely States to outlaw or severely regulate abortion, should the Supreme Court overrule the Roe versus Wade ruling.

Also rated as a risky State in the same NARAL study was the State of Pennsylvania, one of many States which have enacted restrictive laws on abortion in recent years. It is this State's statute on abortion which the Supreme Court has agreed to review in the coming months. Whether the Court formally overrules Roe versus Wade in this case, or narrowly limits its decision to Pennsylvania's specific abortion regulations, its decision cannot help but have an effect on the right to personal privacy of women in all States. Should Pennsylvania's regulations be upheld by the High Court, what will stop lawmakers from making similar legislation in other States?

It is my belief that the Government should not be able to interfere with the most personal choice any woman might ever have to make. It is my hope that the Supreme Court will protect women against any further State erosion of a woman's individual rights. If, however, States are allowed to continue to create restrictive laws designed to make the option of abortion more difficult, then I certainly hope that policymakers will be able to unite on this divisive issue and secure women's freedom of choice in law.

If we fail to ensure that a woman's right to make her own childbearing decisions is not in any way restricted, then the lives of many Americans will be placed in great danger. The health of women who find themselves forced to seek illegal and unsafe abortions will be at risk. And our Nation's overall regard for women's rights will be at risk.

Let us not undermine the breakthrough made for women by the Supreme Court in 1973. Let us not jeopardize the right of a woman to choose whether she will bear children. Let us not place a woman's right to personal

privacy at risk. Instead, let us reaffirm those rights and give consistent support not only to those who choose to have children, but also to those who do not.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN P. MURTHA RECEIVES MINUTE MAN AWARD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, at its 1992 National Council Mid-Winter Banquet on January 22, has presented its Minute Man of the Year Award to Representative JOHN P. MURTHA of Pennsylvania. This award is presented annually by the ROA to "the citizen who has contributed most to national security in these times."

Mr. President, previous recipients of the ROA's annual Minute Man of the Year Award include Presidents Ford and Reagan; Senators Stennis, Jackson, Russell, THURMOND, NUNN, STEVENS, and BYRD of West Virginia; and Representatives Vinson, Rivers, Sikes, Hebert, McCormack, Laird, Albert, Mahon, MONTGOMERY, and others.

Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee has an outstanding record of service to our Nation as a civilian and a member of the Armed Forces. He retired from the Marine Corps Reserve as a colonel in 1990. His active duty included service in Vietnam in 1966–67, for which he volunteered, and during which he received the Bronze Star and two Purple Hearts.

Congressman MURTHA has worked hard to assure that America has a strong defense. His emphasis on upgrading the National Guard and Reserve Forces has been an important factor in assuring that our Nation can respond quickly and effectively to crises such as the recent Desert Shield and Desert Storm military actions in the Middle East.

Mr. President, I offer my congratulations to Congressman MURTHA and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of previous recipients of ROA's Minute Man of the Year Award.

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

PREVIOUS RECIPIENTS OF ROA'S ANNUAL MINUTE MAN OF THE YEAR AWARD

1958—Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff.
1959—Senator Richard B. Russell.
1960—Colonel Bryce N. Harlow.
1961—The Honorable Hugh M. Milton II.
1962—The Honorable Carl Vinson.
1963—The Honorable Dennis Chavez (posthumously).
1964—The Honorable Margaret Chase Smith.
1965—The Honorable L. Mendel Rivers.
1966—The Honorable John C. Stennis.
1967—The Honorable Robert L.F. Sikes.
1968—The Honorable F. Edward Hebert.
1968—Francis Cardinal Spellman (posthumously).
1969—The Honorable John W. McCormack.
1970—The Honorable Melvin L. Laird.
1971—The Honorable Strom Thurmond.
1972—The Honorable Carl Albert.
1973—The Honorable Henry M. (Scoop) Jackson.
1974—The Honorable George H. Mahon.
1975—The Honorable Gerald R. Ford.
1976—The Honorable John L. McClellan.
1977—The Honorable Bob Wilson.
1978—The Honorable Charles E. Bennett.
1979—The Honorable Milton R. Young.
1980—The Honorable Samuel S. Stratton.
1981—The Honorable John Goodwin Tower.
1982—The Honorable G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery.
1983—President Ronald W. Reagan.
1984—The Honorable Sam Nunn.
1985—The Honorable William L. Dickinson.
1986—The Honorable Ted Stevens.
1987—The Honorable Bill Chappell, Jr.
1988—The Honorable Caspar W. Weinberger.
1989—The Honorable John W. Warner.
1990—The Honorable Robert C. Byrd.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time for morning business has expired.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The Chair hearing no objection, morning business is extended for 3 minutes.

TRAVEL AND TOURISM

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, in my State of South Dakota, tourism is a major industry and a major employer. I previously served as chairman of the Tourism Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate. There are few areas that produce more hard currency for our country, and this is increasingly true as the number of visitors has increased. It is a major industry and should be recognized as such. I am proud to be a part of the tourism caucus in the U.S. Senate, and I am proud to be able to continue working to promote travel and tourism.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I ask my colleague from Wisconsin if he would mind yielding to me for 2 minutes.

Mr. KASTEN. The Senator has the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time for morning business has expired.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for up to 2 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the extension of morning business? The Chair hears none.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 minutes.

SENATOR SPECTER'S APPOINTMENT TO THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I was not on the floor last night when our distinguished Republican leader announced my appointment to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs. I wish to thank Senator DOLE for his very kind comments in announcing my appointment to that position. It is a very significant committee assignment, one which had been held by my distinguished colleague, the late Senator John Heinz. It is a position of great importance to my State, as the committee deals with housing, which is of tremendous concern in Pennsylvania, with mass transit, which is also of tremendous concern in Pennsylvania and with banking and the savings and loan matter.

On a personal note, the appointment enables me to carry forward a number of the important initiatives which had been on the agenda of Senator John Heinz.

I want especially to thank my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Senator DON NICKLES, for affording me this opportunity. Seniority on the Republican caucus operates by the principle of alphabetical order. Senator NICKLES had first choice on the committee assignment and, after discussing it with me, was gracious in yielding the position to me. Again, I thank Senator DOLE for his gracious remarks, and I thank Senator KASTEN for allowing me this floor time.

STRENGTHENING EDUCATION FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will resume consideration of S. 2. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2) to provide the achievement of national education goals, to establish a National Council on Education Goals and an Academic Report Card to measure progress on the goals, and to promote literacy in the United States, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Nickles Amendment No. 1479, to enhance educational opportunity, increase school attendance, and promote self-sufficiency among welfare recipients.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question before the Senate is on the Nickles amendment, amendment No. 1479.

AMENDMENT NO. 1482 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1479

(Purpose: To enhance educational opportunity, increase school attendance, and promote self-sufficiency among welfare recipients)

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I send a second-degree amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTEN], for himself, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. SMITH, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. COATS, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. WALLOP, proposes an amendment numbered 1482 to amendment No. 1479.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the word "Sec." and insert the following:

. STATE OPTION TO ESTABLISH LEARNFARE PROGRAMS.—Section 402(a) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" after paragraph (44);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (45) and inserting in lieu thereof "and;" and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(46) at the option of the State, provide that the needs of an individual will not be taken into consideration (or will be taken into consideration only in part) under paragraph (7) for any month if such individual—

"(A) is over the age specified in the applicable State compulsory school attendance law at which a child must begin to attend school, but under the age of 16; and

"(B) has, as determined by the State agency, failed without good cause to regularly attend an elementary, secondary, vocational school, or other appropriate school;

but if the needs of an individual are not considered (or are considered only in part) by reason of this paragraph, he shall still be considered to be receiving aid under this part for purposes of determining the eligibility for such aid of any other individual to whom paragraph (7) applies, and for purposes of determining eligibility for medical assistance under the State's plan approved under title XIX.".

(4) The effective date of this section shall be June 1, 1992.

Mr. KASTEN. The amendment is simply a date change, and I say to my colleagues that this amendment is relative and consistent, therefore, with the agreement that was reached last night.

Mr. President, I am in strong support of the efforts of the Senator from Oklahoma, and this amendment is designed to improve school attendance so that more students whose families receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children [AFDC], will complete their school education and will be better able to enter the work force.

I ask my colleagues this morning basically one simple question: What is wrong with providing incentives to encourage a child to go to school?

Mr. President, attending school is not a question of "maybe I will, maybe I will not." It is not a "maybe" kind of a question. It is a "you shall" kind of a question. You shall go to school. You shall complete your education. It is a must.

Learnfare is based on the premise that parents are responsible for their children, including that the parents ensure that the children attend school regularly. Wisconsin pioneered the first Learnfare Program in 1988. It took Wisconsin more than a year, more than 12 months, to obtain a Federal waiver from the Department of Health and Human Services to implement our creative Learnfare Program.

This Learnfare amendment will eliminate the need for States to obtain a Federal waiver in order to implement a Learnfare kind of program. We cannot continue, in my view, to let the bureaucratic clearance process bring innovative ideas to a screeching halt as we are searching for ways to improve our educational system.

Parental involvement—not Government interference—is the most important step to education reform. That is why it is so alarming that many parents do not even know if their kids are in school or not. Learnfare is an innovative way for parents to participate in the educational process through total communication with school administrators.

Mr. President, I also wish to make a general comment on education reform. We have a model of education that is riding the coattails of the early 20th century. America has changed tremendously since World War II, but schools are still operating under an antiquated system.

Children living in poor homes, broken homes, homes with ineffective parents are crying out now for help. Listen for a moment to a few of these alarming statistics: 20 percent of American children live in poverty; 32 percent of children in central cities—I am not talking about total—32 percent of children in central cities live in poverty; 44 percent of black children live in poverty; 38 percent of Hispanic children live in poverty; 50 percent of poor children do not finish high school—half do not finish high school. Fifty-three percent of all poor children are single-parent households headed by women; 24 percent of adults who did not complete high school live in poverty.

Clearly, our business as usual schools are not improving the overall welfare of children who are outside of the mainstream. My State of Wisconsin is moving ahead against the odds in trying to stimulate education reform for the poor and the middle class.

Wisconsin is leading the way with its choice program in Milwaukee and the Learnfare Program, which we are addressing with this amendment and its effort, also in Wisconsin, to pull together ideas for the new American school concept.

I think it is only right that this body support efforts similar to those in Wisconsin and the Nation in our tireless efforts to break the mold in education. I believe the time is running out on America's children and time is running out on America's education as usual. We have to act now. I hope we can act in a bipartisan manner to help rescue tomorrow's generation. That is why I support education reform and that is why I support this amendment, and I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] is recognized.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I wish to compliment my friend and colleague, Senator KASTEN from Wisconsin, for his statement, his leadership, and his second-degree amendment. I think the amendment that we are considering today is a very important amendment when we are talking about an education bill and trying to help those people who many times fall through the cracks. They do not get an education.

The amendment we are talking about, Learnfare, will allow States to put requirements on welfare recipients to have their children attend school.

I spent a little time this last recess traveling in the State of Oklahoma. I went through some housing projects. I went through areas of my State where we have a lot of people who are not graduating from high school. I went into some at-risk schools that are really trying to help people who are falling through the cracks. I also talked to some youngsters in some housing projects, mostly dependents of welfare parents, who were not in school and frankly, I wondered why.

I visited one welfare project; a mother of seven had all of her kids in school and she was very proud of the fact that her kids were making grades in school. I complimented her for it. I think it is fantastic that she has high aspirations for her children. She happened to be a daughter of a welfare mother, so she was second generation welfare, and her real hope was her children would not grow up in welfare. That is my hope, too.

I went through a couple of projects, and I saw children and parents and said, "You know we really have to do something different or these children are going to be basically enslaved into a welfare dependency." This is a terrible cycle. Instead of really helping these youngsters I think we are hurting them. Instead of helping the welfare families, I am afraid we are assigning them to a life of Government assistance. We need to break this mold, and the best way to break the mold, at least through this Senator's opinion, is through education.

It is not easy. The amendment that I am offering today is an amendment we

call "Learnfare." The essence of it is that it would allow States to put some requirements on welfare recipients to have their children attend school. If their children do not attend school, a State can withhold a portion of their welfare payments to families with dependent children and use a little carrot and stick that says, "yes, if you don't attend school you are going to receive a reduction in welfare benefits." Therefore, a welfare percent will have a real incentive to make sure their kids are in school. Financially it will make a difference.

We do not touch Medicaid and we do not touch food stamps, but only AFDC.

Some people will question, wait a minute, is this cruel to that family? I do not think so. I think really it might be a real blessing to a family if they keep their kids in school and give them an education. Education will get people off this welfare dependency cycle. Hopefully, if they get an education and get a job, they will be very productive, taxpaying citizens.

In some of the units I looked at, I am afraid, I saw youngsters who were dropping out of school, and in some cases their parents did not really care whether or not they are in school. These youngsters are getting an education, but the education is in crime. They cannot get a job, and they are not in school. What are they going to do? They are committing petty theft, doing a little vandalism, and the next thing you know delivering drugs. You know, a 15-year-old or 16-year-old kid and the only way they can pay for that car is to get involved in drugs.

So they become addicted to money and crime because that is their notion of how to be successful. They see friends who dropped out of school who are driving the fast cars and smoking marijuana or crack, and, well, if they just deliver a little bit they can make money too.

We have to break this cycle of generational welfare dependency. I do not think it is optional. It has to be done. We have to do everything we can to break this cycle.

This amendment will give the States some flexibility to target and to attack this problem. This is an idea which now is being talked about all across the country—and I compliment again the Senator from Wisconsin and I compliment the Governor of Wisconsin for being leaders of this. We have States all across the union that want to do this, but they run into a problem.

Why in the world will we not, as a Federal Government who pays about half of the cost of AFDC, encourage this on a national scale? I am not even trying to do that. I am just saying let us let the States do it.

You say some States are doing it. But to do this, they have to get permission from the Department of Health and Human Services.

Some people say, well, it makes sense. Federal involvement makes the program operate smoother and makes sure there will not be glitches or problems. The problem is the Department of Health and Human Services takes too long. They cannot make a decision, or they put so many requirements on the petitions that it takes forever for it to happen.

The State of Wisconsin took 18 months to obtain full approval of its entire program. The petitions that came from Wisconsin are a couple of inches thick. The bureaucracy saying no, we are not really interested in you doing this until you jump through every little hoop and hurdle we can impose on you. They make it almost impossible for the States to do.

You have State legislators and Governors of both parties that think this is a very good idea. They administer these programs and they think this is a good way that they can help put real incentives to get our country's youngsters in school. It will supplement State truancy laws. It will give an incentive for some families to keep their children in school. States want to pass these measures, but must run and get the blessing of the Federal Government to do so, and it takes too many months, too much bureaucracy, too much redtape, and too much expense, and they can hardly get it done.

Let us have a little faith in our Governors. I heard the Senator from Massachusetts talking about an idea, let's give more authority to the Governors in this block-grant type of approach done on S. 2. I compliment the Senator on much of S. 2. Why do we not have the confidence in Governors being able to administer this type of program, if the Governors and legislatures wish to pass it?

I tell you in my State, Oklahoma, the House of Representatives passed a program like this 91 to 5. They said yes, let us put in some kind of requirement. We are going to have a reduction in AFDC programs if individuals receiving those payments do not keep their kids in school. If the States want to have some flexibility for the youngster who will not go to school and the parent really tries, let us allow the States to do that.

I have confidence in the States. They can handle the difficult cases. I am sure there are some difficult cases where parents are really trying to get the kids to school, they maybe grab them by the ear take them all the way to school. The youngster, as soon as the parent leaves, takes off. There are youngsters that are very difficult to control. I have four youngsters and one or two of those have been a challenge, so I can understand that.

So if the States want to put in flexibility, let us allow the States to make some decisions. They are in charge of this program. The States are the ones who are most concerned about education, as they should be. They are the ones most directly impacted by crime and by welfare and the problems that welfare dependency has brought upon them. Let us give them a little opportunity, let us waive this requirement that they have to get the blessing of HHS before they make the linkage between compulsory school attendance and welfare. I think if we do so, we will have more welfare children attending school. That will be the net result. We will have more welfare children attending school and, likewise, getting a job, breaking this cycle of welfare dependency on the Federal Government. I think that it will be a positive step.

Mr. President, I might also mention that the amendment that Senator KASTEN and I are introducing is cosponsored by Senator SMITH, Senator D'AMATO, Senator COATS, Senator SYMMS, Senator BOREN, Senator THURMOND, Senator HELMS, and Senator WALLOP.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NICKLES. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KASTEN. First of all, I want to thank and congratulate the Senator for his amendment and also for his speech. And let me, if I can, just reemphasize one point. This does not mandate Learnfare. As a matter of fact, other States might call it something different.

What this does is simply give the States the opportunity to move forward on innovative educational programs for poor children. I know we have had hearings in Washington. I know we may have hearings in the future. The fact is that this does not affect anything we are doing except to make it possible for States to move forward once they—the Governors and the State legislatures—move forward. The Senator correctly stated that this gives the Governors and State legislatures the ability to break the mold, if you will.

I just simply want to share with you and my colleagues that in the first year in Wisconsin's program, 36 percent of the Learnfare population who were truant in the prior semesters immediately corrected their attendance problems and were never sanctioned. In other words, in the large group of people that had problems, their families simply got together and corrected the problems.

In Wisconsin, we had 27,000, roughly, teens who were subject to the Learnfare requirements the State legislature and Governor referred to; actually it was 27,061. Of those 27,061 people, only 2.8 percent of them ever found themselves subject to the sanctions which the State legislature and the Governor went forward with.

So in fact, the program and the consequences of parents giving up their responsibility for the education of their

children, the consequences of that act, worked in and of itself and we never had to put the law in force except for 2.8 percent. In other words 97.2 percent of this eligible population made the choice to go to school, and the penalties were imposed only on 2.8 percent. I do not have the statistics for how many months those penalties were in fact imposed.

But the point that the Senator is making is important. We are giving the States the opportunity, and here in Wisconsin it worked. I am hopeful that our amendment will be adopted.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for giving that excellent example.

The other part of the Wisconsin example that I am thinking of is that the Governor and the Legislature of Wisconsin petitioned for this waiver for its entire Learnfare Program and it took them over 18 months and, Mr. President, about 2 inches of paperwork between the Governor and the Secretary of HHS trying to meet the qualifications to obtain this waiver. It should not take a year-and-a-half once the Governor and legislature decide they want to implement a program and put our children in school.

I am delighted to hear 97 percent of youngsters in this category stayed in school. I think that is a great success. Even if it was not that high, I would still consider it quite a success if we are really encouraging and getting positive results of putting more people back into school who really were falling through the cracks, who were going to drop out. And, frankly, if they drop out again their likelihood of being unemployed is much greater, their likelihood of being on welfare is much, much greater, and unfortunately the likelihood of their being involved in crime increases dramatically as well. So education is a big key in solving and maybe breaking their welfare dependency cycle.

I think we ought to give the States the flexibility. Let us make this waiver automatic or eliminate the waiver requirements so they do not have to fight the bureaucracies in Washington, DC, and let them really get in, roll up their sleeves, and try and fight the welfare dependency and improve the quality of education in their States if they so choose.

Mr. BENTSEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, when I first looked at this amendment, I thought it was a benign amendment. I thought I liked the objective. I understand the sincerity of the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Wisconsin in trying to find ways to get people off welfare, and Learnfare sounds like a good title.

But then as I began to delve beneath the surface to see what was actually being accomplished by this amendment, I became concerned. I heard my friend from Wisconsin talking about an incentive. To me it looks like we are talking about punishment. Under this amendment a 6-year-old kid who has missed school because his mother is a drug addict would be asked to go without a warm coat. What that child needs is not punishment, but someone who will go to that mother, and try to get her off drugs.

A 1990 study of the Wisconsin Learnfare Program found that 41 percent of the children who were not maintaining the attendance level that is required—41 percent of them were from families where you had abused children, you had drug addicts, you had people where you needed some support to try to address the problems that need to be resolved to make it possible for a child to go to school on a regular basis.

What you are talking about in this amendment is not an insignificant change in the welfare system. You are talking about a very major change. And it ought to be made in the committee of jurisdiction. It ought to be given careful study before we start to unravel the Welfare Reform Act of 1988.

Remember the tough time we had getting that bill passed? My friend, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] played a major role, persuading the administration, Republicans and Democrats to all work together to bring about reform. It was a very significant achievement.

Senator MOYNIHAN is going to be having hearings on issues that are similar to those raised by this amendment. He is quite willing to include this amendment as part of those hearings and delighted to have the two Senators come and testify on it and see if we can come up with a reasoned, concerned, effective answer. We ought to have the full deliberation and consideration of the committee of jurisdiction. A change of this magnitude should not be accepted as a last-minute amendment to the legislation before us.

As chairman of the Finance Committee, about the president that passage of this amendment would set for the future. In my view it would be a mistake to open the door to amendments that would begin to undermine the national consensus that we now enjoy and that terms from the cooperative effort of Members from both sides of the aisle in passing the Family Support Act of 1988.

That does not mean that changes cannot or should not be made. But they ought to be made only after due consideration.

I have looked at some of the cosponsors of this amendment. We have some very able Members. But I have a hunch they have not really studied the consequences of what this amendment would bring about. Certainly we need more consideration than just debate today on this floor.

At the appropriate time, I will be moving to table this amendment when the vote comes up next Tuesday.

The substance of the Nickles-Kasten amendment is akin to similar proposals for changes in the welfare system that will be the subject of hearings on February 3 by the Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy.

I understand the appeal of a Learnfare concept, and I wholeheartedly endorse the goal of promoting educational attainment for all of our children. That is one of our biggest problems—having an educated work force in this country to maintain this Nation as a world competitor. I absolutely share the goal of a better education for children.

But let me point out that the State of Wisconsin began a Learnfare project in 1988 under a waiver granted by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. And, fortunately, when the Secretary granted that waiver, he also required an evaluation of the impact of the project so we could judge whether it set out a new policy for other States to follow.

I am told the report on the Learnfare project will be released by the Department of HHS as early as the end of this month. Let us wait for it.

Let us have it available in the committee to give it consideration. I would hope that the Senators would want to read that report before they pass an amendment as significant as this one.

The point has been made that States have to wait too long to bring about a change; it takes too long to get a waiver from the administration. I heard my friend from Oklahoma say that. I heard him say it took a year and a half for Wisconsin.

We called up the Department to try to understand how long it had taken because I agree a year and a half sounds like a long time. But, according to the Department of Health and Human Services, Wisconsin submitted its request for a waiver in May of 1987 and just 5 months later—5 months, not a year and a half—the Department approval had taken place. Wisconsin submitted a request for a waiver for a revised program in the spring of 1990. And that request was approved in June. That is a pretty quick response in the bureaucracies we have in Washington.

So the kind of program that the Senator is interested in can already be implemented without undue delay and, by all evidence, the Department of HHS has been working hard to accommodate States in this regard.

I will leave it to the junior Senator from Wisconsin to discuss some of these issues in more detail, some of the concerns that have arisen in the Learnfare Program in his State. But I urge my colleagues, this is not a throwaway amendment, this is not a throwaway vote. It can have some very serious consequences.

Let us in the Finance Committee that have the jurisdiction, let the senior Senator from New York who has made this one of the major issues in his legislative career who has a deep concern about attendance in school and education of children and making welfare work—he has been a leader in that regard—let him handle it. Let us be cautious and not open the door to major policy changes without giving them the deliberate consideration they deserve.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support my motion to table.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to table the Nickles and Kasten amendment occur at 2:20 p.m. on Tuesday, January 28 with the preceding 5 minutes equally divided between Senator NICKLES and Senator KASTEN and myself, as chairman of the Finance Committee.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the Senator modify that to give each side at least 5 minutes?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand the desire to be able to give an explanation. I would like to, if it is agreeable with the chairman of the Finance Committee, try to work a process out with the majority leader. I am unaware now of the total number of amendments we are going to have and there have been a number of requests to speak on a variety of different amendments at different times.

Just so we have some degree of consistency in terms of how we are going to treat all the amendments—I can understand the desire to have an explanation for those. What I would like to try at least to be able to do is to have some consistency about how we are going to treat all of the amendments. I would be glad to work this out with my friend and colleague, the Senator from Utah, with the minority leader, and I would like to talk to the majority leader and indicate to him the requests that have come and leave it up to him to be able to describe a formulation that will be fair and equitable to all.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, I defer to the manager of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I understand the problem.

Mr. KENNEDY. I have no objection if the Senator wants to schedule this for the first amendment on Tuesday afternoon. If that is the desire of the Senator, I would certainly support that request.

Mr. KASTEN. I have no objection to the request.

I wonder if the Senator will yield for just one brief clarification?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. KASTEN. I thank the Senator.

Both he and the Senator from Oklahoma are correct with regard to the time agreement. There was a waiver that was granted within 5 months for one age group. It was the older age group. I will have the information on Monday if it is important. But for the younger age group we had to go through a longer process for the waivers and it was, as the Senator from Oklahoma pointed out, roughly 18 months.

So one waiver came through for older children in about 5 months but the entire Learnfare Program of the State that the State legislature and Governor passed was not okayed until 18 months later. In effect, both Senators are right. It was, in effect, a bureaucratic problem we were faced with and that is what we are trying to get through with our amendment.

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will yield to further clarify that? I will be happy to insert this for the RECORD, but the original Learnfare request by Wisconsin was filed in October 1987. The waiver request for the last age group, the younger age group down to age 6, was not approved until June 1990. So it was approved in different stages. But the point is that the Governor and legislature tried to move forward and we are talking about almost 3 years by the time they covered all age groups as the legislature wished to do. So it is a bureaucratic process.

Concerning the Senator's unanimous consent——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will withhold. There is a unanimous-consent request before the Senate. Does the Senator from Texas insist on his request, withdraw it, or revise it?

Mr. BENTSEN. The Senator from Texas will withdraw it until we can arrive at a resolution of the problem with the majority leader and the manager of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas withdraws the request and he retains the floor.

Mr. BENTSEN. I would say to my colleagues, I question the length of time. I have a hunch when we do some further checking we will have further clarification over the difference in the interpretation as to how long it took to get the waiver from HHS.

But, Mr. President, I yield the floor. I see my distinguished friend from Wisconsin is waiting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas yields the floor.

Who seeks recognition?

Mr. KOHL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL].

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield for just 2 minutes on this matter?

Mr. KOHL. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. First of all, I want to express our appreciation and gratitude to the chairman of the Finance Committee for his leadership on this particular issue. I think he has outlined some of the very serious problems that such an amendment would present for the educational development of many of the neediest children in our society.

You find that the families of many of the children on Aid to Families with Dependent Children are homeless. These children are moving through five or six schools in the course of a year as these families try to find housing and other essential services. This is an enormously complicated issue. I think the chairman of the Finance Committee has outlined the complex implications of this amendment for our most vulnerable children, many of them in their earliest of years.

I am in complete accord with the chairman of the Finance Committee that this is an area the Finance Committee should review and make recommendations. We will work very closely with the chairman, looking forward to review the recommendations of the Finance Committee. I urge all of our Members to support this motion to table. It makes sense, not only on the jurisdictional grounds, but most importantly, in terms of the education of our children who face the most difficult challenges.

The chairman of the Finance Committee has outlined the reasons for giving this further study in the committee, and I urge my colleagues to support the motion to table the amendment when it comes up. I am grateful to the Senator from Texas for making these very important points on the floor this morning. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. KOHL. Thank you, Mr. President.

I also would like to express my appreciation to the Senator from Texas for his interest in this very important subject and for his thoughtful comments.

I also would like to express my appreciation to the Senator from Texas for his interest in this very important subject and for his thoughtful comments.

Along with him, I rise to oppose the Nickles-Kasten amendment.

The amendment before us would provide a blanket waiver to any State that chooses to implement a so-called Learnfare program. Apparently the authors of the amendment want to eliminate the process that my State of Wisconsin had to go through to get our Learnfare waiver approved. They were, I suppose, frustrated by the length of time it took to get the waiver and the fact that certain conditions where attached to the program before the waiver was granted.

I was not frustrated by the process. I was, in fact, very pleased with the way the process unfolded, and I want to see it continue. Let me briefly tell you why.

I should begin by telling you that Learnfare, in essence, involves a simple concept: We ought to hold parents—in this case AFDC clients—responsible for getting their children to school.

I support that concept. We probably all do. It makes intuitive sense. It is consistent with the concept of parental and individual responsibility. It is a good idea.

But, as is so often the case, the devil is in the details. And there are a lot of details and a lot of different forms of Learnfare.

In Wisconsin, Learnfare has bipartisan roots. The idea originated from a task force controlled by Democrats. The legislation that created the program was passed by Democrats in the State legislature.

The program that was passed, and that I supported, allowed us to sanction parents whose children did not go to school regularly. They lost welfare payments. But they also got something: case management.

We recognized that truancy is a problem, but was also recognized that truancy is often a sign of other problems. Often, these children are from families with multiple problems, like substance abuse, child abuse, lack of child care, transportation, et cetera.

So the idea was to identify troubled families and intervene: Provide access to needed social services, and then pull AFDC benefits for not complying with mandatory school attendance.

But once the politics took over the issue, two things became clear: No. 1, bashing welfare recipients makes great political hay; and No. 2, States can save a lot of money by denying welfare benefits. As a result, those social service components of Learnfare can be very vulnerable. They can be eliminated. And then all that is left is the sanction—the loss of AFDC funds—rather than the sanction and the support.

The waiver process that the Senator from Oklahoma is seeking to eliminate is one of the best tools we have to preserve both the sanctions and the support.

And that is what happened in Wisconsin. The original Wisconsin Learnfare waiver request was, frankly, rubberstamped by the Reagan White House. It was not reviewed; it was just approved. As a result, we had a program in place which required no evaluation, no social service support, and no State accountability to speak of.

The consequence of short circuiting the waiver process were disastrous by most measures. There was no attendance monitoring system in place. The record system was seriously flawed. There was no advance warning to families; many of them had their checks cut without even knowing that their children were truant. And some even lost their homes as a result. Between September 1988 and December 1989, the families of 6,612 Milwaukee County teens were sanctioned for failure to meet the Learnfare school attendance requirements. A preliminary study and evaluation by the Employment and Training Institute at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee confirmed some of our worst fears: 2,722 of the sanctioned children were from families that the Children's Court had already identified as child-abusing and neglecting families; 41 percent of the families needed intervention and the likelihood was that the reduction of AFDC benefits increased the child abuse and neglect.

Additionally, the preliminary report identified a waiting list for alternative education slots for the dropouts, along with lack of access to needed services.

Despite the serious concerns with the program, the State of Wisconsin approached the Department of Health and Human Services on September 12, 1989 for an extension of the Learnfare waiver. Between that time and June 6, 1990, when a modified waiver was granted, there were serious, sustained and substantive discussions about the nature of the program. I participated in those discussions. I wanted Wisconsin to get the waiver, but I also wanted to make sure that Wisconsin had a good program.

Because negotiations were required, because the waiver was not automatic, I think the Wisconsin Learnfare Program has a much better chance of accomplishing its goal. If fully implemented by the required State legislation, it will be a better program because of the checks and balances that do and should exist between the State and Federal Governments.

JoAnn Barnhardt, Assistant Secretary for Family Support, did a brilliant job of balancing the needs of the AFDC clients with the needs of the State in terms of flexibility and innovation. The Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Martin Gerry, was extremely helpful in improving the evaluation of this program. Accountability was built into Learnfare and evaluation was required.

In fact, that evaluation of the Learnfare program should be released next week. It will give use a sense of what does and does not work in this area. It will tell us what we have done wrong and what we are doing right in this important social experiment.

The amendment before us, Mr. President, would circumvent both the process of negotiation and evaluation. It requires no accountability on the part of the States; in fact, no reporting of any kind. It is an abrogation of our responsibilities here on the Federal level.

The chairman of the Finance Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy chaired one hearing on Learnfare in June 1990 at my request. It was very helpful and very constructive in our effort to design a good Learnfare program for Wisconsin. I am certain that the chairman would be willing to hold hearings on the process of granting waivers to similar programs. In committee, we could examine some of the process questions this amendment raises. And, as a result, we might produce a piece of legislation which is more sophisticated than simplistic.

Let me conclude, Mr. President, by making just a few points.

First, this is not a debate about the value of Learnfare as a concept. Members can support that concept, as I do, and vote against this amendment, as I will.

Second, this is a debate about whether or not the Federal Government has a right and a responsibility to review and approve—and improve, if needed—State plans which effect Federal funds and federally granted benefits.

Third, the history of Wisconsin's Learnfare program demonstrates that Federal involvement is both helpful and necessary. Because of Federal involvement, Learnfare in Wisconsin will be substantially different. It will have sanctions, but it will also have support for families and children in trouble.

Fourth, if people support Learnfare as a concept, then they ought to support a full exploration and examination of the best way to implement such programs. That is why we ought to have hearings on this issue. There is no need and no justification, for a rush to judgment on the floor. The Finance Committee is willing to work on this issue. We ought to be willing to let them. And we ought to recognize that we can benefit from their work.

So I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment so that we can get on with the task of developing real legislation to deal with this important problem.

Thank you, Mr. President.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, we have discussed this now with the authors of the amendment on both sides, and the majority leader, and I understand it is cleared with the Republican leader.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to table the Nickles amendment occur at 2:20 p.m. on Tuesday, January 28, with the preceding 10 minutes equally divided among Senator NICKLES, Senator KASTEN, and the chairman of the Finance Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas desire to make the tabling motion?

Mr. BENTSEN. I have been advised to change that to 2:25.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair was inquiring whether or not the Senator from Texas desires to make a tabling motion and make provision, therefor, at this time?

Mr. BENTSEN. Yes; I will move to table the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator include that in his request?

Mr. BENTSEN. I ask that be included in my request, the preceding statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The question is whether or not the vote will occur at 2:25.

Mr. BENTSEN. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With 10 minutes prior thereto, debate occurring thereon, and with a motion to table in order. Is there objection?

Mr. NICKLES. We have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection. It is so ordered.

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN].

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I wish to emphatically associate myself and my colleagues on the Finance Committee with that last observation of my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. The Finance Committee not only is willing to take up this question, it is anxious to do; it is seized of the subject. I could say to my friend and we will, in fact, hold hearings on this matter Monday, February 3, a week from now. I say to my friends on this side of the aisle, and particularly to my friend from Wisconsin, and my friend from Oklahoma, we are not hostile to your purpose, not at all.

We would like to be orderly and concentrated when we go forward. When we passed the Family Support Act in 1988, we provided that any mother receiving welfare benefits who had not graduated from high school and was not in school must return to school, finish high school or the equivalent, on pain of losing her benefits. This is not a matter that we thought marginal.

We have since learned from what is now about 3 years in the field—not long in these matters but something—when the States have set out to enforce the provisions of the Family Support Act about job training or education, overwhelmingly they have found that what was needed was education. Job training was marginal. If you get that education, you will find yourself work.

So we do not in any way oppose the idea that for every right there is a responsibility; that there is not entitlement, sir, that does not carry with it an obligation. We said over and over again in the Family Support Act that society has to help persons who are dependent, and they have to help themselves.

If I may make the point, in thanking the Senators from Wisconsin, both of them, for bringing this up, we are not talking about a marginal matter. We have been developing on the Finance Committee some statistics on this. We claim to have developed the first equivalent of an unemployment rate for dependency. And I might say that it is maybe not generally known that it was only quite recently that we have learned to measure unemployment. The mathematics, the statistical techniques of sampling, just were not there.

If you pick up the Economic Report of the President, which was created by the Employment Act of 1946, you will find that the first unemployment rate comes in 1948. We used to take the unemployment rate 10 years, in the census that we took in the spring of 1930, spring of 1940, and so on. And officially there was no depression, because nothing happened by the spring of 1930 and rearmament was upon us by 1940.

I can now say to Senators and our beloved President pro tempore, we can show that going on one-third of the children born in the United States in 1980 will have been on welfare before they are age 18; going on one-third—30.2 percent. That means they will have been paupers—not a pretty word, but not a pretty condition. The actual historical experience of the cohort born in 1967, 1968, 1969—the Michigan Study of Dynamics we set up under OEO—was that almost one-quarter of those children were, on welfare and of that number, sir, I have to report to the Senate, the rate for black children was 72 percent.

At this moment, when we are thinking of unemployment, which was the classic problem of industrialization, there are twice as many AFDC cases as there are unemployment cases in the United States—twice as many. So we do not in any way resist the thought that this Learnfare matter should be looked at to see what we find, see if it makes sense.

Most of us in this room are parents—most of us with gray hair are parents—and if you have ever really put your mind to telling a 17-year-old what to do, you know you have difficulties that are not always resolved.

The Senator from Wisconsin, who just spoke, very correctly pointed out that the Learnfare at first had no controls. Now, that is a statistical term which means the group to which nothing is done. So you can see what, if anything, are the different experiences of those for which something is done. Medicine does that all the time by giving you placebos. You take this pill, which is no pill; you take the real pill, and then you find out.

My great friend, Fredrick Mosteller, professor of mathematical statistics at Harvard, once said someone told him that they did not have any controls because it was only an experiment. And if you have no controls, you will not know anything. You will not know anything for a decade anyway.

I have said several times on this floor that by the year 2000, we will have some feeling whether the Family Support Act is working. You do not get into this kind of fix over 50 years and get out of it in 5 months. This has all come on us since about the mid-1960's. We have seen welfare benefits for children cut 42 percent. If you had said in 1965, let us cut the amount of food children get by half, people would say you are a monster. But we did it.

We do not have records. The majority leader has just informed me, I inform the Senate, he will be calling up Calendar No. 305, which is a bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop and implement an information gathering system measuring and reporting on welfare dependency. JoAnn Barnhardt and Martin Gerry, as the Senator from Wisconsin observed, have been very cooperative in developing this idea.

Again, the economic report took a long time to have real substance. But the time came when it did. Now we knew something about unemployment.

So I would just say to my friends, when we move to table, as has been done, it is not in an adversarial mode at all. It is, rather, in a way, if I could say, to thank them for bringing this up, and to assure them that we are seeing to the matter; to invite them, if either would like to testify, to open the testimony Monday a week from now. They will be welcomed, and I would hope they might find the opportunity either to come or, if there is a more convenient date, we will make another date available.

A statement would be very welcome. You are onto the issue. The issue of dependency defines our time. It is the defining issue of a postindustrial society.

With that, Mr. President, I see both my colleagues have risen, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin Mr. [KASTEN].

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, first, I have a parliamentary inquiry. I understand there was a time limit on the debate for this amendment. Are we still within that time limit? Otherwise, I would ask unanimous consent that I proceed——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request of the Senator from Texas was for Tuesday next. It did not put a time limit on today's debate on this amendment.

Mr. KASTEN. I thank the Chair.

I simply want to reply very briefly to the Senator from New York. First of all, I thank the Senator for his statement in saying that, in effect, we want to look at a lot of different ideas, and this is one of the ideas we ought to look at.

I thank him for his openness, and I obviously appreciate his lifelong interest and success in welfare reform and in a lot of the issues that we are associated with, the issues around this amendment.

He is right; we do not at this time have any statistics, but I have impor-

tant anecdotal evidence which I would like to share.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Will the Senator yield for one comment? Data is the plural of anecdote.

Mr. KASTEN. From three anecdotes, two in Milwaukee and one in Rock County, let me give the flavor of what is happening in Wisconsin right now with regard to this program.

This is a 17-year-old male in Rock County, a rural area between Milwaukee, WI, and Madison, WI. A 17-year-old male using drugs and alcohol was skipping school. His mother was unaware of his attendance problem until the welfare grant cut under Learnfare.

The mother confronted the 17-year-old son with evidence of nonattendance and learned of the drug-alcohol problem. The mother insisted that the son receive treatment for his chemical dependency and return to school, which ultimately he did. The son raised his test average by 70 percent, plans to graduate with his class this year, and wants to go to college and become an airline pilot.

Learnfare is the catalyst to put this family together to address not only the education problem but also the drug problem, and we have put them altogether. We have him back in school; we also have him in a treatment facility.

Another example: In Milwaukee, a teen parent experienced problems in regular school, with family, said she was "ready to drop out." That individual now attends a Learnfare-funded alternative education program. It is called the Project Second Chance, a spinoff of Learnfare through the Milwaukee Vocational Technical College. She is now an honor student who will graduate this month, plans to pursue nursing or a related medical field through college.

In February 1990, this same individual addressed the seventh annual Special Needs Conference. This Special Needs Conference is sponsored by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. She was guest speaker at this conference, received a standing ovation from an audience of over 200 individuals.

A final example, just one of the three I have: This is a teen parent with two children. This teen parent dropped out of school. She returned after being contacted by a Learnfare case manager in November 1988.

She enrolled in an alternative program called Learning Enterprise, again a spinoff of what we are trying to do here, funded through Learnfare. She has now received her high school equivalency diploma, met with the Governor through the learning experience on Milwaukee Day. This is one more of the anecdotes that are working.

Finally, Mr. President, our Wisconsin program, in addition to being recognized by the Federal Government, is something that is now working. It has been honored by other impartial observers. Learnfare, for example, was a semifinalist in the 1990 Innovations State and Local Government Awards Program. This is a program sponsored by the Ford Foundation and John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, which recognizes State and local government projects that successfully address some of today's most difficult policy problems.

My point here is, the Senator is right, we do not have all the numbers, but we certainly have some interesting success stories from which we can build, and I look forward to appearing before the Senator's committee with regard to the hearings.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that a letter endorsing the Nickles-Kasten amendment on the Learnfare way be printed in the RECORD at this point as if read.

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

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, WI, January 23, 1992.

Sen. ROBERT W. KASTEN, Jr.,
Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: I applaud you and Senator Don Nickles for introducing an amendment to remove federal obstacles for states that wish to enact "Learnfare" programs.

I fought hard for Learnfare in Wisconsin because it is good public policy, and because it just makes good sense. One of the most pernicious poverty traps is the lack of an education. Staying in school gives you the skills to escape the welfare rolls, and embark on a productive, independent life. It also gives you a sense of self-respect and accomplishment.

If Learnfare can break the cycle of poverty for one young mother or one welfare family, I think it is a program well worth supporting. I hope your colleagues in the Senate will agree with me.

Best regards,

TOMMY G. THOMPSON,
Governor.

Mr. KASTEN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN].

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, may I simply thank the Senator from Wisconsin for the information he just brought to us. Do not disparage the anecdotal. As I said, data is plural of anecdote. He knows how big a problem it is. He knows how difficult it is.

I want to welcome the Senator's statement that he would appear before our committee, the Finance Committee. I only take exception to his one phrase when he spoke of the success which the Senator from New York has had in this area. I have had no success. I have simply studied the subject for 30 years now, stayed with it, and I begin to see other people recognize its importance as well. That is a measure of success. But the problem keeps getting worse. It may be it could be worse yet. But that again we do not have the data on.

I thank the Senator very much. I look forward to hearing from him.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. METZENBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM].

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Nickles amendment may be temporarily laid aside in order that I may send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1483

(Purpose: To discourage States from offering tax incentives that reduce the amount of Federal, State, or local funds available in such State for educational purposes)

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM] proposes an amendment numbered 1483.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

In the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . STATE EDUCATIONAL FUNDING AND STATE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUNDING OR STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No State shall be eligible to receive Federal funds appropriated and or designated for State economic development purposes or State industrial grants, if such State or political subdivision, or agency or other entity of such State offers, permits or grants a tax incentive, as defined in subsection (b), that relieves a taxpayer from paying any State or local tax which would otherwise be payable for the direct or indirect support of primary and secondary education.

(b) DEFINITION OF TAX INCENTIVE.—For the purpose of subsection (a), the term "tax incentive" means the abatement of tax, the exemption from tax, the deferral of tax, the reduction of tax, the diversion of tax payments and/or the authorization of payments in lieu of taxes which are offered, permitted or granted to a private corporation for profit, a nonprofit community redevelopment corporation, an individual, or any other entity engaged in economic development, for the purpose of promoting new economic development and/or the retention and/or expansion of existing facilities within the State, and which results in a loss of revenue which, but for the abatement of tax, the exemption from tax, the deferral of tax, the reduction of tax, the diversion of tax payments and/or the authorization of payments in lieu of taxes, would be payable for education purposes.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to an issue that is having a very profound effect on the ability of our public schools to educate young people in America today.

It is a matter that no one seems to want to talk about when we consider

the subject of what to do about the crisis in American education.

The issue I am talking about is the growing problem of American companies demanding sizable tax breaks from their communities, tax breaks that cut into funds that pay for local public schools. Local property tax abatement is a growing and serious problem that has pitted nearly every city and every State in vicious competition to attract and retain industry and jobs. Businesses want to pay less, and they know that they have local communities over a barrel.

I do not criticize the businesses for doing that. That is part and parcel of the way it is done today. And the businesses say that if they do not get the tax breaks they want, they threaten to leave town, taking jobs with them.

But the impact upon our American school system when one community competes with another has been horrendous. The loss of school revenue caused by these tax breaks is seriously affecting the ability of local schools to do the job we expect them to do—buy books, hire teachers at decent wages, maintain buildings, educate our children, and transform them into productive citizens.

Very few corporate CEO's or plant managers these days expect to pay the same rate of tax as the local residents of the community. I am frank to say I do not blame them. I do not blame them for seeking to get these additional tax incentives. It becomes part and parcel of the system. As a consequence, the corporate CEO's demand incentive packages that can wind up taking millions of dollars out of local schools.

What is particularly ironic about this is that it is American business leaders who chronically decry the state of American education. In speech after speech, it is our corporate CEO's who state that an educated, literate work force is the key to American competitiveness. They pontificate on the importance of education. They point out their magnanimous corporate contributions to education in one breath, and then they pull the tax base out from under local schools in the next.

Is it their fault? No; I do not really think so. I guess, if I were a corporate executive, I might be doing the very same thing as a matter of responsibility to the corporate shareholders. It is only if we here in Congress do something about it to prevent this competitiveness between various local communities that we are going to be able to bring it to a halt.

I do not believe we can call upon any particular corporate executive not to go forward and seek additional tax advantages, to get tax abatement, but I think that we can do something about the subject here in the U.S. Congress.

Let me tell you the problem. Last week the New York Times reported that New York State and local governments grant as much as $500 million a year in tax breaks to business.

Much of that money comes right out of the schools.

And there is no evidence that tax incentives even create jobs.

There is no evidence that tax incentives are a major factor in attracting businesses to communities in the first place.

I have here a study by two Purdue University professors on the subject of local tax abatement and enterprise zones in Indiana. They found that in 1988, the city of Gary, IN, paid $73,654 in local property tax subsidies for every single job created in its enterprise zone.

South Bend, IN, paid $173,539 for every new job.

That means that each new job, assuming it pays an average of $25,000 a year, which is on the high side—is completely subsidized by the taxpayers of South Bend for nearly 7 years.

That is money directly out of the public school system.

Indianapolis, the city that won the much touted development plum of 1991, the United Airlines maintenance facility.

What did it cost?

It cost $364 million in State and local grants and tax subsidies, including $70 million in tax increment financing bonds, a highly speculative endeavor in which future increases in local property tax revenues are pledged to pay off the bondholders.

Am I criticizing United Airlines for going all over the country to try to get the best deal it could? No. I think their corporate executives were doing probably what they should have been doing for their stockholders. But we must put an end to this competitiveness, as one community competing against another, giving away more and more of the tax dollars needed to operate the community, as well as the public school system. Because in these efforts, it means we are taking more money out of the schools.

And if property values go down the schools lose even more.

In most States, local school boards have no role in negotiating or finalizing tax abatement agreements between businesses and local governments. They are completely cut out of the process. That is not to say that the schools are not concerned. They are.

School boards in Ohio and Texas have gone to court demanding greater say in tax abatement decisions. School boards in Minnesota have demanded and won tighter restrictions on the use of tax increment financing.

Last year, the National School Boards Association commissioned a survey of the Nation's 13,000 school districts to investigate the effects of corporate exemptions on public school finances. Local boards were asked whether they had lost money as a result of tax abatement, and if so, how much over the previous year.

Although the survey is not yet complete, the initial returns are enough to concern any parent who has kids in public school, enough to concern every Member of the U.S. Senate, because the issue is not a particular problem for Ohio, it is not particular problem for Utah, or for Indiana, or for California, or West Virginia; it is a problem that is endemic to the entire Nation.

Danville, IL, reported losing $111,000 in 1990.

Poudre School District in Colorado lost $497,000.

Cedar Rapids, IA, School District lost $500,000.

Plaquemines Parish School Board in Louisiana lost over $1 million.

St. Louis, MO, public schools lost $17 million, 13 percent of its $226 million budget.

Philadelphia lost $24 million.

The list goes on: Las Vegas, NV; Rome, NY; Canton, OH; Trenton, OH; Slippery Rock, PA; Memphis, TN; Dallas, TX; Fort Worth, TX; Beloit, WI; Montgomery, AL; Wichita, KS. All lost money for schools, and so did many others.

Two weeks ago, the New York Times ran a story about the furious competition between Arlington, TX, and Ypsilanti, MI, to keep their General Motors assembly plants.

Arlington officials were completing an incentive package offering GM tax breaks between $7 million and $10 million, most of which would come straight out of the pocket of the local schools.

General Motors is one of the most relentless pursuers of local tax abatement. In an April 21, 1991, article, the Washington Post reported that GM's successful effort to cut by over $1 million its annual taxes in Tarrytown, NY forced the town to lay off dozens of teachers and administrators, eliminated new library books and school supplies, and postponed school repairs.

And as a condition for locating its new Saturn factory in Spring Hill, TN, GM forced the local government to waive all property taxes until 1995.

In fact, GM will not be liable for the full taxable value of the Tennessee Saturn plant until the year 2025. By that time, the plant will be obsolete.

Corporations in my own city of Cleveland, I am sorry to say, have depleted the school system of more than $100 million in tax revenues, according to the president of the school board.

Last year, the Cleveland Society Center, a new downtown hotel and office building was given a 100-percent property tax exemption, which cost the Cleveland schools $4.8 million. I am pleased to have that new hotel and office building in downtown Cleveland, but I do not believe that it ought to be built at the expense of the kids who go to school in the city of Cleveland.

Again, I want to repeat that I do not point my finger at the developers and say you should not have done this. It is perfectly appropriate for them to do it, as long as it is permitted under the law, and it is probably part of their corporate responsibility to do it. Whatever we might want to call it for the corporate executives, the only way we can put a stop to it is by the amendment I have submitted on the floor of the Senate.

The Florida State Department of Revenue estimates businesses in that State received tax concessions amounting to $500 million last year, while the State's business contributed little more than $32 million to public education.

That is the issue, Mr. President.

For all our hand-wringing about what is wrong with American education.

For all the billion-dollar programs we come up with.

For all the platitudes coming out of corporate America about contributing to the education of America's youngsters.

The issue is—businesses are contributing to the problem, not helping to solve it. They are not to blame; we are to blame, if we do not do something about it. They are taking out essential revenues needed to educate our kids—and they are calling it economic development.

I believe it is time corporate America came to grips with what it is doing here.

Sure, businesses face intense pressures in competing, but they will not be able to compete in future years, unless the children of America are educated. And you cannot educate the children of America by cutting down on the dollars available to pay for the teachers and the school books, buildings and janitors and all of the other things that are needed in a school system.

Sure, they have the option of taking jobs overseas where labor is cheaper and taxes are lower.

But what about their rhetoric about education, what about their commitment to the community?

Have the 1990's completely absolved business from any moral commitment to the community whatsoever?

It is an endless circle, Mr. President. Businesses criticize the job our schools are doing, and then proceed to nail down every tax break they can get, further eroding the schools' ability to do the job. They will continue to do it, unless we put a halt to it here in the Congress of the United States. I do not say this in a negative pejorative way. I say it because I think it is good for America, and I think that the business community would accept it as being good for America, but recognizing that if they can get those breaks, of course they are going to try to get them.

I say that it is time for us here in Congress to have impact on this issue. This is a fine educational bill that we have before us. We can make it a better educational bill. We can help to solve the problems of our schools by enacting this amendment.

I believe the only effective way to end the competition is for the Federal Government to simply prohibit all communities from giving tax breaks that reduce the amount of revenue available for schools. If nobody can do it, then nobody is at a competitive advantage nor competitive disadvantage.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the current amendment be temporarily set aside and that I be permitted to propose another amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is a question in the Chair's mind as to whether or not it was the intent of Senators to set aside the Kasten amendment and the Nickles amendment until Tuesday next. The Chair would interpret the intent being the order that was entered at the request of the Senator from Texas carried with it the Kasten amendment. Technically, once it is temporarily laid aside——

Mr. NUNN. I will restate the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not the Senator's fault. I am trying to clarify the RECORD.

The intent, as the Chair interprets it, is that I think all Senators had in mind that the Kasten amendment would likewise go over until next Tuesday. Technically, if that is not the case, would the Senator from Georgia yield the Senator from Ohio so that he might clarify this question so that there is no longer floating around here the idea that the Kasten amendment and the Nickles amendment are still before the Senate but they are just temporarily laid aside?

Mr. NUNN. I say to the Chair, and my friend from Ohio, I could restate the unanimous-consent request and perhaps that will clarify it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Nickles amendment be laid aside until 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, January 28, and the Metzenbaum amendment be laid aside until recalled by Senator METZENBAUM.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The problem with the request, if the Senators will indulge the Chair, it makes no mention of the Kasten amendment. The Kasten amendment in the second degree is still pending. Of course if the motion is made to table the Nickles amendment on Tuesday next it would carry with it the Kasten amendment. But technically the Kasten amendment has not been included in any of the requests that have been made.

Mr. NUNN. If the Chair will permit, I will rephrase the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Nickles amendment and the Kasten amendment be laid aside until 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, January 28, and that the Metzenbaum amendment be laid aside until recalled by Senator METZENBAUM.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered, and the Chair again thanks the Senator from Georgia.

AMENDMENT NO. 1484

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, in just a moment I will send an amendment to the desk, but I will go ahead and explain the amendment so that Senator BREAUX, who is one of the primary coauthors of the amendment and will shortly be on the floor, will also address the amendment when he comes to the floor. I will send it to the desk on behalf of the two of us and on behalf of Senator PRYOR, Senator BOREN, and Senator LIEBERMAN.

This amendment we are offering today establishes a national youth apprenticeship demonstration program. I introduced this proposal as a separate bill along with other Senators and that bill is designated S. 2059 during the last session.

There was counterpart and is counterpart legislation offered in the House by Congressman DAVE MCCURDY of Oklahoma.

We offer this amendment for a very simple reason. I do not believe we can talk meaningfully about educational reform in our country without recognizing the deficiencies in the preparation of those young people who do not go to college—non-college-bound youth—for the skills that they must have if they are going to successfully contribute to the workplace.

This amendment will establish a 5-year youth apprenticeship demonstration program and a public/private Institute for Youth Apprenticeships to oversee the demonstration program and make recommendations on how our Nation can best create a permanent and national system of apprenticeships. I believe this is the kind of contribution to educational innovation that the Federal Government is in the best position to make: seed money to investigate ideas that we know have great potential merit but which need to be tested under real-life circumstances around the country.

The case for a special effort in skills training in America is made every day by statistics which vividly show that we are not keeping up in America with the ever changing demands of the workplace. The General Accounting Office has estimated that 9 million of the Nation's 33 million youth aged 16 to 24 will not have the needed skills to meet employer requirements for entry-level positions. It is no wonder the businesses of America are spending an estimated $30 billion a year to provide basic skill training to American workers, and I do not think it is sufficient.

Our task will not get any easier in the future, when even more skills will be necessary in the American workforce. A task force of the Center for Strategic and International Studies found that the percentage of our jobs considered unskilled is steadily shrinking, from 60 percent in 1960, which were unskilled jobs, to 35 percent in 1990, to an estimated 15 percent in the year 2000. In other words, by the year 2000, 85 percent of the jobs in America are estimated to be skilled jobs. If we do not begin to catch up in skills training right now, we may find ourselves and our economy hopelessly off target in the near future.

Apprenticeships would supply supervised work experience during high school promoting not only desirable work habits but specific job-based skills that can be certified just like any other educational proficiency level. As many Senators know, youth apprenticeships have already proven themselves to be successful really for many years in Europe, going back centuries in some countries in Europe, including Germany, England, Sweden, and also in Japan.

I do not suggest that we duplicate any other country's program. Instead, we in America should adopt a principle of comprehensive, work-based, competency-tested skills learning programs to our own culture, our own economy, and our own educational system. The demonstration programs offered in this amendment provide the best available means of making that adaptation.

Each program will establish a partnership between secondary and postsecondary schools and the businesses and employers of America. In the 10th grade, students will sign contracts with employers to begin apprenticeship programs in the 11th grade. These programs will last for 3 years—culminating 1 year after graduation from high school. In the first 2 years of the 3-year program, high school courses will be combined with training at work sites. The program is structured so that students gradually increase the time spent at work sites from 30 percent in the 11th grade to 50 percent in the 12th grade. In the third year, youth apprentices will supplement on-the-job training with academic courses at technical institutes or community colleges. Students will receive a high school diploma at the end of high school and a certificate upon completing apprenticeship training in recognition of their competency in the field in which they received their training.

The programs will be established, supervised, and evaluated by an Institute for Youth Apprenticeship. This is a new entity, or will be a new entity if this legislation becomes law, with a board of 21 directors representing education, business, labor, and civic leaders, and a one-time Federal funding authorization of $50 million.

The Institute's board will work with the various demonstration program site partnerships to ensure that students have the requisite basic skills to enter into the apprenticeship program. The Institute will also develop competency standards for apprenticeships and for trainers in specific occupational fields. The local business, education, and labor partnerships formed to create the apprenticeships will be responsible for local program and curriculum development and also responsible for quality assurance of the training programs.

This amendment does not contemplate creation of a new Federal program supplementing existing skills training efforts—indeed, clear language has been included to preclude any duplication of effort. We aim, instead, at a basic reorientation of those efforts to tighten the links between the world of learning and the world of work for the forgotten half of American youth who do not go to college.

Mr. President, our current economic situation makes an immediate push for apprenticeships especially timely. No tax cut—no investment incentive—no spending stimulus can do nearly as much for working Americans as giving them the skills they need to increase their own incomes and to increase the productivity and competitiveness of our overall economy.

Youth apprenticeships represent an innovation that can simultaneously upgrade our educational system and our competitive position in the global economy. If we are serious about educational reform and economic recovery, I urge that we take this first important step toward youth apprenticeships.

Mr. President, I know the Senator from Massachusetts is very interested in this subject. I know he has looked at many different proposals. It is my understanding that he plans to have a comprehensive set of hearings on this bill and other legislation in the near future. It is my hope that that is the case, and it is my hope that we will be able to pass this legislation either as an amendment to this bill or at some very early date.

59-059 O—96 Vol. 138 (Pt. 1) 15

AMENDMENT NO. 1484

(Purpose: To establish youth apprenticeship demonstration programs)

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk on behalf of myself, Senator BREAUX, Senator PRYOR, Senator BOREN, and Senator LIEBERMAN and ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], for himself, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. LIEBERMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 1484.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2 of the Committee amendment, in the table of contents, strike the items relating to title III of the amendment and insert the following:

TITLE III—YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP

Sec. 301. Short title.
Sec. 302. Findings and purpose.
Sec. 303. Definitions.
Sec. 304. Institute for youth apprenticeship.
Sec. 305. Establishment of youth apprenticeship demonstration programs.
Sec. 306. Contracts.
Sec. 307. Youth apprenticeship demonstration program requirements.
Sec. 308. Coordination.
Sec. 309. Nondiscrimination.
Sec. 310. Notice, hearing, and grievance procedures.
Sec. 311. Nonduplication and nondisplacement.
Sec. 312. Evaluation.
Sec. 313. Executive Schedule.
Sec. 314. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 315. Termination and repeal.

TITLE IV—DEFINITIONS

Sec. 401. Definitions.

In title III of the Committee amendment, strike the title heading and all that follows through "sec. 301. definitions." and insert the following:

TITLE III—YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Youth Apprenticeship Act of 1992".

SEC. 302. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) many foreign countries, including Germany, Japan, Denmark, and Sweden, have national policies that—

(A) are aimed at effective employment preparation of youth who do not seek a college education; and

(B) include programs that provide occupational guidance to students and combine schooling with work experience;

(2) in Germany, almost all eligible students apply for vocational training, which substantially reduces the risk of unemployment for young people, and German firms spend $18,000,000,000 annually on vocational training;

(3) United States international competitiveness is being eroded because a substantial increase is occurring in jobs requiring greater skills and youth are unprepared to meet the new labor market demands;

(4) partly as a result of inadequate skills in the work force, the productivity growth of

the United States has slowed dramatically over the past 10 years, with the country taking almost 3 years to achieve the same productivity improvement previously achieved in 1 year;

(5) while the United States still leads the world in productivity, the rate of productivity improvement is increasing much faster among competing nations;

(6) the economic position of United States high school graduates who do not seek a college education is deteriorating, with real earnings of the graduates declining by 28 percent from 1973 to 1986;

(7) about 9,000,000 of the 33,000,000 United States youth age 16 to 24, or 27 percent of the youth, lack the necessary skills to meet employer requirements for entry level positions;

(8) in the United States, apprenticeship training programs are providing valuable training services to—

(A) 300,000 apprentices enrolled in more than 40,000 federally registered programs; and

(B) 100,000 apprentices participating in nonregistered programs;

(9) attempts to expand apprenticeship training in the United States have been unsuccessful and the percentage of the civilian United States work force enrolled in federally registered apprenticeship programs fell from an already low .3 percent in 1970 to only .16 percent in 1987;

(10) federally registered apprenticeship training programs do not provide assistance to the average high school graduate, as evidenced by the fact that—

(A) fewer than 2 percent of United States high school graduates enter into youth apprenticeship training programs; and

(B) the median age of United States apprentices is 25;

(11) currently, there are at most approximately 3,500 United States high school students participating in school-to-work apprenticeship programs; and

(12) school-to-work apprenticeship programs can—

(A) allow students to become registered apprentices as the students complete high school;

(B) produce positive outcomes for the students, schools, and employers; and

(C) provide supervised work experience for the students during high school, promoting desirable work habits and developing knowledge and skills for the working world.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to develop and evaluate a range of youth apprenticeship programs that will—

(1) establish partnerships between secondary and postsecondary schools, employers, labor organizations, and community and civic leaders to bridge the growing gap in skills, income, and opportunity between college bound and noncollege bound youth;

(2) offer young people a better chance to gain marketable skills and incentives to remain in school and achieve better grades;

(3) establish a systematic transition for students from school to work by combining work experience for youth with a work-related curriculum;

(4) identify and develop competency standards for youth apprentices;

(5) instill a sense of pride, self-esteem, and purpose in youth apprentices;

(6) contribute to the public policy debate on youth apprenticeship programs; and

(7) test a range of approaches to youth apprenticeship programs.

SEC. 303. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this title:

(1) BOARD.—The term "Board" means the Board of Directors of the Institute.

(2) DISADVANTAGED YOUTH.—The term "disadvantaged youth"—

(A) means an individual (other than an individual with a handicap) who—

(i)(I) is a economically disadvantaged individual; or

(II) has academic disadvantages; and

(ii) requires special services and assistance in order to succeed in an apprenticeship training program; and

(B) includes—

(i) an individual who is a member of an economically disadvantaged family;

(ii) a migrant;

(iii) an individual with limited-English proficiency; and

(iv) an individual who is identified as a potential dropout from a secondary school.

(3) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED FAMILY; ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED INDIVIDUAL.—The terms "economically disadvantaged family" and "economically disadvantaged individual" mean a family and an individual, respectively, that the Institute, or a partnership participating in a youth apprenticeship demonstration program, determines to be low-income, according to the latest available data from the Department of Commerce.

(4) INSTITUTE.—The term "Institute" means the Institute for Youth Apprenticeship, established in section 304.

(5) PARTNERSHIP.—The term "partnership" means a coalition of secondary and postsecondary schools, employers, labor organizations, and community and civic leaders, formed for the purpose of operating a youth apprenticeship demonstration program.

(6) POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL.—The term "postsecondary school" means a community college, junior college, technical institute, or area vocational school.

(7) POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—The term "postsecondary school demonstration program" means a demonstration program described in section 306(b)(3).

(8) SECONDARY SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—The term "secondary school demonstration program" means a demonstration program described in section 306(b)(2).

(9) YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—The term "youth apprenticeship demonstration program" means a demonstration program described in paragraph (2) or (3) of section 306(b).

SEC. 304. INSTITUTE FOR YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an Institute for Youth Apprenticeship that shall administer the programs established under this title. The Institute shall be an independent establishment, as defined in section 104 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) COMPOSITION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—The Institute shall be administered by a Board of Directors. The Board shall be composed of 21 members, including—

(1) a Chairperson, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(2) the Administrator of the Office of Work-Based Learning of the Department of Labor;

(3) the Director of the Division of Vocational and Technical Education of the Department of Education; and

(4) 18 members, appointed by the President—

(A) who shall include—

(i) nine individuals from among individuals nominated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(ii) nine individuals from among individuals nominated on the joint recommendation of the Majority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the Senate; and

(B) of whom—

(i)(I) six individuals shall be representatives of the education community;

(II) six individuals shall be representatives of labor and worker groups; and

(III) six individuals shall be representatives of the business community; and

(ii) individuals within each of the groups described in subclauses (I), (II), and (III) of clause (i) shall represent the national, State, and local community levels.

(c) TERM.—Each appointed member of the Board shall be appointed for a term of 5 years.

(d) VACANCIES.—Vacancies in the membership of the Board shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. The vacancy shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the duties of the Board.

(e) FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT.—

(1) MEMBERS.—Members of the Board appointed under subsection (b)(4) shall not be employees or officers under section 2104 or 2105 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson of the Board shall be an officer under section 2104 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) SUIT.—Members of the Board shall be immune from suit and legal process relating to acts performed by the members in their capacity, and within the scope of their functions, as members of the Board.

(g) COMPENSATION AND REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES.—

(1) UNCOMPENSATED SERVICE.—Members of the Board who are not employees of the Federal Government shall not be compensated for the performance of duties for the Board.

(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member of the Board shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons employed intermittently in the Government service, for each day the member is engaged in the performance of duties away from the home or regular place of business of the member.

(h) QUORUM.—A quorum shall consist of 14 members of the Board, except that 9 members may conduct a hearing.

(i) MEETINGS.—The Board shall meet at the call of the Chairperson or a majority of the members of the Board.

(j) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—The Chairperson, in consultation with the Board, shall appoint an Executive Director for the Institute.

(k) STAFF.—

(1) APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION.—The Executive Director of the Institute may appoint and determine the compensation of such staff as the Board determines to be necessary to carry out the duties of the Institute.

(2) LIMITATIONS.—The rate of compensation for each staff member appointed under paragraph (1) shall not exceed the daily equivalent of the rate for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, for each day the staff member is engaged in the performance of duties for the Institute. The Executive Director of the Institute may otherwise appoint and determine the compensation of staff without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, that govern appointments in the competitive service, and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, that relate to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(l) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Executive Director of the Institute may obtain the services of experts and consultants and compensate such experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, as the Board determines to be necessary to carry out the duties of the Institute.

(m) DETAIL OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—On the request of the Board, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education shall detail, without reimbursement, any of the personnel of the Department of Labor and the Department of Education to the Institute as the Board determines to be necessary to carry out the duties of the Institute. Any detail shall not interrupt or otherwise affect the civil service status or privileges of the Federal employee.

(n) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—On the request of the Board, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Education, and the heads of other pertinent Federal agencies shall provide, without reimbursement, such technical assistance and administrative support services to the Institute as the Board determines to be necessary to carry out the duties of the Institute.

(o) OBTAINING INFORMATION.—The Executive Director of the Institute may secure directly from any Federal agency information necessary to enable the Institute to carry out the duties of the Institute, if the information may be disclosed under section 552 of title 5, United States Code. Subject to the previous sentence, on the request of the Executive Director of the Institute, the head of the agency shall furnish the information to the Institute.

(p) GIFTS AND PRIVATE CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Executive Director of the Institute may accept on behalf of the Institute gifts or contributions from private sources for the benefit of the Institute or to carry out any of the functions of the Institute. No gift or contribution shall be accepted if the gift or contribution is conditioned on any expenditure of funds by the Institute.

(q) VOLUNTARY SERVICE.—Notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, the Chairperson of the Board may accept for the Board voluntary services provided by a member of the Board.

SEC. 305. ESTABLISHMENT OF YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.

After consultation with the Board, the Chairperson of the Board shall establish guidelines, criteria, and procedures for youth apprenticeship demonstration programs, including—

(1) developing recommended guidelines for an appropriate curriculum for each occupational field within the programs, including postsecondary courses to enable apprentices to supplement training after completion of the programs;

(2) establishing site criteria to be used in the selection of partnerships to develop and evaluate youth apprenticeship demonstration programs, including requirements that the programs be established in rural and urban areas in all regions of the country;

(3) establishing criteria for apprenticeship occupations, including requirements that demand exist for skill training in the occupations and that the occupations offer a career ladder for apprentices;

(4) establishing competency criteria for apprenticeships and trainers in specific occupational fields; and

(5) establishing certification procedures for apprentices and trainers.

SEC. 306. CONTRACTS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this title, the Executive Director of the Institute shall, to the extent appropriations are available, enter into contracts with eligible partnerships, to pay for the Federal share of developing and evaluating youth apprenticeship demonstration programs, in accordance with the requirements specified in section 307.

(b) CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall enter into contracts under this section with eligible partnerships that propose youth apprenticeship demonstration programs consistent with the criteria and procedures established under section 305.

(2) SECONDARY SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall enter into contracts with eligible partnerships to establish demonstration programs at the secondary school level.

(B) WAGE INCENTIVE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—The Board shall enter into a contract with an eligible partnership to establish at least one demonstration program in which the Institute shall pay for 50 percent of the cost of the apprenticeship wage.

(C) DISADVANTAGED YOUTH DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—The Board shall enter into a contract with an eligible partnership to establish at least one demonstration program that shall train disadvantaged youth.

(3) POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—The Board may enter into contracts with two eligible partnerships to establish demonstration programs that solely involve students at the postsecondary school level.

(4) AWARDS.—The Board shall enter into contracts under this section on a majority vote of the Board.

(c) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to enter into a contract under this section, a partnership shall submit an application to the Executive Director of the Institute at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Executive Director may require. At a minimum, the application shall include—

(1) a description of the youth apprenticeship demonstration program proposed to be conducted by the partnership, including sufficient information to enable the Executive Director to determine whether the proposal of the partnership is consistent with the criteria and procedures specified in section 305;

(2) an assessment of the future work force needs of each area in which a youth apprenticeship demonstration program will be established and the manner in which the program will help provide skilled workers to meet the needs;

(3) a description of the activities to be offered through the youth apprenticeship demonstration program to students in the seventh grade or older;

(4) a description of the manner in which each school, employer, or other representative of a partnership shall participate in the partnership;

(5) a description of the manner in which the program will be administered by schools participating in the youth apprenticeship demonstration program, including the support and counseling staff available to students pursuing apprenticeships, which staff at a minimum shall include one full-time vocational counselor;

(6) a description of the manner in which in-service training for teachers will be provided and the manner in which such training will—

(A) be designed to train teachers to effectively implement apprenticeship training curricula;

(B) provide for joint training for all the teachers in the partnership; and

(C) provide for the training in weekend, evening, and summer sessions, institutes, or workshops;

(7) a description of the manner in which training programs will be provided for counselors and the manner in which such training will be designed to enable counselors to more effectively—

(A) recruit students for apprenticeship training programs;

(B) ensure that such students successfully complete high school and the apprenticeship training program; and

(C) assist such students in finding appropriate employment;

(8) a description of courses to be offered to students considering or participating in the apprenticeship program;

(9) a description of the work processes to which apprentices will be exposed;

(10) a description of the manner in which apprentices shall be selected;

(11) a description of the academic and technical skill levels to be achieved by apprentices on completion of the program;

(12) a description of the apprenticeship wage and employee benefits offered;

(13) an estimate of the amount of time to be spent by apprentices at the workplace during the school day;

(14) a plan for monitoring and evaluating apprentices and the youth apprenticeship demonstration program within each partnership; and

(15) an assurance that the partnership will comply with the matching requirement specified in subsection (d).

(d) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the costs of developing and evaluating youth apprenticeship demonstration programs shall be not more than 50 percent.

(2) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the costs may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, and services. Amounts provided by the Federal Government, or services assisted or subsidized to any significant extent by the Federal Government, may not be included in determining the amount of such non-Federal share.

SEC. 307. YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.

(a) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Each partnership that participates in a youth apprenticeship demonstration program shall be responsible for—

(1) program and curriculum development;

(2) coordination and quality assurances; and

(3) provision of information to the Institute for the assessment and evaluation of apprentices and training programs.

(b) SECONDARY SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The partnerships participating in secondary school demonstration programs shall provide apprenticeship training to students as appropriate for the grade level of the students.

(2) SEVENTH THROUGH TENTH GRADE STUDENTS.—The partnerships shall provide students in the seventh through tenth grades with an opportunity to learn about possible occupations through secondary school courses, site visits, job sampling, and employer visits to secondary schools. The partnerships shall also provide information about the youth apprenticeship demonstration program to the parents of students in the seventh through tenth grades.

(3) TENTH GRADE STUDENTS.—The partnerships shall provide students in the tenth

grade with an opportunity to apply and interview for apprenticeships. Apprentices who successfully complete the tenth grade, pass a basic skills test, and successfully interview with employers may sign agreements with employers at the end of the academic year.

(4) ELEVENTH AND TWELFTH GRADE STUDENTS.—The partnerships shall provide training at work sites for students in the eleventh and twelfth grades, in combination with secondary school courses. The partnerships shall structure the training and educational requirements of students—

(A) so that students gradually increase the time spent at work sites from 30 percent in eleventh grade to 50 percent in the twelfth grade, depending on the structure of the program; and

(B) in such a manner as to allow the students to graduate and receive a high school diploma with other members of their class.

(5) SECONDARY SCHOOL GRADUATES.—The partnerships shall structure the training and educational requirements of secondary school graduates so that students spend 75 to 80 percent of program time at work sites and draw on postsecondary schools for supplementary theory and skill courses. The youth apprenticeship demonstration programs shall allow students in technical fields to take basic skills courses and apply them toward an associate degree.

(c) POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—Partnerships participating in postsecondary school demonstration programs shall provide on-the-job training to students to supplement academic courses taught in postsecondary schools.

(d) PAYMENT.—

(1) SECONDARY SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), employers participating in secondary school demonstration programs shall pay for 100 percent of the cost of wages to apprentices.

(B) SUBSIDIZED WAGE.—Employers participating in demonstration programs described in section 306(b)(2)(B) shall pay for 50 percent of the cost of the apprenticeship wage.

(2) POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—

(A) WAGES.—Employers participating in postsecondary school demonstration programs shall pay for 100 percent of the cost of the apprenticeship wage to apprentices.

(B) SCHOOL COSTS.—Individual students shall pay for the cost of taking continuing basic skills courses from a postsecondary school.

(3) AMOUNT.—Apprentices participating in the secondary and postsecondary school demonstration programs shall receive, at a minimum, an apprenticeship wage equal to the wage rate described in section 306(a)(2) of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1989 (29 U.S.C. 206 note).

(e) TRAINING.—Employers participating in the postsecondary school demonstration programs shall pay for the cost of on-the-job training.

(f) EMPLOYMENT.—The Institute shall encourage, but not require, employers participating in youth apprenticeship demonstration programs to place, or assist in placing, the apprentices in employment positions similar to the positions in which the apprentices received training.

(g) OTHER EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS.—Apprentices participating in youth apprenticeship demonstration programs shall—

(1) be covered by all applicable Federal and State laws regarding occupational health and safety; and

(2) receive the same employment benefits as full-time employees, commensurate with the length of service of the apprentices to the employer.

SEC. 308. COORDINATION.

The Institute shall—

(1) consult with the Office of Work-Based Learning of the Department of Labor and with the Division of Vocational and Technical Education of the Department of Education;

(2) provide technical assistance to partnerships participating in youth apprenticeship demonstration programs to assist the partnerships with strategic planning, curriculum planning, and coordination;

(3) operate an apprenticeship clearinghouse for the partnerships;

(4) disseminate model programs and practices to the partnerships;

(5) gather input from all sources regarding the labor mobility of apprentices; and

(6) comply with evaluation and report requirements specified in section 312.

SEC. 309. NONDISCRIMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any assistance provided under this title shall constitute Federal financial assistance for purposes of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.), title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.), the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.), and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.).

(b) NONDISCRIMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any individual with responsibility for the administration of a youth apprenticeship demonstration program that receives assistance under this title shall not discriminate in the selection of participants to the demonstration program on the basis of race, religion, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, or political affiliation.

(2) EXCEPTION.—This subsection shall not apply to an employer or educational institution that is controlled by a religious organization, if any, if the application of this subsection would not be consistent with the religious tenets of the organization.

(c) RULES AND REGULATIONS.—The Chairperson of the Board shall promulgate rules and regulations to provide for the enforcement of this section, including provisions for summary suspension of assistance for not more than 30 days, on an emergency basis, until notice and an opportunity to be heard can be provided.

(d) RIGHT OF ACTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General of the United States may file an action under this section in the appropriate district court of the United States against any organization or partnership under this title that violates this subsection.

SEC. 310. NOTICE, HEARING, AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) SUSPENSION OF PAYMENTS.—The Chairperson of the Board may in accordance with the provisions of this title, suspend or terminate payments under a contract providing assistance under this title whenever the Chairperson determines there is a material failure to comply with this title or the applicable terms and conditions of any contract entered into under this title.

(2) PROCEDURES TO ENSURE ASSISTANCE.—The Chairperson of the Board shall prescribe procedures to ensure that—

(A) assistance provided under this title shall only be suspended for not more than 30 days for failure to comply with the applicable terms and conditions of this title and only in emergency situations; and

(B) assistance provided under this title shall not be terminated for failure to comply with applicable terms and conditions of this title unless the recipient of such assistance has been afforded reasonable notice and opportunity for a full and fair hearing.

(b) HEARINGS.—Hearings or other meetings that may be necessary to fulfill the requirements of this section shall be held at locations convenient to the recipient of assistance under this title.

(c) TRANSCRIPT OR RECORDING.—A transcript or recording shall be made of a hearing conducted under this section and shall be available for inspection by any individual.

(d) STATE LEGISLATION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to preclude the enactment of State legislation providing for the implementation, consistent with this title, of the programs administered under this title.

(e) GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—State and local applicants that receive assistance under this title shall establish and maintain a procedure to adjudicate grievances from participants, labor organizations, and other interested individuals concerning programs that receive assistance under this title, including grievances regarding proposed placements of the participants in the projects.

(2) DEADLINE FOR GRIEVANCES.—Except for a grievance that alleges fraud or criminal activity, a grievance shall be made not later than 1 year after the date of the alleged occurrence.

(3) DEADLINE FOR HEARING AND DECISION.—

(A) HEARING.—A hearing on any grievance conducted under this subsection shall be conducted not later than 30 days after the filing of the grievance.

(B) DECISION.—A decision on any grievance shall be made not later than 60 days after the filing of the grievance.

(4) ARBITRATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—On the occurrence of an adverse grievance decision, or 60 days after the filing of the grievance if no decision has been reached, the party filing the grievance shall be permitted to submit the grievance to binding arbitration before a qualified arbitrator who is jointly selected and independent of the interested parties.

(B) DEADLINE FOR PROCEEDING.—An arbitration proceeding shall be held not later than 45 days after the request for the arbitration.

(C) DEADLINE FOR DECISION.—A decision concerning a grievance under this paragraph shall be made not later than 30 days after the date of the beginning of the arbitration proceeding concerning such grievance.

(D) COST.—The cost of an arbitration proceeding shall be divided evenly between the parties to the arbitration.

(5) PROPOSED PLACEMENT.—If a grievance is filed regarding a proposed placement of a participant in a program that receives assistance under this title, the placement shall not be made unless it is consistent with the resolution of the grievance pursuant to this subsection.

(6) REMEDIES.—Remedies for a grievance filed under this subsection shall include—

(A) suspension of payments for assistance under this title;

(B) termination of payments; and

(C) prohibition of the placement described in paragraph (5).

SEC. 311. NONDUPLICATION AND NONDISPLACEMENT.

(a) NONDUPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Assistance provided under this title shall be used only for a program that does not duplicate, and is in addition to,

an apprenticeship program operating in the locality.

(2) PRIVATE NONPROFIT ENTITY.—Assistance made available under this title shall not be provided to a private nonprofit entity to conduct activities that are the same or substantially equivalent to activities provided by the State or local government agency in the locality that the entity resides in, unless the requirements of subsection (b) are met.

(b) NONDISPLACEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An employer shall not displace an employee or position, including partial displacement such as reduction in hours, wages, or employment benefits, as a result of the use by such employer of a participant in a program receiving assistance under this title.

(2) SERVICE OPPORTUNITY.—An employer shall not create a service opportunity under this title that will infringe in any manner on the promotional opportunity of an employed individual.

(3) LIMITATION OF SERVICES.—

(A) DUPLICATION OF SERVICES.—A participant in a program receiving assistance under this title shall not perform any services or duties or engage in activities that would otherwise be performed by an employee as part of the assigned duties of the employee.

(B) SUPPLANTATION OF HIRING.—A participant in any program receiving assistance under this title shall not perform any services or duties or engage in activities that will supplant the hiring of full-time workers.

(C) DUTIES FORMERLY PERFORMED BY ANOTHER EMPLOYEE.—A participant in any program receiving assistance under this title shall not perform services or duties that have been performed by or were assigned to any—

(i) presently employed worker;

(ii) employee who recently resigned or was discharged;

(iii) employee who is subject to a reduction in force;

(iv) employee who is on leave (terminal, temporary, vacation, emergency, or sick); or

(v) employee who is on strike or who is involved in a lockout.

SEC. 312. EVALUATION.

(a) EVALUATION BY THE INSTITUTE.—

(1) FINAL EVALUATION.—

(A) EVALUATION.—The Institute shall conduct an evaluation of all youth apprenticeship demonstration programs to determine the effectiveness of apprenticeship training and the most effective youth apprenticeship program structures for a nationwide youth apprenticeship program. The evaluation shall include an analysis of—

(i) the ability of the programs to prepare workers, particularly minorities and women, for the technical workplace;

(ii) the ability of such programs to increase the overall competency of the work force in the United States;

(iii) the level of academic and technical skills acquired by an apprentice in the programs;

(iv) the potential labor mobility of apprentices;

(v) the effectiveness of combining on-the-job training with classroom instruction;

(vi) the ability of the programs to encourage students to complete secondary school;

(vii) the ability of the programs to establish a more definite transition from secondary or postsecondary school to work;

(viii) the value of apprentices and the effectiveness of the program according to business; and

(ix) the direct and indirect costs and benefits of the demonstration program to the company and the individual student.

(B) REPORT.—The Institute shall prepare and submit a report to the President, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Education, the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, containing the evaluation described in subparagraph (A), and recommendations for legislative reform. The Institute shall submit the report not later than 9 months after the conclusion of the youth apprenticeship demonstration programs.

(2) INTERIM EVALUATION.—

(A) EVALUATION.—Not later than 24 months after the initiation of the youth apprenticeship demonstration programs, the Institute shall conduct an interim evaluation of the effectiveness of all the demonstration programs, including an assessment of the matters described in paragraph (1)(A) to the extent that the necessary data and information is available.

(B) REPORT.—The Institute shall prepare and submit a report to the President, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Education, the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives containing the evaluation described in subparagraph (A). The Institute shall submit the report not later than 33 months after the initiation of the demonstration programs.

(b) EVALUATION BY PARTNERSHIPS.—

(1) DATA COLLECTION AND ASSISTANCE.—Each partnership that participates in a youth apprenticeship demonstration program shall establish data collection mechanisms consistent with the needs of the Institute and provide to the Institute information for, and assistance in conducting, the final evaluation described in subsection (a)(1) and the interim evaluation described in subsection (a)(2).

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(A) EVALUATION.—Each partnership that participates in a youth apprenticeship demonstration program shall conduct an annual evaluation that contains summary information on the implementation and operation of the demonstration program including—

(i) the number and type of students enrolled in apprenticeship training;

(ii) a description of the type of activities in which the youth apprentices are participating, including the type of occupational training youth apprentices are receiving;

(iii) the effectiveness of the program in keeping youth in secondary or postsecondary school;

(iv) the reaction of businesses involved in the training program; and

(v) any other information that the Institute may require.

(B) REPORT.—Each such partnership shall submit an annual report to the Institute containing the information described in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 313. EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE.

Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Chairman, Board of Directors of the Institute for Youth Apprenticeship.".

SEC. 314. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1993, which shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 315. TERMINATION AND REPEAL.

(a) TERMINATION.—Not later than 69 months after the initiation of the youth apprenticeship demonstration programs, the Board and Institute shall be abolished, and all programs established by this title shall terminate.

(b) REPEAL.—Not later than 69 months after the initiation of the youth apprenticeship demonstration programs, this title and the amendments made by this title shall be repealed.

TITLE IV—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 401. DEFINITIONS.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I commend Senator NUNN and Senator BREAUX for focusing attention on the whole issue of assisting young people in making a successful transition from school to work. This is a critical area for the young people of this country. Close to 50 percent of all high school students do not go on to training or higher education programs after they finish high school. They go to work. And to a great extent, these workers are really the backbone of this American economy. They are the workers who directly produce the goods and services that fuel the economy, and the economic capability and capacity of the United States today and for the future depends in large part on the productivity of this segment of the work force.

One of the most compelling aspects of the "America's Choice" report issued in 1990 by The Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce, cochaired by former Labor Secretaries Ray Marshall and Bill Brock, is the section which describes the comprehensive systems that have been established in many of the countries of Western Europe as well as in Japan to prepare and train young people for work, and the impact of those training systems on work force productivity in those countries.

It is interesting that in these countries, there is virtually complete consensus among the various political parties and between business and labor on the critical importance of work force training. Virtually all the political parties, and segments of these societies that tend to approach political issues from widely diverse viewpoints, have recognized that substantial public and private investment in work force training is essential to their ability to compete successfully in the global economy. In this regard, these countries are far ahead of us.

In recent years, there has some experimentation in this country with pilot programs to provide young people with opportunities to participate in apprenticeships and other programs that combine academic work with practical support for those kinds of on-the-job experience, but we do not currently provide significant programs either at the State or the Federal level or, generally, in the private sector.

In the United States, the private sector currently spends an estimated $30

billion on employee training. But most of the training programs, by and large, are for employees of the supervisory and management level. Very few of these programs reach down into the level of the so-called frontline work force that is directly engaged in the production of goods and services.

The best estimates and studies in these areas show that with good training, 40 percent of the increased productivity that comes from the investment in new production equipment comes from the worker that uses the equipment effectively. The equipment alone can increase productivity to a certain level. But studies indicate that with additional training and education of the individuals that use the new technology, productivity is significantly increased.

So this is a very, very important area that we in the Labor and Human Resources Committee are focusing on. Last October, together with the senior Senator from Oregon, introduced legislation which is currently pending before the committee that would implement many of the recommendations contained in the "America's Choice" report. Both Ray Marshall and former Labor Secretary Brock have testified before the committee in support of that legislation.

But as the proposal put forth by the Senators from Georgia and Louisiana demonstrates, there are a number of alternative ways to approach the whole issue of school to work transition, all of which deserve full and careful consideration by the committee. The Senators from Georgia and Louisiana deserve credit for raising this issue in the context of the education bill, currently before us because our education reforms must address not only early and secondary school education but also the critical issue of what happens to our young people as they leave school and enter the work force.

So I want to give my assurances to the Senators from Georgia and Louisiana that this is an area of high priority for the Labor and Human Resources Committee. We have established it as one of the four areas of educational reform that we have committed ourselves to—early education secondary school education, the school to work transition, and higher education.

We will have the higher education bill, we expect, on the floor in February or March. And we are going to begin the debate with Senator WIRTH, Senator WELLSTONE, and others on the Head Start and the early education programs. But the school-to-work transition is a key priority, and we want to work very closely with our colleagues from Georgia and Louisiana on this issue.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana, Mr. BREAUX.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for recognition. I also want to thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his comments.

I join with the Senator from Georgia in cosponsoring this legislation to establish a youth apprenticeship program.

Mr. President, I think the American education system is truly failing a large portion of the youth of America. I say that, recognizing the tremendous contribution of this bill we are considering today, as well as other pieces of legislation, and Federal aid to education, and the work that those programs have accomplished. The accomplishments have been tremendous. The failures are very serious.

I had the opportunity to present a distinguished accomplishment award, along with my senior colleague from Louisiana, Senator JOHNSTON, to a shipyard in Louisiana a couple of months ago because of the work that they have been able to do. As we gathered to present the award, all of the employees gathered in this large facility. There were about 400 welders in the audience. I asked the owner of the company how many of these welders came to the company as trained welders when they were hired? His response was a little startling because he said "zero." Not a single one of these welders came to them and offered themselves for employment as a person who knew how to be a welder.

The owner of the company explained to me, further, they had to set up their own school in the shipyard to train people after they hired them.

Can you imagine a CPA firm having to set up its own school in order to train men and women to be certified public accountants before it could hire them? Can you imagine a law firm having to set up its own law school in the law firm in order to be able to train people how to be lawyers so it can hire them? Of course not. That is the function, they will tell you, of schools. Schools train lawyers. Schools train CPA's. Schools train doctors. The businesses that they work in do not do that.

When it comes to a carpenter, an electrician, a welder, a pipefitter or so many of these other skilled crafts in this country that are desperately needed to increase our productivity, to increase our ability to compete, I suggest the schools are not meeting the challenge.

It is no wonder, then, why we have countries like Japan and others saying we are beating you Americans because you do not have trained workers. Our workers are not lazy. But many of them are not trained properly by the schools so they have an opportunity to enter the work force and offer their skills to a potential employer.

In our system, the employer has to spend time, effort, and money to do what schools should be doing.

Mr. President, what Senator NUNN and I are offering today is a youth apprenticeship program for those youngsters who, right now, in many large cities, particularly among disadvantaged young men and women, particularly among minorities, who are saying "I do not like physics," "I do not like calculus," "I do not understand chemistry," and then start causing problems in schools. We see, far too often, these young students either quitting school because they do not have an interest, or flunking out, or dropping out, or they are getting kicked out because they cause problems.

These young students see no relation between what they are studying in their high schools and what they are going to have to do in the real world after they, hopefully, graduate from high school. That is the real problem.

Disadvantaged youth, minorities in particular, are really suffering the brunt of this educational system's disadvantages. They are suffering because we are not training them to what their real life is going to be all about.

For those who are going to college, the high schools have exchange programs with all the universities in their State. They have scholarships. They have loans. But for that youngster who is not going to the University of Georgia or the University of Massachusetts, or LSU, or Harvard, or what have you, we do not do enough. In fact, I think we do far too little.

When these youngsters who do not do well in those type of programs in high school get flunked out or thrown out or kicked out, what do they do? They hit the streets with no skills, no craft, nothing to offer a potential employer. They hit the streets and turn to a life of crime and a life of drugs because that is all they can do, because they see no relation between what they learn in high school and what they will have to do later on in life. They become frustrated and, as a result of that, we are losing a generation of Americans in this country, a generation who see no relation between what they are learning in high school and what their future is going to be in the workplace.

What Senator NUNN and I are presenting to the Senate today—and I am delighted at the words of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts about his intent—is to try and give these youngsters, who we are losing because they have no hope, something that will give them hope and training so that when they finish high school they can get a decent job.

The youth apprenticeship program takes those kids in the 8th grade, the 9th grade and the 10th grade, takes them to businesses in their community, brings them to that shipyard, brings them to an electrical shop, brings them to industries in their particular locale and lets them see what is happening out there to try to get them interested in what the real world is all

about. Let them become exposed to the jobs that may be available if they can cut the mustard or learn the skill in their local community. We would offer those students an opportunity, a choice really, between pursuing an apprenticeship program or pursuing a high school and college-oriented curriculum; then create a 3-year apprenticeship program for the 11th, 12th, and an extra year after that where these students would spend some time in the morning learning the basic skills of education—reading, writing, arithmetic—the basics. And then in the afternoon have them actually work in an apprenticeship program in one of these industries that they have already been exposed to in the 8th, 9th, and 10th grades.

We bring industry and schools together in a partnership so ultimately when these youngsters get out of high school they get two things: They get a high school diploma, and they get a certificate of apprenticeship so that young student can take that certificate and go to that shipyard that I gave as an example and say, "I am a high school graduate and I know how to be a welder and I can do a good job for you."

Job skills training is as important a part of the American educational system as it is to train someone to go to the finest university in the land. Everybody does not have to be a college graduate to be a success in this country. We need those skilled craftsmen and women, to be able to compete and to be more productive as a country and as a society.

Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Georgia who has introduced this legislation in the last Congress as well as in this Congress. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for indicating to this body his willingness, his awareness of the problem, and I think, from what I heard, for his enthusiasm for the concept of an apprenticeship program that can be developed in legislation that, hopefully, will be coming before this body and this Congress sometime this year.

I would like to submit for the RECORD an executive summary entitled "Why America Should Develop a Youth Apprenticeship System" by Robert Lerman of American University and Hillard Pouncy, Swarthmore College and of Brandeis University.

I ask unanimous consent to have that printed in the RECORD.

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

WHY AMERICA SHOULD DEVELOP A YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP SYSTEM

(By Robert I. Lerman, the American University, and Hillard Pouncy, Swarthmore College and Brandeis University)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

America faces a fundamental domestic challenge in the 1990s: reversing the stark and growing disparity between the fates of college-bound and non-college youths in our society.

In recent years, the latter have suffered a dramatic decline in real wages and income. Further limiting their economic prospects are the disappearance of high-skill jobs in traditional industries, and the failure of our nation's education system to impart even basic skills and competencies to many. If we permit these trends to continue, the promise of upward mobility will ring hollow for the "forgotten half" of young Americans who do not finish or go beyond high school.

The United States needs to give urgent priority to expanding the career options of non-college youth. Already, the country is losing a tragically large number of young black men to crime and drugs. The drop in real wages of young high school graduates of all races is weakening the commitment of young men to the economic mainstream and to family life. And the lack of job-ready skills, together with the declining number of young workers, is limiting the nation's productivity growth and thus its ability to raise living standards.

The root of the problem is that the capabilities of the work force, especially non-college workers, are not keeping up with the rising demand for skilled labor. As a result, U.S. productivity and wage growth remain low, while the gap widens between the earnings of college and non-college workers.

Between 1973 and 1987, the ratio of wages for college graduates to wages for high school graduates rose from 1.49 to 1.81, for young men with 5-9 years of work experience. In fact, in terms of purchasing power, the earnings of high school graduates actually declined over the last 15 years.

Defining the problem in this way inevitably calls attention to the American school system and its poorly designed system for integrating non-college youth into meaningful careers. Typically, high schools have close connections with colleges but weak links with employers. After leaving high school, non-college workers usually rely on informal contacts to obtain a full-time position. Many test the labor market by moving from one employer to another before settling into a long-term job.

High-school students who are not going to college see little if any relationship between what they learn in school and their future careers. Nearly 60 percent of vocational students end up in jobs that have nothing to do with the training they receive in high schools. For America's non-college youth, a large and widening gulf separates the world of school and learning from the world of skilled and rewarding work.

This reality poses particularly serious problems for disadvantaged youth. While most non-college youth see little gain from performing well in high school, they tend to stay in school anyway, if only because of social and family constraints. Disadvantaged youth, however, are more likely to fall prey to pressures from the street, including peers encouraging them to leave school altogether. And the absence of formal connections between employer and schools imposes special hardships on inner-city black youth, because they have few informal links to jobs.

In many ways, public policies have reinforced the growing tendency for academic skills to determine career success. Governments spend enormous amounts on grants and loans for low-income students to attend college. These help the most academically capable, but do nothing for the vast majority of low-income youth. Far less is spent on vocational education, which, in any event, is often divorced from labor market realities.

The natural impulse of policy makers is to develop highly targeted programs for the poor and for minority youth. Yet such a strategy can easily backfire. When programs deal only with the most disadvantaged and least educated, the participants easily become stigmatized. Many employers are unwilling to take a chance on the graduates and the youth themselves see such training programs as a weak substitute for existing jobs in the regular or underground economy. Funding is often unstable and difficult to sustain; at best, the programs provide only a marginal addition to the existing systems of education, training and career placement.

This paper makes the case for an alternative strategy—a job apprenticeship system for non-college youth beginning in the late high school years. Such a system would embed the job market difficulties of minority youth within the broader problems faced by non-college youth.

The apprenticeship system is elaborate and widely used throughout Germany, Switzerland, and Austria. But U.S. policy makers are only now beginning to take a serious interest in this method of integrating young people into jobs and careers. Our proposal would adapt the German model to American conditions, making due allowance for differences in culture and in the kinds of social problems our society faces.

We call for a national skill-building partnership between public schools and business. It would focus on four primary goals:

Expanding the nation's supply of skilled workers;

Narrowing the earnings gap between college and non-college youth;

Creating a powerful new incentive for youths to do well and stay in high school; and,

Offering disadvantaged youths a realistic alternative to early parenthood, crime and drugs.

How would a U.S. youth apprenticeship system work? Our approach envisions a five-step process:

(1) change school curricula to expose students in the 8th through 10th grades to information about various occupations, including visits to businesses.

(2) offer 10th grade students a choice between pursuing a job apprenticeship or remaining on a purely academic track. Those choosing the former option would sign formal contracts with specific employers.

(3) create a three-year apprenticeship, starting in the 11th grade, during which students could earn skill certifications as they combine on the job training with school courses.

(4) give apprentices a comprehensive test at the end of the 12th grade to ensure both job and educational proficiency.

(5) spend at least 75 percent of the third year of apprenticeship on the job, and the remainder either in high school or community college to supplement technical training.

We propose a national Youth Apprenticeship Institute through which representatives of schools, businesses, governments and labor organizations can work together to specify the necessary skills required to enter and succeed in an occupation, to develop a system for certifying trainers as well as apprentices, and to monitor the quality of work site training. Washington's role is chiefly to act as a catalyst for efforts by local school systems and business to harmonize their curricula, job training and hiring practices. We further recommend $500 million in federal matching grants to fund apprenticeship demonstration projects in 10 cities.

Ultimately, the purpose of these efforts is to gain national credibility for apprentices as highly trained workers whose skills are occupationally specific, portable enough to be valuable for a variety of employers, and critical for taking effective advantage of additional training. It is also possible that apprenticeship will inspire youths who otherwise might not have finished high school to go on to college, in order to enlarge their prospects.

Youth apprenticeship is a progressive strategy for stimulating growth with equity—for boosting our nation's productivity while equalizing opportunities for young Americans. It can radically improve the preparation of youths for the skill demands of a global economy. At the same time, it offers minority youth an avenue into the economic mainstream. Youth apprenticeship answers the need for broad-based programs that reach the disadvantaged but avoid the stigma associated with welfare-type programs.

Mr. NUNN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield the floor?

Mr. BREAUX. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN].

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Louisiana. He made it very, very clear why this should be a top priority of our educational system. I do not think any other part of education deserves the priority that skill training does today. I believe that is true not only for the individuals involved, approximately 50 percent of American young people, but also for our economy and for our competitive position in the world.

We are going to have very few unskilled jobs in the future, and we had better start recognizing that. I think it is enormously significant that the Senator from Massachusetts also puts top priority in this area. I believe it is not only a matter of skill training that we need to address, but also it is a matter—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator withhold until the Chair can secure order in the Chamber? Staff people will please take seats.

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, it is not only a matter of skill training, but just as important is the underlying importance of self-esteem. It is time for us to recognize that people who do not go to college in this country are also very important. It is time for us to recognize that people who do not go to college are extremely important to our economy and important in terms of their social and economic and political contributions to this Nation.

So it goes beyond skill training. It goes to self-esteem. I think that recognition that our skilled workers in this country have not really had in the past is something that we really are going to have to understand and emphasize if we are going to compete in the world today. Believe me, those in Germany and those in Japan who are skilled workers also are accorded the kind of self-esteem and the kind of importance in their countries that make them conscious of the contribution they are making and proud of that contribution.

So I think it is time for us to have an emphasis on this. The Senator from Massachusetts, understandably, would like to treat this proposal in the context of other proposals and look at it in his committee before actually having the Senate vote on it.

Could I get some feeling from the Senator from Massachusetts when this would be addressed in terms of hearings and perhaps legislation coming to the floor?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it would be my intention, as soon as we have the higher education bill out—I would hope by early March—that we would have hearings on the school-to-work transition in March and see what progress we can make after that time. It is a matter of very considerable importance and priority. We welcome the opportunity to work with the Senator.

We have, I might just say to the Senator, at Northeastern University—which was the first university where the students spent half their time on academic work and half getting actual work experience—an example of a phenomenal success in the educational experience. At Raytheon, one of the very fine defense companies, we have in Massachusetts, 75 percent of their scientists are all graduates from Northeastern University.

About 60 percent of the kids that go to Northeastern University have parents who never went to college. Basically, they come from the children of working class. They go to Northeastern to get a first-rate education and a first-rate work experience at some of the fine companies up in the New England area.

I think the very worthwhile issues the Senator brings up is how can we expand that kind of experience? How far down should we go into younger ages? What is the appropriate balance between time spent in academic work and time spent in the workplace. That should be established to assure that young people participating in such programs are going to have adequate educational experience, as well as a good start at work?

There are some school districts, for example, where young people moving from their sophomore to their junior years in high school make a decision at that point whether they are going into higher education or are going on into some kind of vocational training programs. Then they will have some division in terms of their academic program. This is not a final decision. The young people can change their minds if they make a decision to switch from one program to the other, but what it does is begin the thinking process among the young people as to what they want to do after high school, and give them some real-life experience with companies and corporations and training programs. It has been quite successful in some of the communities and school districts that have tried that.

So I assure the Senator that we will give this issue a high priority, and we hope that we will be able to have hearings in the latter part of March. I guess we have a break somewhere in the middle of March. Then we will try and go as far as we can in terms of legislation.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will yield for a brief observation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. NUNN. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his assurances and for the priority he gives this subject, and also for his expression of intent on hearings. I know he has a lot of things that he is working with, and I know that it is always difficult to schedule. It is gratifying to me, and I know to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX] to know that the committee is going to have hearings on the subject and have a vote on it on the floor sometime this year.

With that in mind, with those assurances and the understanding that the manager of the bill would prefer to bring this up in terms of other legislation and after discussing it with the Senator from Louisiana, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia withdraws the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1484) was withdrawn.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I just want to express my appreciation for the cooperation of the two Senators.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask Senator NUNN if I might be an original cosponsor of the amendment, and I ask consent that I be made an original cosponsor of the Nunn-Breaux amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I think it is high time that we in this country recognize that there are literally—literally—thousands and thousands of young Americans who truly want to get training for a meaningful job as part of their formal education.

I must tell you that there are few young Americans, other than in the professions, such as doctors and lawyers and the like, there are few who are getting training for a job that exists out there in America. This will permit that to begin to happen in more schools, and more and more Americans will have an opportunity to make that kind of decision.

I want to tell my friend from Georgia that I was in the city of Farmington just about 2 months ago. I was literally astounded to find that a small community, 60,000 people, had established one vocational training institution for all of the public schools, and they used busing for a different reason. They bused in the afternoons the young people who wanted vocational training from around the city schools to this magnificent vocational training center.

One might say, what did they learn there? I was absolutely taken aback by the kind of vocational training that existed there. For instance, General Motors and one of the major Japanese automobile manufacturers had chosen that center to actually put equipment in free to train young men and women in the art of maintaining and repairing today's sophisticated cars. Actually, there is a tremendous shortage of such people because these cars of today are loaded with electronics, with computers, and you do not go in and just take a wrench to them. You have to know what it is all about.

Frankly, it is a beautiful course. It takes 6 months to train these young people, who end up with a certificate that they can take anywhere in the Nation to get a high-paying job at an automobile dealership that needs a first-class mechanic who will take care of Chevrolets or Pontiacs. I believe this should start happening across America.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. They have done the same thing in Framingham, MA.

Mr. DOMENICI. It is exciting.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is tied into a 2-year college there. The graduates can earn $35,000 when they graduate, even in this kind of recessionary period. You can take further training to be a master in mechanics, which enables you to earn as much as $55,000 a year.

The interesting thing is the Japanese are providing new cars, their engines. It was Toyota up in Massachusetts. And what they have found is that the graduates go on out to the dealerships and that is improving the services and improving the sale of Toyota in my part of the country.

Mr. DOMENICI. Exactly.

Mr. KENNEDY. I know the Senator has other things to talk about.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am delighted that the Senator has asked me to yield. I believe we ought to, between this bill, higher education, and the vocational education bill—there are three coming down the pike, as I understand it—and maybe even the reauthorization of the Joint Partnership Training Act, address this issue with some stimulus to the local communities to engage themselves in this kind of additional training for young people because there are many meaningful jobs of this type that they must be trained for, and they are not all steel mill operations and the like. They have to do with the sophisticated appliances that we live by and live with today, and many people will get good jobs in them if we use this approach.

Having said that, I understand it is my privilege here, based on yesterday's commitment, I can propose an amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1485

Mr. DOMENICI. I send an amendment to the desk, which is an alternate certification of teachers amendment. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] proposes an amendment numbered 1485.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There being no objection, further reading of the amendment is dispensed with.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following new title:

TITLE VI

ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION OF TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

FINDINGS

SEC. 601. The Congress finds that—

(1) effective elementary and secondary schools require competent teachers and strong leadership;

(2) school systems would benefit greatly by recruitment pools of well-qualified individuals, such as scientists and engineers, from which to select teachers and principals;

(3) talented professionals who have demonstrated a high level of subject area competence or management and leadership qualities outside the education profession and who wish to pursue second careers in education often do not meet traditional certification requirements; and

(4) alternative certification requirements that do not exclude such individuals from teaching or school administration solely because they do not meet current certification requirements would allow school systems to take advantage of these professionals and improve the supply of well-qualified teachers and principals.

PURPOSE

SEC. 602. (a) It is the purpose of this part to improve the supply of well-qualified elementary and secondary school teachers and principals by encouraging and assisting States to develop and implement alternative teacher and principal certification requirements.

(b) As used in this part, the term—

(1) "alternative teacher and principal certification requirements" means State or local requirements that permit entry into elementary and secondary teacher and principal positions for individuals who have demonstrated a high level of appropriate subject area competence, or management or leadership qualities, in careers in or out of the education field, but who would not otherwise meet existing requirements for teaching or supervisory positions. Alternative teacher and principal certification requirements may recognize that—

(A) for teachers, a high level of demonstrated competence in an appropriate subject area may be substituted for traditional teacher certification requirements (such as teacher training course work); and

(B) for principals, a high level of demonstrated competence in administration and management may be substituted for traditional principal certification requirements (such as teaching experience or supervisory experience in the field of education); and

(2) "State" means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 603. For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated $25 million for fiscal year 1993.

ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 604. (a)(1) From the amount appropriated to carry out this part, the Secretary shall allot to each State the lesser of either the amount the State applies for under section 605 or an amount that is proportional to the State's share of the total population of children ages five through seventeen in all the States (based on the most recent data available that is satisfactory to the Secretary).

(2) If a State does not apply for its allotment, or the full amount of its allotment, under the proceeding paragraph, the Secretary may reallocate the excess funds to one or more other States that demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, a current need for the funds.

(b) Notwithstanding section 412(b) of the General Education Provisions Act, funds awarded under this part shall remain available for obligation by a recipient for a period of two calendar years from the date of the grant.

STATE APPLICATIONS

SEC. 605 (a) Any State desiring to receive a grant under this part shall submit an application, through its Governor, at such time, in such manner, and containing such information, as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(b) Each State application shall—

(1) describe the programs, projects, and activities to be undertaken; and

(2) contain such assurances as the Secretary deems necessary, including assurances that—

(A) funds awarded to the State will be used to supplement, and not to supplant, any State or local funds available for the development and implementation of alternative teacher and principal certification requirements;

(B) the State has, in developing its application, consulted with the State or local agency that certifies teachers and principals, as well as representatives of elementary and secondary school teachers and principals, local school systems, parents, and other interested organizations and individuals; and

(C) the State will submit to the Secretary, through the Governor, at such time as the Secretary may specify, a final report describing the activities carried out with funds awarded under this part and the results achieved.

(c) Sections 435 and 436 of the General Education Provisions Act, except to the extent that such sections relate to fiscal control and fund accounting procedures, shall not apply to this part.

USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 606 (a)(1) A State shall use funds awarded under this part to support pro-

grams, projects, or activities that develop and implement new, or expand and improve existing, alternative teacher and principal certification requirements.

(2) A State may carry out such programs, projects, or activities directly, through contracts, or through subgrants to local educational agencies, intermediate educational agencies, institutions of higher education, or consortia of such agencies.

(b) Programs, projects, and activities supported under this part may include, but are not limited to, the—

(1) design, development, implementation, testing, and evaluation of alternative teacher and principal certification requirements;

(2) establishment of administrative structure necessary to the development and implementation of alternative teacher and principal certification requirements;

(3) training of staff, including the development of appropriate support programs, such as mentor programs, for teachers and principals entering the school system through the alternative teacher and principal certification program;

(4) development of recruitment strategies; and

(5) development of reciprocity agreements between or among States for the certification of teachers and principals.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI].

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the President of the United States early last year, in recognition of a growing problem in the United States, challenged the Congress to push our sovereign States as hard as we could to create alternative certification of teachers' principles and practices and put it into their State laws. I am pleased to note that many States are moving in that direction.

Mr. President, what this means is a 45-year-old expert in history, perhaps a Ph.D., is ready to semiretire and wants to help teach young people in the public schools of the State of West Virginia or New Mexico. The problem we have, believe it or not, is that that person has to go back to a college of education, in some instances go back there for 2 years, before he or she is certified to teach in a public school even when the public schools do not have anyone on the teaching faculty who even comes close to that man or that woman.

The same is true in science and math and physics, except in that category we have an abundance of scientists and physicists and engineers who are either retired or very much desire to teach young people. In many schools of this country they run headlong into State certification processes which say they are not prepared to teach. In some instances, Mr. President, it is absurd.

I know of a 38-year-old, well-educated woman with young children of her own, who is, to everyone in the community, a magnificent teacher of children, because she has taught her children in a marvelous way, who says, "I would like to teach in the public school." She cannot afford what they are submitting to her. The pay is fine for her, but because of the 2 years in college to get ready to teach when she has a degree from Georgetown University in English and history and has, indeed, in all respects already shown her qualifications, we are turning that 38-year-old person away from teaching.

Now, this amendment is essentially what the President asked us to do on alternative certification—very broad, a grant program to encourage the States to do this.

I understand from the distinguished chairman, Senator KENNEDY, that alternative certification is not on the bill before us. It certainly would be germane, and it would belong there, but it is not there because it was considered by the committee in a higher education bill wherein the entire subject of training of teachers is discussed and provided for and some alternative certification procedures are included therein in much the same way as the President asked us early in the year to consider and adopt. I will very shortly ask the chairman if that is the case. If it is the case, then obviously the Senator from New Mexico does not want to duplicate things. I will withdraw the amendment and, clearly, it will be before the Senate in short order as part of the higher education bill and we will get a chance to debate it then, perhaps modify if then. But that is exactly what I intended for today.

I understand that the junior Senator from California would like to speak for a couple of minutes in support of this approach, after which time I will ask Senator KENNEDY a question and I will withdraw the amendment.

I yield the floor at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR].

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I request 15 minutes of time, one, to speak very briefly to the amendment of Senator DOMENICI; and second, to propose three amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may speak as long as he wishes at the moment.

Mr. KENNEDY. If I could ask, would it be possible to finish with the Domenici amendment first so we can just conclude that aspect of it?

Mr. SEYMOUR. Certainly. Then would I be able to follow?

Mr. KENNEDY. I hope so. And then I want to go to Senator WELLSTONE and Senator WIRTH, who have been extremely patient. That would be my hope.

Mr. SEYMOUR. So then I could follow Senator WELLSTONE and Senator WIRTH?

Mr. KENNEDY. I hope we could conclude Domenici and then do the Senator's within a very reasonable period of time, and then we will have a longer discussion with the Wellstone and Wirth proposal, if that is agreeable.

Mr. SEYMOUR. I thank the Senator. I appreciate that. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I rise today in support of my distinguished colleague from New Mexico, Mr. DOMENICI, and the amendment that is offered. I understand the process we are going to follow is that that amendment will come up at another time and will be withdrawn now. But I wanted to add my comments at this moment because I am in strong support of this concept of alternative teacher credentialing.

Last year, a poll was conducted by USA Today, and it found that nearly half of all the teachers selected as Teachers of the Year felt their training was inadequate and based primarily on theory, not experience, not real world experience.

A report conducted by the Rand Corp. in 1987 projected serious teacher shortages in the coming years, in particular the number of teachers with specialized skills in math, science, or bilingual education. In my State of California, Mr. President, somehow we have to find 100,000 new teachers, 100,000 new teachers, between now and the year 2000. That is because we have so many kids coming into our schools as a result of population growth.

Alternative teacher credentialing has a great deal to offer. It has a great deal to offer to this problem of teacher shortage, because there are thousands, tens of thousands of people out there who, as a second career, would look toward giving back a little bit of that which they have so richly worked for and deserved as a career, as a computer technician, for example, and they want to offer it back in the classroom. They bring real world experiences in addition to the theoretical knowledge that needs to be imparted to our children. I have talked with individuals from Apple Computer, for example, who want to do just that, but the barrier that is in their way and preventing them access to the classroom is a very extensive, very elongated credentialing process which does not recognize this real world experience they would bring to the kids.

So, in conclusion, Mr. President, I think this is an idea whose time has come as we look for innovative ways to raise the quality of education for our youngsters and at the same time meet the needs of teacher shortages. This is an idea that needs to be implemented.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield for a moment so we can dispose of the Domenici amendment?

Mr. SEYMOUR. I yield, certainly.

Mr. KENNEDY. If that is agreeable.

Mr. President, I want to express our appreciation to the Senator from New Mexico. He is absolutely right in emphasizing the importance of alternative certification.

We have had, in the course of our hearings, a review of what are going to be the demands by our young people in

the teaching profession over the next several years. Not all of the teaching schools in the country will meet that particular demand.

Plus there are many of those that are in technical areas and have technical skills that would like to be able to go back into a teaching profession and help and assist the young people in their community.

We had an alternative certification provision in the legislation last year that provided grants to States for them to develop those kinds of programs. We have a similar kind of program in our higher education bill. I believe there are 120 pages dealing with the subject that is on the calendar at the present time.

I invite the Senator to work with us, prior to the time that we even bring the matter to the floor, and to see how we can review those particular provisions, and strengthen them in ways that I think the Senator has outlined. We would welcome the opportunity to work with him.

We are very much aware of the Senator's own personal experience with a member of his family and the very fascinating and unique experience that that individual had. I am sure that kind of situation could be replicated by many others in this country.

So I want to state our appreciation to the Senator. He has identified an area of very significant importance. We are strongly committed to these alternative certification provisions. We welcome an opportunity to work with him as we move toward the higher education bill.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI].

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, first I thank the junior Senator from California for his support for this amendment. I say to the chairman, Senator KENNEDY, I am most appreciative of his remarks. I think it is obvious—not only because we are getting into an era of teacher shortage but because there are so many Americans without teaching certificates with great substantive educational credentials, who would like to help out in the schools, and cannot go back to school for 2 years to get a certificate and would do an excellent job with some kind of screening process—that we ought to move with dispatch to encourage in every way possible to get this alternative certification by our States in each and every one of the 50 States.

I think that will happen. We just want to make sure that we do something to expedite it.

I guess many who read Parade magazine saw the story recently of a young woman who got excited about alternative teaching and recruited people on the basis of helping out. Thousands of Americans have already pledged to help and many of them may not be able to teach because of certification requirements. It would be nice to tell them that some fictitious old ancient process does not stand in their way today.

I withdraw my amendment at this time, Mr. President.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator for his cooperation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator withdraws his amendment.

The amendment (No. 1485) was withdrawn.

Mr. SEYMOUR. Addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR].

AMENDMENT NO. 1486

(Purpose: To provide for drug and alcohol prevention education and gang violence prevention education)

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR] proposes an amendment numbered 1486.

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 53, line 7, strike "and".

On page 53, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

(13) projects to educate students in alcohol and drug awareness and prevention;

(14) projects to educate students in gang awareness and gang violence prevention; and

On page 53, line 8, strike "(13)" and insert "(15)".

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, this very simply and quickly is an amendment that addresses the issue, the great problem that we are all faced with in America—substance abuse. Really what it says is that education is a key component to winning the war on drugs.

I have been an author and fought hard for legislation that heightens penalties for drug pushers. In fact, I supported the death penalty for the drug kingpins. I have also been a strong believer in treatment programs for alcohol addition or drug addiction.

The third component, and most important, where we really win the war on drugs is to get into our young children's minds early on what can happen if they become substance abusers.

So very simply what this says is as we consider all the other changes included in S. 2, that local schools consider developing substance abuse education programs.

I ask for its consideration, Mr. President. My understanding is the amendment has been agreed to by both sides.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we support this particular proposal.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, may I simply congratulate the distinguished Senator from California for bringing this issue to the attention of the Senate. It is an amendment which clearly improves the bill by identifying a problem area that ought to have the attention of our school administrators and teachers throughout America.

He has obviously spent a lot of time and effort in his own State of California, and while he has been here in the Senate, working on this issue trying to identify options for doing a better job of dealing with the drug and alcohol problem, particularly in our Nation's schools. We are happy to recommend to the Senate that this amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is an agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

The amendment, number 1486, was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I have another amendment that I would like to send to the desk.

AMENDMENT NO. 1487

(Purpose: To provide for mandatory parental involvement for students enrolled in choice programs)

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Any amendment the Senator sends to the desk will get immediate consideration at this point.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR] proposes an amendment numbered 1487.

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 34, line 11, insert ", if such initiatives permit parents of students served by a school and require parents that choose a school in accordance with this clause to participate in governance, management, processes, or activities related to the children's education programs" before the semicolon.

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, what this amendment deals with is parents being involved with their children in school. I have always felt that a parent should take the time to spend reading to their children, maybe before they go

to bed, to discuss at the dinner table, as we do around my house, what happened in school today, what are you studying, what are your assignments?

Last weekend when our 9-year-old, who is a fourth grader, was faced with doing a term paper on Tom Jefferson, I was part of helping him read and help put that report together.

There are some who will say that is easy for you, JOHN SEYMOUR. You are a U.S. Senator. You are in a position where you have time to take care of your kids and work with them in school, and others do not; both parents are working; maybe a single-parent family. It may be that, as I find in California, it is a Hispanic family. In their culture they hold the school and the school board way up here, and they are afraid to go in, talk to them, and deal with them.

So what this amendment says very simply, Mr. President, is where a parent chooses, a parent takes an affirmative action to choose a school for their child—in other words say I am unhappy with little Johnny's or Mary's education in this school, I choose to remove them and put them in the other school. They take that action but they also make a commitment at the same time that they will be involved with that child's education.

To the degree that it is difficult, and I know it is difficult, particularly in California where we have a lot of single parents, a lot of conditions because of high cost of living that you have both parents working, that in fact it is a real challenge for them to find the time. But I am reminded of my grandmother.

She was a single parent, divorced, raising my mother and her sister. She worked in a department store, in Goldblatt's Department Store in Chicago, IL. She did not make a lot of money. She was a saleslady in the drapery department. But she found time to ensure that her two daughters got their education, did their homework, and did their studies.

So it can be done. It also can be done if the school will reach out. If they do nothing more than go into the living room of the single parent and say, look, I want you to know what little Johnny or Mary is doing in school, and these are the courses they are taking, and I want you to know I am here to help you. You can call me at the schoolhouse and we will sit down and work together to ensure that child gets an education. That is what this amendment is all about.

I think it makes a lot of sense. You cannot lay it all on the teacher. The teacher cannot be everything to that child. I think parental involvement is the key ingredient to ensuring that we have a higher quality education for youngsters, not only in California but across America. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California for focusing the debate on the importance of parental involvement. We have attempted to do that throughout the legislation in encouraging parents to be involved.

I know in my own city of Boston where we have been able to get a large amount of parental involvement, it has had a very clear reflection in strengthening academic achievement and accomplishment. The only word that concerns me is "requirement," the required nature of this undertaking, for those that make a selection in terms of choice.

The Senator points out that his grandmother was a single parent, and she was able to make that kind of commitment. That is an admirable achievement and accomplishment. Whether we are going to be able to find that all of those single parents, working one or perhaps even two jobs, have the desire to make that kind of commitment is questionable. Not every parent will be able to make every particular meeting, and every kind of assembly, and attend every kind of forum. And is that really our role?

I would much prefer to do everything we can to encourage it, and if a local school district wants to make that a requirement, that is really up to them. But I have some hesitation about making that a requirement.

What I would like to do is see if we cannot work with the Senator over the course of the weekend to try and find ways which would satisfy both of us. I believe the Members have as strong an interest in ensuring as much parental involvement as we possibly can. We have heard about a variety of different programs in the course of our hearings directed at increasing parental involvement. There have been some program models, which have been extraordinarily successful at attracting parents. It is clearly our desire to encourage these programs.

I have a hesitation about setting that as a requirement for every school where a child takes advantage of a program to strengthen academic achievement. It may very well discourage children from being able to take advantage of some opportunities which they otherwise might.

I thank the Senator for bringing that to our attention. We will try and work with him on that. I do not feel we can accept it in its current form today, but we will try and see if we cannot find ways that we can accept it, and we will work with him over the period of the weekend.

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I am particularly pleased, and I appreciate the chairman's willingness to work on further language to perhaps refine the concept. Certainly, I do not hold any idea that the language I come up with is perfect. I am certainly willing to receive input and work over the weekend on this.

Let me restate what we are talking about here. We are not telling, and I am not telling, because I think the Federal Government tells too much, quite frankly. I think if the Federal Government did a lot less telling to the local school districts and the States on how to deliver education, our kids would receive better education. We are saying that the State will determine how the local school districts will do it.

It might come out as simple as the local schools sending home a report to mom and dad and asking them to review it so that they understand. Do it in the mail.

It might be as simple as saying, when you show up at the schoolhouse and say you want to move Johnny or Mary from this school to that school, we wanted you to know we want you to meet with those folks over at the other school and talk about little Johnny's or Mary's education.

It could be as rigorous as: We want to sit down with you once a month. We have done testing on Johnny, he has problems we would like to work out, and we would like to set up a counseling session with you once a month, or something of that type.

But the total flexibility is left to the State and local school districts to determine how to meet this commitment. I offer this amendment in the sense that if a parent cares enough to go down to the local schoolhouse and ask for the child to be removed and put in another school, then they ought to care enough to follow through and ensure they are getting what they hoped to when they made that decision.

So, Mr. President, I am hopeful that over the weekend we can work out some satisfactory language to achieve the objective.

AMENDMENT NO. 1488

(Purpose: To permit the establishment of SMART Schools as new public schools)

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I have one final amendment that I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KOHL). Does the Senator wish to withdraw his previous amendment or set it aside?

Mr. SEYMOUR. Yes, please.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the Senator wants to set it aside so we will try and work it out, and he can maintain his option. If he wants to insist on a vote, he will be able to do so. We will work with the Senator on that.

Mr. SEYMOUR. Yes. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR] proposes an amendment numbered 1488.

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 34, strike all beginning with line 8 through line 16, and insert the following:

(ii) initiatives to increase parental choice among public schools, including assessment of student needs and parent information and referral programs;

(iii) the establishment of new public schools, such as Essential Schools, Accelerated Schools, New American Schools, charter schools, Comer Schools, SMART Schools, and Schools of the 21st Century, in accordance with subparagraph (C); and

(iv) other activities developed in conjunction with local educational agencies that are designed to improve student achievement in the public schools.

SEC. 203. STATE APPLICATION.

On page 58, before line 1, insert the following:

(9) the term "SMART School" means a school that—

(A) offers curriculum options that best match the needs of the students served by the agency, such as college preparatory, vocational education, math and science, or cultural arts;

(B) recruits teachers with specialized skills, especially skills in mathematics, science, and bilingual education, from professionals in fields other than education;

(C) establishes alternative certification procedures for certifying the professionals described in subparagraph (B), that shall comply with applicable State requirements regarding alternative certification or State waiver requirements;

(D) permits parents of students served by the school, and requires parents that choose their child's school, to participate in governance, management processes, and activities relating to their children's educational programs; and

(E) in the case that such school is an elementary school which establishes a Head Start or other preschool transition program such as a Follow Through program, assists students within a school who were previously enrolled in Head Start or a similar program in making a transition to elementary school, and ensures that at-risk students will receive needed assistance.

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, what this amendment deals with is what I call the "smart schools amendment," because it takes into consideration a number of ideas that we would ask be considered by schools, not mandated, but be considered by schools as they try to develop a better curriculum, a better way of delivering education to the kids.

What we start off with is the notion of a very successful program called Head Start. Head Start is a program to take care of the kids, as the President has talked about, as we have talked about, in their early years, preschool years; and this is the follow up, so that that child who has been delivered that service in preschool does not fall through the cracks in first, second, or third grade.

We are asking them to consider a followup program, outlined as Head Start to provide the counseling service, maybe the health services that are needed, whatever special needs that this particular child needs, to ensure that the child makes it. So many times in California, Mr. President, I talk to constituents, and I talk to kids, and by the seventh or eighth year of education, they have made their minds up to quit. The reason is that because those first 7 or 8 years have been tough. They are trying to catch up. So we need to give them the support, such as the Head Start Program, that will permit them to catch up so they develop that self-confidence and self-esteem that will carry them through to the goal, which is to get a high school diploma.

Dropout rates in California last year were running from 25 to 30 percent of our kids—no high school diploma. That is because they do not think they can make it. They look at their siblings, and they did not make it. Mom and Dad did not make it. What will make them make it? It is going to build that self-confidence, and they can only do that through a program that ensures they are healthy in body and mind, meaning they believe they can, and they are developing self-confidence, and maybe they have some little wins, but they are in a race they think they can win. That will keep them in school.

The next thing we talk about is curriculum choice, Mr. President. What I am suggesting in this area is that schools think about a different curriculum.

When I went to school, we had a choice between the college preparatory curriculum or vocational education. Not all our youngsters are going to go on to college and get a degree. For some of them, their sights are set, at least at the moment in time—freshman or sophomore year in high school—they are thinking about getting a job. So, many of those youngsters will drop out. They say, "I do not need a high school diploma. I am going to get a job over at Joe's Mechanic Shop," or "I am going to get a job at a local market."

If we could offer them an alternative course, to prepare them to go to work for Joe's Mechanic Shop or the Alpha Beta Market, if we prepare them for that, they will hang in and get their high school diploma.

So what this talks about, this smart schools amendment, as I refer to it, is develop those alternative curriculums. Maybe they want math and science, maybe that is what they are really into. Give them math and science. Maybe they want culture and the arts. Give them that alternative. In other words, take the basic core curriculum and style it to meet the kids' needs and let the local school district, who know best, I think, and the parents and the teachers locally, who know best, let them design a program that is going to appeal to the child, challenge the child, and direct him or her toward the goal—a high school diploma.

So, that is what this is really all about. It is to provide flexibility in curriculum development and let that development take place closest to the kids right down at the local level but suggest to them, yes, you can achieve the same objectives that a college preparatory course will offer you, only you will achieve it a little bit differently. We are going to teach you the math courses, and even the science courses, in relationship to the particular field of occupation or interest that you might have.

So I think the smart school amendment is a smart idea, and we are not mandating it. We are offering it to the local school districts and the local schools and say, "Look. Consider these. Maybe, just maybe, this is a better way, and maybe, just maybe, you might be able to improve your dropout rate by 10 or 15 percent if you challenge the students and give them an alternative course."

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we value very highly the programs that have been developed, including both prenatal programs, which provide care prior to the time of the birth of a child, and the well-baby programs, which try to take care of that child in the very early years.

We have the Comprehensive Child Development Act that passed 2 years ago. Our appropriation in that program is up to about $40 million. It really followed the Beethoven project that tracked children from expectant mothers that received good heath care; it tracked them all the way through early education, 4- or 5-year-olds, and tracked them through the schools—how did they achieve academically, dropout rates, run-ins with the law, teenage pregnancy, substance abuse? The record overwhelmingly supports the earliest possible intervention.

We have indicated to Senators BREAUX and NUNN the importance of moving from school to work, which the Senator has talked about. There will be follow-on legislation. There must be follow-on legislation because it deals with a number of wide ranging and new Federal programs that are focused in various ways on how we move from school to work adequately. That is what we are going to deal with now. The programs which have been referenced in our legislation, such as the essential schools, and Ted Sizer's programs. We had extensive hearings on them. We included the Comer programs, and we have had wide, extensive hearings on them. We have heard about the New American Schools which is the administration program. We have had very, very important testimony on it.

I am just reluctant regarding the smart school program. When I listen to

the description of it, goals sound very, very worthwhile. But what we have tried to do in referencing these points is to take the records of achievement and accomplishment from these particular learning experiences and reference them in our legislation.

I had not heard of smart schools until 5 minutes ago. We received the amendment an hour ago. All the things the Senator talks about in terms of further support for children as they move on from Head Start into the schools, are all worthwhile.

Last year our Head Start bill focused on the transition from Head Start to school. We found, in too many instances, that even though the learning experience in early education was significant, that there were some problems, even for the 28 percent of the kids that are able to get it. The fact is that because there was not a comfortable transition into the schools, there was a lost opportunity.

The Senator reminds us of continued support for those who are involved in the Head Start program and for the overall educational experience, all of which we support. But I do not really know. From what I hear from the Senator, it is difficult for me to differ with the kind of support that should be given to the young people, but I have real reluctance to writing in the smart schools when the programs we identified have really been the result of very extensive hearings, not that we are excluding the possibility of the development of these kinds of programs at the local school level, which should be supported.

I suggest to the Senator that, whether in California or elsewhere they develop programs to reflect the kind of objective that the Senator has and be competitive with others in those communities and try and demonstrate their continued effectiveness. But I am reluctant to put smart schools in this legislation. You know I headed legislation, called smart start, for a long time, about 5 years, around here. And now I have smart schools so I cannot get enormously worked up in opposition to it.

So, I would hope that maybe over the weekend we could talk further with the Senator about it. I would be reluctant at this time to identify the smart school concept and put it in the same category as the other concepts, in which we had very extensive, impressive and important hearings on. Not that those programs will be advantaged necessarily in the competition for limited funds, but at least in trying to give some guidance, some advice to schools and parents, those kinds of experiences definitely have had some merit.

I would be glad to reference this in the report to indicate that this matter had been brought to us so that people who are looking through the whole range of different kinds of options to try to get ideas would at least have their attention flagged to it. But at this point I am reluctant to put it here. Let me try to work with the Senator over the weekend. If not, we will have to face it next week.

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, again, I appreciate the willingness of the chairman to work with us over the weekend. Certainly, as with the other amendment, I am willing to set this aside and see if we can find some common language.

I say to the Senator I want to apologize to him. There was no intent to plagiarize. I just was not around 5 years ago.

Mr. KENNEDY. No. We all borrow ideas from each other around here. I am one of those who does.

Mr. SEYMOUR. It had some appeal to the chairman. At least, it carriers a spirit of wanting to understand what we are trying to do here. What we are really trying to do is provide a menu, a menu of ideas, and from my part I sincerely believe that this issue of the quality of education is in such a crisis state that we need to try all the ideas we can, all the ideas that we can, to see if they work and provide maximum flexibility for people at the local level to make the decisions, give them the greatest opportunity to dream, come up with new ideas and new programs.

A lot of the ideas in the smart schools amendment are not new. They are really old ideas that have worked in the past. Maybe the time has come to take a look at what has worked in the past, that maybe in our ideas of high technology and sophistication in curriculum development we have gone beyond that, and we have some good ideas back here.

So I would like to take the menu—and that is my whole intent with the smart schools amendment—take the menu being offered in S. 2 and say "Here are a couple of good ideas. Put them on the menu, too."

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator very much. We will work with the Senator and we will reserve his right. I thank the Senator for his cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California wish to lay the amendment aside by consent at this time?

Mr. SEYMOUR. Yes, I do with the option, of course, of picking it up at a later time if we are unable to work out satisfactory language.

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

The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD].

AMENDMENT NO. 1489

(Purpose: To integrate academic and vocational training at the high school level)

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] proposes an amendment numbered 1489. On page 52, line 4, insert the following: "which may include comprehensive programs (developed with input from local, state and area business leaders) to provide options for those high school students unlikely to attend postsecondary school, that integrate essential academic instruction with technical skills, and provide the training necessary to succeed in a technical career.".

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, this amendment is designed to address a problem that is becoming more clear with respect to our system of higher and elementary and secondary education.

It is well recognized that the United States has the finest system of higher education in the world. We know that students from all over the globe come to the United States for the purpose of getting higher education.

Mr. President, we are not doing such a good job with secondary education. That is where our competitors are doing a superior job, especially with respect to the half of our students who never go on to higher education, which is where our students tend to catch up with the students from the countries with whom we compete.

Very simply, this amendment is designed to focus on providing a curriculum that will allow those students in our secondary schools who have no intention of going on to higher education, that they will have a curriculum that will provide them with the technical skills—the math skills, the writing skills, the analysis skills—to allow them to compete in a high technology world that we currently are experiencing.

Mr. President. that is the guts of this amendment, to focus on the question of what we do to give an opportunity to those students who will not go on to higher education, who will not have a chance to catch up with the students from the countries with whom we compete.

Mr. President, this amendment is inspired by a unique institution in North Dakota—North Dakota State College of Science in Wahpeton. This 2-year school has successfully linked academic training with vocational training for almost 90 years. The school's success is based on the concepts contained in this amendment—integrating academic and vocational training and incorporating input from area businesses.

This amendment addresses a very real need in America. According to a recent study by the Economic Policy Institute, The Myth of the Coming Labor Shortage: Jobs, Skills, and Incomes of America's Workforce 2000, "the bigger and more important chal-

lenge [than producing more college graduates] is to improve the jobs, pay and skills of the noncollege-educated work force."

More than 70 percent of the jobs in America will not require a college education by the year 2000, according to a recent study by the National Center on Education and the Economy. The United States has the best universities in the world, but we do not have a system for training noncollege-bound youth. Our competitors, however, invest heavily in the skills of those students.

For many American students, finishing high school is challenge enough and going on to college or a vocational school after high school is not a consideration. In my view, we must provide options to the academic-based curriculum for students who are not going to go on to college. This amendment will do that. In addition, I believe it will provide some incentive to stay in school for those who are on the verge of quitting.

A quarter of our students drop out of high school before they graduate. In the inner cities, more students quit than finish high school. School work must have some relevance to life outside of school in order to keep students in school and I believe the combination of vocational and academic training included in this amendment will also address this disastrous dropout rate.

A 1989 poll of Fortune 500 companies indicated that over half of the 400 respondents found it difficult to hire employees with good basic skills. One-third of the companies offer their employees remedial courses to improve reading, writing and math abilities. Productivity losses caused by poorly trained workers and remedial training cost industry about $25 billion a year.

An integral part of the amendment is the incorporation of the ideas of area business leaders. Bringing in the real world needs of the business community into program design will assure that the curriculum will be relevant to the workplace. In addition, by linking quality academic preparation—reading, writing, analytic and math skills—with quality technical skills needed in the work force, we could assure graduating students of a successful career in a technical field. Businesses would be able to hire employees equipped with the skills they need to get their jobs done productively.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their support. I understand this amendment will be accepted.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I welcome the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota. I think the Senator was probably here earlier when we were talking about related issues with Senator NUNN and Senator BREAUX. This is a very worthwhile amendment.

One of the really exciting new organizations is the National Alliance of Businesses. The National Alliance is supporting businesses to work with particular schools. We found that in Worcester, MA, for example, just about every business has effectively adopted a school. It is an exciting kind of new partnership that is taking place.

This is a concept that the Business Roundtable has been supportive of.

I think what this amendment does is give recognition and appreciation in the legislation for that particular kind of function. We have seen, for example, in a number of communities, that one of the key objectives of drug—free schools, is building partnerships between the business community, nonprofit organizations, and students. The businesses volunteer staff take the young people to a ball game, or to some other kind of event at the end of the school day. These partnerships have been very successful at dramatically reducing substance abuse in the schools.

This kind of encouragement for the private sector is something that is completely consistent with all the objectives of the legislation. We welcome it and I urge that the Senate adopt the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1489) was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WIRTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 1490

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate concerning investments in education and school-to-work transition initiatives)

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I have an amendment that Senator WELLSTONE and I are offering to the bill and I send it to the desk.

The OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. WIRTH], for himself, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PELL, and Mr. CONRAD, proposes an amendment numbered 1490.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING INVESTMENTS IN EDUCATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the needs of the nation's children and youth have been seriously neglected for more than a decade, as evidenced by a 56 percent increase in defense spending but only a 5 percent increase in programs targeted to America's children;

(2) the failure to invest in early childhood development, education, and job training programs has long term economic and social costs and consequences and poses a growing threat to the competitiveness and productivity of the nation;

(3) the investment in such programs is cost-effective because it saves the Federal Government greater sums in future outlays for special education, welfare, and law enforcement and contributes to deficit reduction;

(4) since the 1990 Budget Agreement, the world has changed dramatically as a result of the fall of communism, the democratization of Eastern Europe, and the far-reaching changes in the Soviet Union;

(5) there is a need for higher priorities for investments in human capital which are currently prohibited by the 1990 Budget Agreement;

(6) a comprehensive Federal education agenda must recognize and invest in the full range of educational programs, including the four essential areas of—

(A) early childhood development;

(B) elementary and secondary education;

(C) the school-to-work transition; and

(D) higher education;

(7) with respect to early childhood development—

(A) the number one national education goal is that all children should enter school ready to learn;

(B) experts agree that access to Head Start, immunizations, and adequate nutrition are essential to ensuring school readiness;

(C) despite 25 years of proven success, only 28 percent of all eligible children currently receive Head Start;

(D) despite the effectiveness of the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children, only 55 percent of eligible pregnant women and children are served;

(E) ensuring that all eligible 3, 4, and 5 year old children have the opportunity to participate in the Head Start program, and receive adequate nutrition and health care services are the most important steps that the Federal Government can take to improve educational performance; and

(F) the business community recognizes school readiness as the most important education goal and refers to this cost effective investment as basic to the survival of our free enterprise economy;

(8) with respect to elementary and secondary education—

(A) changing demographics are overwhelming the nation's educational system because increasing numbers of disadvantaged children are arriving at the school house door with severe barriers to learning;

(B) millions of children are denied access to essential educational and support services because proven Federal programs remain significantly underfunded; and

(C) many students leave middle grades without the skills necessary to become productive citizens in a dynamic, adaptable democracy;

(9) with respect to the school-to-work transition—

(A) at least half of American youth never enter college;

(B) the forgotten-half of America's youth become the front-line workers upon whom

the nation's future productivity and competitiveness depend; and

(C) unless the Federal Government make the investments in human capital necessary to train front-line workers and become a nation of high skills, the America will be consigned to an irreversible future as a low-wage society with a declining standard of living; and

(10) with respect to higher education—

(A) over the last 15 years, the cost of college education has outpaced the cost of living, and higher education is increasingly out of reach for low- and middle-income Americans;

(B) unlike other industrialized democracies, the United States expects students and their families to bear the primary burden of paying for higher education; and

(C) although Pell grants have in the past helped many lower- and middle-income students meet their college expenses, today's students are increasingly being forced to rely on loans.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) legislation should be enacted that realigns the 1990 Budget Agreement to reflect the true priorities of the American people by shifting unnecessary military spending into domestic programs including early child development, education, and job training to promote the nation's long term economic growth and social well being; and

(2) the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 should be amended to permit the realization of a new domestic order through—

(A) investments that ensure that all eligible 4, and 5 year old children receive comprehensive Head Start services by 1997, at the full funding level provided for in the Augustus F. Hawkins Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1990, that the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children is available to every eligible pregnant woman and child, as well as investments in other critically important early intervention programs such as immunization, and comprehensive family support services;

(B) investments that ensure that elementary and secondary schools have the financial assistance necessary to improve educational achievement, promote student participation, and provide an educational environment that is conducive to learning including a constructive student-teacher ratio, as well as adequate funding for proven programs that enhance equity in education and provide the foundation to meet future challenges;

(C) investments in school-to-work transition initiatives that develop partnerships among all levels of government and the private sector to assist non-college bound youth and strengthen the training of workers throughout their lifetime in the workplace; and

(D) investments that increase access to higher education by—

(i) expanding the Pell grant program to reach more low and middle income students and guaranteeing a Pell grant to all eligible students;

(ii) expanding student loan programs for middle-income students;

(iii) encouraging early intervention programs for at-risk youth to attend college; and

(iv) making more intensive efforts for the recruitment and training of teachers.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I am offering this amendment, and Senator WELLSTONE and I have been working on this along with Senator KENNEDY, Senator PELL, Senator CONRAD, Senator SIMON, and others.

Mr. President, let me, if I might, read the guts of the sense-of-the-Senate resolution:

(1) legislation should be enacted that realigns the 1990 Budget Agreement to reflect the true priorities of the American people by shifting unnecessary military spending into domestic programs including early child development, education, and job training to promote the nation's long term economic growth and social well being; and

(2) the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 should be amended.

AMENDMENT NO. 1491 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1490

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate concerning investments in education and school-to-work transition initiatives)

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the amendment and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. WIRTH], for himself, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PELL, and Mr. CONRAD, proposes an amendment numbered 1491 to amendment No. 1490.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after "SEC." and insert the following:

. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING INVESTMENTS IN EDUCATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the needs of the nation's children and youth have been seriously neglected for more than a decade, as evidenced by a 56 percent increase in defense spending but only a 5 percent increase in programs targeted to America's children;

(2) the failure to invest in early childhood development, education, and job training programs has long term economic and social costs and consequences and poses a growing threat to the competitiveness and productivity of the nation;

(3) the investment in such programs is cost-effective because it saves the Federal Government greater sums in future outlays for special education, welfare, and law enforcement and contributes to deficit reduction;

(4) since the 1990 Budget Agreement, the world has changed dramatically as a result of the fall of communism, the democratization of Eastern Europe, and the far-reaching change in the Soviet Union;

(5) there is a need for higher priorities for investments in human capital which are currently prohibited by the 1990 Budget Agreement;

(6) a comprehensive Federal education agenda must recognize and invest in the full range of educational programs, including the four essential areas of—

(A) early childhood development;

(B) elementary and secondary education;

(C) the school-to-work transition; and

(D) higher education;

(7) with respect to early childhood development—

(A) the number one national education goals is that all children should enter school ready to learn;

(B) experts agree that access to Head Start, immunizations, and adequate nutrition are essential to ensuring school readiness;

(C) despite 25 years of proven success, only 28 percent of all eligible children currently receive Head Start;

(D) despite the effectiveness of the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children, only 55 percent of eligible pregnant women and children are served;

(E) ensuring that all eligible 3, 4, and 5 year old children have the opportunity to participate in the Head Start program, and receive adequate nutrition and health care services are the most important steps that the Federal Government can take to improve educational performance; and

(F) the business community recognizes school readiness as the most important education goal and refers to this cost effective investment as basic to the survival of our free enterprise economy;

(8) with respect to elementary and secondary education—

(A) changing demographics are overwhelming the nation's educational system because increasing numbers of disadvantaged children are arriving at the school house door with severe barriers to learning;

(B) millions of children are denied access to essential educational and support services because proven Federal programs remain significantly underfunded; and

(C) many students leave middle grades without the skills necessary to become productive citizens in a dynamic, adaptable democracy;

(9) with respect to the school-to-work transition—

(A) at least half of American youth never enter college;

(B) the forgotten-half of America's youth become the front-line workers upon whom the nation's future productivity and competitiveness depend; and

(C) unless the Federal Government make the investments in human capital necessary to train front-line workers and become a nation of high skills, the America will be consigned to an irreversible future as a low-wage society with a declining standard of living; and

(10) with respect to higher education—

(A) over the last 15 years, the cost of college education has outpaced the cost of living, and higher education is increasingly out of reach for low- and middle-income Americans;

(B) unlike other industrialized democracies, the United States expects students and their families to bear the primary burden of paying for higher education; and

(C) although Pell grants have in the past helped many lower- and middle-income students meet their college expenses, today's students are increasingly being forced to rely on loans.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) legislation should be enacted that realigns the 1990 Budget Agreement to reflect the true priorities of the American people by shifting unnecessary military spending into domestic programs including early child development, education, and job training to promote the nation's long term economic growth and social well being; and

(2) the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Balanced Budget and Emergency

Deficit Control Act of 1985 should be amended to permit the realization of a new domestic order through—

(A) investments that ensure that all eligible 3, 4, and 5 year old children receive comprehensive Head Start services by 1997, at the full funding level provided for in the Augustus F. Hawkins Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1990, that the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children is available to every eligible pregnant woman and child, as well as investments in other critically important early intervention programs such as immunization, and comprehensive family support services;

(B) investments that ensure that elementary and secondary schools have the financial assistance necessary to improve educational achievement, promote student participation, and provide an educational environment that is conducive to learning including a constructive student-teacher ratio, as well as adequate funding for proven programs that enhance equity in education and provide the foundation to meet future challenges;

(C) investments in school-to-work transition initiatives that develop partnerships among all levels of government and the private sector to assist non-college bound youth and strengthen the training of workers throughout their life-time in the workplace; and

(D) investments that increase access to higher education by—

(i) expanding the Pell grant program to reach more low and middle income students and guaranteeing a Pell grant to all eligible students;

(ii) expanding student loan programs for middle-income students;

(iii) encouraging early intervention programs for at-risk youth to attend college; and

(iv) making more intensive efforts to the recruitment and training of teachers.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, the amendment to the amendment that I just offered completes the coverage of this amendment to all ages of the Head Start Program for ages 3, 4, and 5, which had not been in the initial amendment.

Mr. President, the thrust of this amendment is very clear. It is time for us to change priorities, time to change the caps that were voted in, in the 1990 bill, not by spending more, but by spending differently. It is my own belief that it is time for us to dramatically drop expenditures on the defense side—for things like the B-2 bomber or reopening the Rocky Flats nuclear weapons plant.

What this amendment does is say very clearly we should amend the budget agreement, amend the Budget Control Act of 1985, so we can focus, in particular, on investment in education.

These indeed should be the best of times. The cold war is over and the Communist threat is gone forever. Democratic ideals prevail around the world. The market system is pursued by virtually every nation around the globe and the world looks to the United States of America for leadership. But, ironically, there is little rejoicing here at home. We seem to be at peace with everyone but ourselves.

While we paid dearly for 50 years of successful wartime and cold war policy, our children have been short-changed in our schools. For the last decade, a series of education surveys from the Carnegie Commission to A Nation at Risk have warned us about declining performance in the classroom. For the first time, in our Nation's history we will be graduating from high school a generation of young people less literate than their parents. Our commitment to new jobs and retraining in our changing economy is down to the lowest level in 30 years. In too many cases youngsters are being priced out of access to higher education, which is becoming an opportunity only for a privileged few.

These are symptoms of serious problems in our Nation's social and economic fabric, and the list goes on to include health care, research and development, housing and the homeless, and continued environmental degradation despite yeoman efforts in many places. The plague of drugs and related crime continues as our streets become less safe and our communities less secure.

This is a litany familiar to us all; and to one degree or another we have been describing it and discussing it, but it is now time as we start on this legislation to really attack these issues.

But the American people understand the changes that have taken place and that its time to do things differently. And they are asking us to respond to that change. How do I know? I hear it everywhere I go—Greeley, CO, in Pueblo, in Ft. Collins, and all points in between. These thoughts were reaffirmed when a study was recently released that showed that 71 percent of Americans strongly agree they want to make children's programs a priority for our Government. Colorado voters are willing to make children a top priority for Government spending—even when compared with national health insurance, fighting crime and drugs, job training and economic development, cleaning the environment, lower taxes, protecting social security, military spending, and aid to foreign countries—all of these things. They are saying kids should be our No. 1 priority.

I do not intend to stand here and preach gloom and doom on all these other issues, to continue to run through the litany of problems that lie at our feet for the last 10 to 12 years of degradation and change in the economic climate. The blunt fact is that we cannot ignore reality, we cannot pretend it is not there. We cannot isolate ourselves individually or collectively from our broader community responsibility.

Obviously, Mr. President—or it should be obvious, in any case, as it was brought home to us by the mayors' meeting here last week—a great nation cannot survive long if its core cities are rotting away, or if the gap between rich and poor grows, if our young are discouraged by seeming lack of opportunity, if we do not think critically about what we need to do to solve our problems.

The tools are there if we want to use them. As a boy, I learned from my grandfather that when you get in trouble, you go back to fundamentals. Today, we have the opportunity again to do just that, to set the wheels in motion, to go back to fundamentals, to reestablish our commitment to education and opportunity for all young Americans—all Americans. We must invest in our future.

Senator WELLSTONE and I are offering this amendment, along with the other coauthors, a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that states that in order to meet our great and pressing needs here at home, we must have much more flexibility in our budget. By binding ourselves by the straitjacket of the budget agreement of 1990, we are limiting what our Government can do for the citizens of the country. And we are limiting our potential for the future.

The budget agreement must be revised to reflect our true American priorities, and this amendment calls for just that. It states that a comprehensive Federal education agenda must recognize and invest in the full range of educational programs, including early childhood development, elementary and secondary education, school-to-work transition, and higher education.

Our No. 1 educational goal is that all children should enter school ready to learn. We are already behind where we must be to make this goal a reality—a travesty because it should be a reality. We know that Head Start works, for example, Mr. President, and that has been discussed here at some length. We know that children's minds can be enriched and their school work improved if they are ready to take on educational opportunities available to them. But despite this 25-year history of proven success, not even 30 percent of eligible children participate in Head Start.

We talk about it a great deal, but only 30 percent of the eligible kids in the country are enrolled in a program that we know works. Ensuring that all eligible 3-, 4-, and 5-year-old children have the opportunity to participate, it seems to me, is the simplest, and most effective and obvious thing for us to do.

But without changes in our current Federal Government, Head Start will not ever be fully funded. We will never be able to support teacher training programs that bring new vigor to the classroom. We will never be able to meet all the priorities that are talked about by our good new Secretary of Education, Secretary Alexander, by the Governors. My Governor of Colorado, Roy Romer has been deeply involved in this. None of these things that we say

can be done unless we change the budget straitjacket.

We will throw roadblocks in front of the innovation that needs to happen in our schools if we stick with the budget agreement that is old-fashioned and outmoded.

There are so many needs to be met. But we cannot do it unless we change. How do we finance these changes? What are the roadblocks? Let me just point out some pretty startling figures, Mr. President.

We all talk about defense expenditures. We had this debate almost the last thing last fall on the Defense appropriations bill. Do you know what we are spending on defense still? The cold war norm, the peacetime norm, was $235 billion a year in 1991 dollars—$235 billion a year. The cold war is raging; the peacetime norm, $235 billion.

The cold war is over, but now we are spending $290 billion. In other words, at the height of peacetime during the cold war, we were spending $235 billion in 1991 dollars. Now the cold war is over, and we are spending $55 billion a year more. That is a pretty startling figure, Mr. President. Clearly, it indicates that it is time for change.

The American public wants us to change, and change rapidly. I think this resolution is a critical first step toward that goal.

Yesterday, Bob Reischauser, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, indicated to us on the Budget Committee that while the recession was causing pain and should be a matter of some concern, he was much more worried about the long-term health of our economy. Alice Riflin said the same thing. Felix Rohatyn said the same thing. We have heard that over and over and over again from people who have had that experience: Let us look at the long-term investments that have to be made. And education is precisely the kind of investment that is necessary.

Many of us are fond of saying that we have to make choices in the budget to fund essential programs, and that is true. Many, probably everybody in here, has run for office calling for more support for education. And that is justifiable. But the deal is, we have to do it. We cannot just talk about it; we have to do it. We have to make these changes. And that is what the Wirth-Wellstone amendment is all about.

In summary, Mr. President, let me also hearken us back to that President, Abraham Lincoln, who led this Nation through probably the most trying time in our history. He had this wonderful capacity to talk about the future and to use a word that we see so little of today: posterity. President Lincoln said the following:

> A child is a person who is going to carry on what you have started. He is going to sit where you are sitting and when you are gone, attend to those things which you think are important. You may adopt all the policies you please, but how they will be carried out depends on him. He will assume control of your cities, states and nations. He is going to move in and take over your churches, schools, universities and corporations. All your books are going to be judged, accepted or condemned by him. The fate of Humanity is in his hands. So it might be well to pay him some attention.

That is what this amendment is all about.

I want to pay a special word of thanks to my colleague from Minnesota, Senator WELLSTONE. We started working on this last fall when it became absolutely clear that the world was changing more rapidly than our institution was changing, more rapidly than our whole budget process was changing. It was time to move on it. We are now seeing others journeying in this direction.

Fortunately, the administration has started to make some noise about this. And I know we will have their support and the support of everybody here on the Wirth-Wellstone amendment, a first aggressive step toward change.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, first of all let me thank the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WIRTH] for not just the speech on the floor, but really a very consistent commitment to young people and education over the years.

I would be remiss if I did not recognize the presence of Senator PELL here on the floor today, who has been an absolute hero to me as I followed the Senate over the years, having been a teacher for over 2 decades at a higher education level. Senator PELL has just been great, to my mind. I am pleased he is on the floor now while this amendment is being discussed.

Let me also recognize the presence of Senator JEFFORDS from Vermont, who I also know has a very strong commitment to education.

> But imagine my dismay on bringing my daughter to the first day of first grade and finding that a total of 36 students were in the class.

This is a letter from a father in Minneapolis who took his daughter to a really fine elementary school—it is a fine elementary school—but could not believe that there were 36 students to 1 teacher in an elementary school class. This elementary school had had to lay off another teacher, an elementary schoolteacher, who would have also taught that grade.

Let us describe this in human terms. At the Minnesota fair, I met a young woman. She came up and introduced herself to me. I said, "What do you do?" She said, "I am a teacher." I said, "At what level do you teach?" She said "Elementary." Then I made a mistake. I said "Where do you teach?" All of a sudden a look of pained expression came across her face and she said, "I don't have a job." A young women, talented, decided that she wanted to devote her adult life working with young children in the school. She cannot find a job. We have tremendously large classes, too large to do well for children at the elementary level, and yet we have young teachers who cannot find jobs.

I spoke at North High in north Minneapolis last week. I made a huge mistake. I will admit to it on the Senate floor. I talked about early childhood development, Head Start, about WIC. A woman raised her hand, stood up and said, "We are high school students. We feel as if we have been written off. Senator WELLSTONE, are you writing us off? I do not want you to write us off."

I think what she was saying, at least implicitly, was: We believe that the politicians of this country in Washington have abandoned us.

Yesterday, to a young woman in my office, Michelle Moriarity, who is a senior at Cambridge High School, I said, "Where are you going to school?" What she said to me was, "I do not know yet. I want to go to Morehead School, but I am really worried about the finances. I feel I am not low enough income to qualify for the grants." I am sure the Senator from Rhode Island, Senator PELL, has heard that before. "But we do not have enough"—she is the daughter of a farmer—"to be able to afford it." She said, "I am very worried; I do not know quite how I am going to do it."

This is what the amendment Senator WIRTH and I have offered is all about.

I think what is going on in the country, speaking for myself, is a lot of photo opportunity politics when it comes to children in education. I have said it on the floor before and I have to say it one more time. I swear every single politician from every single party loves children and education and is all for them except when it comes to digging into their pockets. It has become the functional equivalent of kissing babies. That and health care. Every politician is for it.

Mr. President, we know what works. When we had the debate on the choice amendment, I heard several Senators, who said it in very good conscience and very good faith, who said we needed to see what would work with some experimental programs. But I think sometimes we harp on the complexity of the matter to the point where that has become the simplification. We do know what works. We do know that every woman expecting a child should have a diet rich in protein. No one wants to disagree with that; it is irrefutable.

As Senator WIRTH said, we do not even fully fund the Women, Infants, and Children Program. We know that children when they are young, before they go into elementary school, according to the Carnegie report, come to kindergarten unprepared because they have not had that nurturing support of environment.

Head Start has been an unambiguous success for 25 years. Nobody argues that it has not been successful. We do not come anywhere close to fully funding it.

And what else do we know? Is it really all that confusing? If you are a teacher at the elementary school level—if I had to do it over again, I would teach at the elementary school level; I think that is much more important than at the college level—you can do well with students if you have 15 students in your class. You can give each one of those students the attention he or she deserves. You can really support them. But we have 35, 40, 45 students per teacher at our elementary school level. We know what works.

I will tell you something else we know that works. We know it works when a young person can go on to a college or university and he or she does not have to work two or three minimum wage jobs while in school. That is exactly what is happening today in our country. I met some students at Morehead State in western Minnesota, and after it was all over, this one young guy came up to me—I will never forget this—he looked at me, and he said kind of philosophically, "You know, my parents told me that the college years would be the best years of my life." He said, "I don't think my parents know what's going on. We are working several minimum wage jobs. Some of us are selling plasma at the beginning of the semester to buy textbooks. These aren't the best years of our lives."

So that is the point of this sense-of-the-Senate resolution. The Kennedy bill is a step forward. Senator KENNEDY has been a tireless advocate for education. But when you get right down to it, we are absolutely hamstrung by this budget agreement, and we have really a minimum amount of resources. It is adequate. That is the way I would describe it. It sure beats the administration's bill, to be perfectly honest, but it is only adequate. And if you lay the bill and the appropriation of money, $850 million, alongside the need, you realize how far we have to go.

So what this sense-of-the-Senate amendment says is it is no longer time to—I think maybe the Chair will appreciate this: There is an old Yiddish proverb. It says you cannot dance at two weddings at the same time. It is time for us to stop trying to dance at two weddings at the same time. We all know very well as we talk about the need to invest in human capital for economic recovery we will not invest in human capital until we have the money to invest in human capital, and we will not have the money to invest in human capital with that 1990 budget agreement that does not recognize a new world and prohibits us from transferring any kind of reasonable sum of money from the military budget to people within our own country.

We focus on education and young people. I think this is a wonderful amendment, in my not so humble opinion. I think it will bring about a very good vote on the floor of the Senate and we will find out how serious Senators are about beginning to make a commitment to education and young people, not just this year but in the very immediate future.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, it is with very great reluctance at this moment that I must oppose the amendment from this side of the aisle. It is not on the content of the amendment but, rather, the fact it is being brought up prematurely, in a time when we should be discussing, if we get into this issue, not only the priorities of education but also the other national priorities we have. Certainly, this same committee has just been dealing with health care reform and the necessity of billions of dollars which may be required in that regard. We still have many other needs, social needs, in our country, but as far as education goes, as a member of the Education Committee and one that has been dedicated to the concept of improving education in this Nation and recognizing the incredible importance it has to our ability to improve our situation in the world economy, to be able to try to get us on the road where we are increasing our standards of living and all of those things that we want and dream about, I certainly recognize we have many problems in that area. I am ashamed of what this Nation spends on education relative to our competitors. I take a look at Japan, for instance, which is one that is on everyone's mind when we talk about international competition. I see that they spend 12 percent of their GNP on education. We spend 6 percent. The Federal Government only spends about 0.6 percent as far as the GNP goes on education. That is abominable, and it needs to be raised in our sense of priorities.

However, I reluctantly have to agree that it would be more appropriate to do this when we take a look at the whole budget, whether we amend it now or whatever time, and not to try to do it on a sense-of-the-Senate amendment at this particular time.

For instance, right now I know there is a commission I got set up in the last reauthorization of the education bill where we examine our need to provide assistance to students to be able to go to college.

Another aspect of that is infrastructure, which has declined in higher education to the tune of about $650 million, to which we need to find an answer, the lack of attention to graduate students, all of those things.

But I say certainly I understand the plea from Members on this side of the aisle that we have to take a look at the whole budget, and members of the Budget Committee on our side want very much to talk on this issue. They will not have a chance to. They were unaware it was coming up.

So I say with great reluctance that at this point, at this time, on this bill that I will have to express my opposition to this amendment.

Mr. WIRTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I am very interested in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I know the strong supporter of education he has been. He and I came to the House together in 1974. There has been nobody I know in the last 18 years who has been a stronger supporter to the commitment to education. So I know the distinguished Senator from Vermont, as he pointed out, but is acting on behalf of his leadership.

However, I am a little bit surprised. I thought my amendment Mr. President, would go through and everybody would agree that we must change our current budget. The President has come to us and talked about the need to spend money on Head Start. We saw him in a Head Start program the other day making telephone calls.

But I do not know where the money is going to come from if we do not change the budget agreement. We talked about New American Schools. I do not know where the money is going to come from if we do not change the budget agreement. We talked about the aid to nonpublic schools. I do not know where the money is going to come from if we do not change the budget agreement. We have talked about access of young people to higher education. I do not know where the money is going to come from if we do not change the budget agreement.

The American people have to know what happened in 1990. We were still in a situation where the Warsaw Pact was extant. We were still in a situation where we had a confrontation between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. We still were thinking we were going to build the B-2 bomber, and many opposed that. We still thought we were going to modernize our nuclear weapons programs and many opposed that, but it was on the agenda. We were still doing that when this budget agreement was put together.

The world has changed dramatically since that budget agreement went into effect. That budget agreement locked us into this expenditure pattern, as I pointed out $290 billion on defense, $55 billion more than at the height of the cold war. That pattern is wrong, Mr. President, and it is time for us to change it. The American people are out there saying to us, change it. They are

out there saying stop a lot of things you are doing, stop fighting the last war, let us go on to the future. It is time for a change. We cannot bury our heads in the sand and pretend it has not happened. We have to change.

What Senator WELLSTONE and I are doing is saying this is a perfect opportunity to start this transformation. This is a perfect opportunity to enhance education. We are talking about an investment in our future. We are talking about the 21st century, and everything that has been discussed on this floor for the last 3 days is not possible without changing this budget agreement. We cannot start to reduce the budget deficit without changing this budget agreement. We cannot make these investments without changing this budget agreement. The time has come.

I think Senator WELLSTONE was as surprised as I to have this being opposed. Maybe there is going to be time to work this out. I am sure there will be because there cannot be anybody in this Chamber who does not know that it is time to change the budget agreement.

I will note the language in here that says we want to meet the priorities of the American people by shifting unnecessary military spending into domestic programs, including, not limited to, but including early childhood development, education, job training to promote the Nation's long-term economic growth and social well-being.

It is a pretty reasonable proposition, I think. I suspect we will all agree with that when we get done with this, and I would hope that everybody understands what this amendment is all about. The Wirth-Wellstone amendment is all about changing, changing, changing, changing what we have done. The cold war is over. Everybody in the country knows it. Let us start doing something about it.

Mr. President, I appreciate the forbearance of the Chair, and I want to again thank my colleague from Minnesota for his help in drafting this amendment and putting it together. I think it makes all kinds of sense and reflects exactly what the President wants to do.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, will either the Senator from Minnesota or the Senator from Colorado help me in understanding the amendment? I notice there were some changes made in the original amendment which addressed the present Budget Act. This one is amending the Congressional Budget Act, as I see the change, of 1974, and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Are we then making this part of the permanent law or the sense of the Senate that it ought to be made a part of the permanent law? Is that the intent, so people understand a little bit better?

The other one was a modification, as I understood it, of the present budget agreement.

Mr. WIRTH. It is my understanding the Budget Act of 1990 that set all these caps also reached back and amended the Budget Act of 1974 and the Budget Act of 1985. So by reference they have to be changed as well.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, let me just add a few words to what the Senator from Colorado had to say. I know the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] is committed to education so let me try and say it is sincerely as I know how.

I thought when I was working on this with Senator WIRTH that one of the really good things about this sense-of-the-Senate amendment was that it would essentially give people the opportunity to vote what they were saying anyway, because what I have been hearing people say on the floor of the Senate and in private conversation is we just know that in terms of what we are announcing as goals and what we care about, we are not funding at adequate levels, and we know we are not going to be able to have the money for that unless we raise taxes—and I did not hear a lot about raising taxes—or unless we go into more debt—and I did not hear much about that—or we are going to have to transfer some from the military budget, a prudent amount, and invest this money in programs that we are now saying are priority programs.

So I thought that when we were working on this, this would be very helpful for Senators to be able to signal to the people in the country, "Look, we have done what we can do at the moment but we know much more has to be done." We do not mean this as symbolic politics; we are going to make the commitment and understand full well that the budget agreement is frozen in time and we will simply have to revisit the budget agreement and have the transfer of some resources. That is all this sense-of-the-Senate amendment says.

I am expecting that it will get, I would not say 100 percent support, but I would be very surprised if there was not tremendous support for it.

Mr. DURENBERGER addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. DURENBERGER. Thank you very much, Mr. President. I would like to take a few minutes to point out an important provision in S. 2 which was added at my urging by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY at the time he brought this legislation to the floor.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee, the chairman of the education subcommittee, the ranking members and their staffs for their cooperation in building this particular matter and this particular amendment into the committee amendment.

I understand that my distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Senator LIEBERMAN, with whom I have worked closely on this provision, has previously spoken on this matter.

I would like to engage in a brief colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts regarding his intent in offering his amendment that expands on the allowable uses of funds authorized under section 202 for State-level initiatives.

This provision, Mr. President, amends section 202 to allow States to use a portion of the block grant authorized under S. 2 to help establish new public schools including charter schools.

This provision is based, in part, on legislation adopted in Minnesota last year that offers a new way for teachers, parents, and others in the community to start new public schools.

The provision Senator KENNEDY has added to S. 2—and the new Minnesota chartered schools law—both affirm three important principles:

First, that school choice is good—but incomplete—without more—and more diverse—school choices.

Second, that parents, teachers, and community groups are an untapped resource in starting and running new schools that offer more choices and more diversity in public education.

And, third, that we will not get more diversity and more choices as long as the only way to start a new public school relies on the exclusive franchise of local school boards and administrators, many of whom may not view the establishment of new schools outside their traditional control to be in their best interest.

Consistent with those principles, Mr. President, Minnesota legislators from both parties joined forces last year to adopt the Nation's first chartered schools law—a law which now allows new public schools to be started by parents, teachers, and others in the community.

Connecticut and a number of other States are now also considering chartered schools legislation.

And, within the past 60 days, the first two chartered public schools have been authorized in Minnesota by their local school boards and by the Minnesota State Board of Education.

WHAT CHARTERED SCHOOLS ARE AND WHAT THEY ARE NOT

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that a great deal of misinformation has been distributed in these halls and in these corridors since Senator LIEBERMAN and I first indicated our interest in introducing an amendment supporting chartered public schools.

So, in the interest of setting the record straight, I want to take a few

minutes here today to respond to the four most important concerns that have been raised by those who oppose the concept of chartered schools.

1. CHARTERED SCHOOLS ARE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

First, let me state emphatically, Mr. President, that chartered schools are public schools.

Chartered schools are funded in the same manner as other public schools in their State and may not charge tuition.

Chartered schools must meet the same nondiscrimination requirements placed on other public schools.

Chartered schools must accept all students who choose to attend. When more students choose to attend than there is space, a lottery must be held to determine placement.

And, finally, chartered schools must be authorized by—and be under contract with—a local school district or other public agency.

2. CHARTERED SCHOOLS MAY NOT BE RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS

Second, Mr. President, let me also state emphatically, that S. 2 as now amended could not be used to help fund religious schools.

In fact, S. 2 lifts language directly out of the Minnesota chartered schools law which was intended by its authors to ensure that these new public schools would be nonsectarian.

That provision in S. 2 states that "any new public school established under section 202 shall be nonsectarian in its programs, admissions policies, employment practices, and all other operations and shall not be affiliated with a nonpublic sectarian school or a religious institution."

3. CHARTERED SCHOOLS MAY NOT HAVE SELECTIVE ADMISSIONS POLICIES

Third, Mr. President, Minnesota's chartered schools may not be elitist schools that screen admissions on the basis of race, academic qualifications, or other factors.

In the event that more students choose to attend than may be accommodated, students are admitted on the basis of a lottery.

Supporters of chartered schools believe strongly that admission requirements should be the same as those placed on other public schools.

4. CHARTERED SCHOOLS ARE ACCOUNTABLE

Finally, Mr. President, it is not true—as some have charged—that chartered schools have no public accountability and would be totally free of academic or other standards.

In fact, Mr. President, accountability for chartered schools is—in some ways—even more stringent and more specific than accountability requirements now placed on other public schools.

In Minnesota, each chartered school must receive its permission to operate from a local school board and the State board of education.

In addition, each chartered school must have a multiyear contract with its sponsor that sets out specific outcomes it must achieve, how those outcomes will be monitored, and how all the requirements of chartered schools will be met.

It is also intended that these contracts would have to be periodically renewed for the charter to remain in force. So, if the chartered school does not live up to its obligations, its contract will not be renewed, and the school will be put out of business.

Show me a public school that has to have its right to exist renewed every 3 years, Mr. President, and I will show you an accountable public school.

CHARTERED SCHOOLS ARE BECOMING A REALITY

Late last year, Mr. President, the first such chartered school was authorized by the Winona School Board and then by the Minnesota State Board of Education. I visited that school and met with some of its teachers and parents just 2 weeks ago.

During that visit, I learned that almost 1,200 people in Winona had signed a petition supporting approval of this new school which will be an enlarged version of an existing private Montessori school.

Officials at the school have said, in exchange for the chartered designation and public funding that comes with it, they will abide by all the provisions of Minnesota's law, including nondiscrimination requirements and acceptance of all applicants they have room for.

To emphasize its nonsectarian nature, the school will be moving from its current rented space in a Catholic elementary school before it begins operations next fall.

Despite the fact that this new school could draw State and local revenues away from other Winona public schools, the district school board chair Stuart Miller has said, "the whole point should be what's best for children, not what's best for the school district or the Montessori school. * * * I think we gain a new way of delivering the public school to people, and we give them choice."

Minnesota's second chartered school was approved by the Minnesota State Board of Education just last week, giving new life to a small public school north of Duluth that was about to close due to declining enrollments.

Teachers, parents, and others in the communities of Toivola and Meadowlands are hoping to use the Minnesota's chartered schools law to create the type of open school that we've traditionally seen mainly in large urban areas.

The Winona and Toivola-Meadowlands chartered schools are just two of dozens of proposals that are now being developed by teachers, parents, and community groups all over Minnesota.

Some of the proposals—like one for a new middle school in Northfield—would create entirely new schools from scratch.

Others—like the two approved so far—and new proposals in Rochester and Rapidan—would convert existing public or private schools to chartered school status.

Several proposals—including one being discussed by the St. Paul Chapter of the NAACP—involve grassroots initiatives by community groups and nonprofit organizations.

And, still others involve individual teachers—or groups of teachers—who are developing proposals to create new chartered schools within their own districts.

One such school—already approved by the school district's administration—involves a group of teachers in North Branch who want to create a new and more innovative middle school.

Another such proposal getting serious consideration has been made by Joan Riedl, a Princeton elementary school teacher who has two chartered school proposals pending before both the St. Cloud and Princeton school boards.

Joan Riedl's proposal is to create a two-classroom chartered school that would have teachers remain with the same students for more than 1 year, and make extensive use of educational technology and parent volunteers.

Some school officials have raised valid questions about the risks involved in allowing teachers to start and run schools.

But, as an editorial in the St. Cloud Times put it,

> Change is always difficult for some to accept. But, the last people who should be balking at the challenge of opening new vistas in the field of education are teachers. Learning should be about experimenting and stretching, reaching and dreaming. It shouldn't be about fear and defensiveness, about competition and risk.

Mr. President, to provide further evidence of the interest and current status of chartered schools legislation in Minnesota and other States, I ask unanimous consent that several articles and editorials from Minnesota and national newspapers be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DURENBERGER. I thank the Chair.

NEED FOR FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE EVIDENT

Mr. President, once up and running, chartered schools will be funded with the same combination of Federal, State, and local tax revenues available to all other public schools.

But, one of the early lessons from attempts to start new chartered schools in Minnesota is that teachers, parents,

and community groups will need both technical and financial assistance to help them get started.

In the business world, we might call this seed money or venture capital. And, although many parents and teachers have good ideas on things they would like to do differently, they need help in exploring and organizing the financial and other aspects of new schools.

Teachers may need stipends, for example, to allow them to take time off to develop their proposals and to design a new curriculum.

Legal and financial expertise often needs to be hired. Equipment and textbooks need to be proposed. And, minor renovations in buildings will often be needed to meet State and local health and safety codes.

As I previously noted, Minnesota's law—and proposals being developed in other States—finance the ongoing operations of chartered schools in the same manner those States finance other public schools.

But, they do not offer the kind of startup funding that can often mean the difference between a good idea and reality.

That is why it is so important, Mr. President, that—thanks to the provision Senator KENNEDY has added at my request—S. 2 now allows States to use a portion of their block grant to help bridge that gap.

INTEREST IN SCHOOL DIVERSITY ALSO EVIDENT IN OTHER STATES

Finally, Mr. President, I want to point out that interest in chartered schools is not at all unique to Minnesota.

Chartered schools are now being actively discussed by legislators and education reformers in a number of States including Connecticut, Massachusetts, California, Florida, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Tennessee.

That is one reason I am pleased that several other Members—including my distinguished colleagues from Connecticut, from Georgia, and other States—have been very supportive of my efforts to ensure that new alternative public schools will be eligible for funding under this legislation.

One of the national leaders in this movement is Dr. Stephen C. Tracy, superintendent of schools in New Milford, CT. Dr. Tracy has drafted a chartered schools proposal that was considered last year by the Connecticut State Legislature and that is now being reviewed by a State legislative task force.

In defending that proposal, Dr. Tracy has said:

As we continue the discussion about the future of public education in our country, I believe that we must move beyond the old distinction between "public schools" and "private schools." The significant distinction, it seems to me, is between schools that are in the public interest and schools that are not.

A second major proposal for chartered schools was also made by Michigan Gov. John Engler as part of a comprehensive deduction reform package he proposed to the Michigan State Legislature last September.

Under Governor Engler's proposal, chartered schools would be authorized by local boards of education and other education or public agencies. They would have to accept students regardless of academic achievement levels or other discriminatory criteria.

And, if a charter were granted, the Michigan schools would receive funding from the State at the level of the State average per pupil expenditure or the per pupil average of the local district in which the school is located, whichever is greater.

A third example of national interest in chartered schools, Mr. President, is in California where a debate has been raging in the State legislature and the deduction and business communities about a wide range of school choice alternatives, including open-ended vouchers for both public and nonpublic schools.

Partly in response to a proposal to place a voucher initiative on next year's ballot, California officials including State school superintendent Bill Honig and several important legislative leaders are now considering a proposal to allow chartered schools to be created and publicly funded.

Such a proposal recognizes the important role that chartered schools can have in both broadening school diversity and in expanding parent choice, while still retaining accountability and the underlying values and principles of public education.

Let me conclude, Mr. President, by expressing my appreciation to my distinguished colleague from Connecticut for his support and for his contributions to my efforts to ensure that new chartered public schools could receive funding under this legislation.

He and I both are hopeful that Connecticut will become the second State in the Nation to make this option available to its teachers, parents, and students.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Education Week, Jan. 15, 1992]

"SUPPLY SIDE" REFORM OR VOUCHER?

CHARTER-SCHOOL CONCEPT TAKES HOLD

(By Lynn Olson)

Advocates bill it as a way to introduce diversity and autonomy into public education. Critics call it a subsidy for private schools.

But one thing is clear: Few people are neutral about a new Minnesota law that encourages licensed teachers to start and run their own independent public schools under contract or "charter" with a local school board.

The first such charter school was approved by the state board of education last month and could open as early as this fall. More than a dozen other proposals are under discussion as well. *(See Education Week, Nov. 27, 1991.)*

Sponsors argue that, by breaking school boards' monopoly on starting up and running public schools, the new law will be a "supply side" reform that will expand educational choices for students and free teachers from oppressive rules and regulations.

But the concept has been adamantly opposed by members of Minnesota's education establishment, who view it as a backdoor attempt to introduce private-school vouchers.

"It's generating more discussion sooner than I had expected," said State Representative Becky Kelso, one of the law's sponsors. "And it's every bit as controversial as I had feared."

While it continues to spur debate in Minnesota, the charter-schools idea also is spreading to other parts of the nation. Lawmakers in at least six states and a handful of school districts are either exploring or plan to introduce charter proposals this year. U.S. Senator Dave Durenburger of Minnesota, meanwhile, is seeking federal funding for such schools as part of a pending education bill.

REDEFINING PUBLIC EDUCATION

Under the Minnesota law, any licensed teacher can ask a local school board to authorize a charter, subject to approval by the state board of education.

The law requires such schools to meet certain basic principles that characterize public education. For example, they cannot screen students, have a religious affiliation, charge tuition, or discriminate on the basis of race, religion, or disability.

Once the state board approves a proposal, the local school board must devise a contract that spells out the outcomes pupils in the school are to achieve.

Each school must have a board of directors, a majority of whose members are licensed teachers at the school. All staff members at the school and all parents of children enrolled there must be able to participate in the board's election.

In addition, lawmakers limited the number of charter schools to eight statewide and to no more than two per district.

But beyond those requirements, the law leaves charter schools essentially free from most rules and regulations that apply to public schools. Parents and students would be able to choose such schools instead of those operated by the district.

For each student, charter schools would receive a payment from the state equal to the average per-pupil expenditure statewide.

Proponents say the notion reflects a rethinking of the say in which Americans traditionally have defined and managed public education.

"Public education shouldn't be defined by who owns the building or who hires the teachers," argued Senator Durenberger in an opinion piece in *The Washington Post*. "It should be defined by outcomes, by the Constitution, by who must be a accepted, by who can't be excluded and by who pays the bills."

'INCENTIVE TO IMPROVE'

As a result of a compromise in the legislature, the Minnesota law makes local school boards the only agency that can authorize charter schools. But, in its purest rendition, the charter concept would allow any public agency—from a state board of education to a hospital—to sponsor a charter school.

The idea first gained currency during the late 1980's, when Ray Budde, an education consultant in Massachusetts, published a slim volume entitled "Education by Charter."

In a 1988 speech at the National Press Club, Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, picked up on the idea.

Mr. Shanker argued that education reform was not moving "fast enough" and that groups of teachers should be granted charters to set up "totally autonomous" schools of choice, within existing school buildings, as a way to jump-start the reform movement.

"When you try to change everybody at the same time, you get tremendous amounts of resistance," he stated. "So we need to provide a policy mechanism to allow smaller groups of people to be able to do these things."

More recently, the idea has caught hold among proponents of school choice who want to increase the range of public-school options available to parents.

It also meshes with current educational thinking that emphasizes creating new "break the mold" schools and holding schools accountable for outcomes, not process.

"The point is not to cripple the public schools," explained Stephen C. Tracy, superintendent of the New Milford, Conn., school system and chairman of a task force that is scheduled to present a charter-schools proposal to the Connecticut legislature next month. "If anything, it's to provide an incentive for them to improve."

A BIT OF A THORN

So far, the Minnesota law has generated a surprising amount of grass-roots activity from an unlikely array of interested parties.

They range from a private Montessori school in Winnona to citizens in Meadowlands who are hoping to save a small rural elementary school, to a maverick teacher in Princeton, and to the St. Paul branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which is considering applying for a charter to create a program that would provide educational and social services to entire families.

The fact that the law offers no money for start-up costs has discouraged some potential contenders, however, and is the primary reason for Senator Durenberger's proposal to provide federal funding.

But many of those launching charter-school plans said the real appeal lies in breaking free from a system that they say chokes creativity.

"Right now, for many reasons, change within the system is real difficult," said Cynthia R. Stevens, an educational consultant who is putting together a proposal in the New Ulm school district, a community of some 15,000 people. "I think what this will allow is for some ideas to surface from outside the system and to get a strong hold."

"I don't see charter schools as the ultimate destroyer of public education," she added, "but maybe as a little bit of a thorn."

Similarly, Joan Riedl, a teacher at North Elementary School in Princeton who has created a multi-age alternative program within her district, said, "I've gone as far as I can with real change in the system."

"This charter-school idea is for teachers," added Ms. Riedl, who is currently working on a proposal. "Many teachers have a resigned attitude to the system."

In Northfield, plans to launch a chartered middle school are being devised by a group of parents who founded a private elementary school eight years ago, when the district refused to consider their proposal for an alternative public school.

"We were sort of pained when we did it, because we were all sort of believers in public education," recalled Griff J. Wigley, one of the parents. "Here's a real opportunity for creating a school where we'd be assured of autonomy and yet it would be a public school."

Mr. Wigley and others contend that site-based management has failed to produce significant change in public schools, because the autonomy that schools gain is whittled away over time.

Because charter schools have independent legal standing from the beginning, he said, that is less likely to occur.

"It's the most sweeping exemption from the whole book of rules that has ever been put into law," agreed Ted Kolderie, a senior associate with the Center for Policy Studies in Minneapolis and a leading proponent of the concept.

PROCEEDING CAUTIOUSLY

But while some superintendents and school-board members said they are intrigued by the law, many are worried about the potential loss of dollars from their districts as students shift to charter schools.

Several also complained about requests to sponsor murky proposals that they do not believe can be implemented by next fall.

"We're not against the concept," said Ron M. Jandura, superintendent of the St. Cloud Public Schools, where Ms. Riedl has presented her plans. "It's just that we're proceeding very cautiously."

"I'm still idealistic enough to believe that we should be able to make things happen within the organization," he added. "You shouldn't have to leave the system to do something good for kids."

According to Representative Kelso, there's "no question" that local school systems stand to lose both pupils and the state allowance that goes with them under the new law.

"I think that's probably perceived by many people within the establishment as a lose-lose situation" she said. "Obviously, I don't agree with that assessment."

"It's good to see the educational establishment challenged," she added. "Plus, I believe that the opportunities being produced for students are good ones."

A POLITICAL COMPROMISE

But the hostility of some board members toward the concept already has advocates worried.

There is an inherent conflict in asking school boards, which stand to lose from such proposals, to authorize charter schools, proponents suggest.

"That's sort of like putting the fox in charge of the chickens," noted Peggy O. Hunter, enrollment-options coordinator for the state department of education.

The original Minnesota bill would have enabled the state board of education to grant charters directly to schools, circumventing school districts. But strong opposition from the two state teachers' unions and the Minnesota State School Boards Association killed that provision.

"It was a totally political compromise at the end," said Jon Schroeder, an education assistant to Senator Durenberger. "It was what put it over the top."

Ironically, the Minnesota Federation of Teachers, Mr. Shanker's state affiliate, remains the most vocal critic of the new law.

Rose A. Hermodson, the union's lobbyist, said that while Mr. Shanker "used the term" charter schools, "it may not be the same concept."

The union claims the law lacks sufficient collective-bargaining guarantees for teachers, puts existing public schools at a disadvantage by not extending deregulation to all schools, and fails to ensure adequate accountability.

According to Mr. Tracy of Connecticut, however, charter schools would actually be more accountable than traditional public schools.

"Because they exist on a charter," he said, "they stand to lose that charter if they violate its terms and conditions, whereas a state department of education is very reluctant to shut down a local school system or take it over."

The more immediate accountability is to parents, he added, who can choose not to send their children to the school.

But the bigger debate surrounding charter schools continues to be the question of what makes a public school public.

In Minnesota, the state board's decision last month to permit the first charter to go to the private Montessori school in Winona has thrown fuel on the fire.

Advocates argue that by agreeing to abide by the basic requirements for a charter school—including open admissions, no tuition, nondiscrimination, and the use of licensed teachers—the Bluffview Montessori School will essentially be reconfigured as a legitimate public school.

"It is, in fact, a new kind of public school," said Senator Ember D. Reichgott, "a new kind of delivery of public-education services."

But opponents portray the Winona example as a "modified voucher plan," and proof that the legislation will open the door to further privatization of education.

In an interview, Mr. Shanker said he was not familiar with the specifics of the Minnesota law. But he added, "I would be concerned if the charter-schools notion became . . . a substitute for dealing with the issue of vouchers."

"This is not, in fact, the nose in the tent to the voucher system," retorted Ms. Reichgott. "Indeed, I see it as the alternative . . . that provides expansion of public-school choice without diverting dollars to private sectarian schools."

She said the difficulty of creating charter schools would result in relatively few of them over time, but that it would provide the spur to encourage existing public schools to change. She also predicted that many of the concerns now being raised about charter schools would fail to materialize.

The next request to create a charter school is scheduled to be considered by the state board this month.

A NATURAL EVOLUTION

Meanwhile, lawmakers in California, Connecticut, Florida, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Tennessee are either exploring or plan to introduce similar charter-schools proposals this year.

In Detroit, moreover, policymakers are continuing to explore the option of creating a charter-schools provision that would allow some private schools in the city to become public, according to David Olmstead, a member of the board of education.

The Detroit board is also pursuing a plan to enable 12 existing public schools to sign a contract with the school board that would enable them to take control of their own budgets, programs, and governance structure.

In Milwaukee, charter-schools proponents suffered a setback last month when school-board members voted 4 to 4 to reject a request from Superintendent Howard L. Fuller to include a charter-schools provision in a package of proposals to the state legislature. But observers said Wisconsin lawmakers may still consider a charter-schools measure this year.

Charter schools are "a very natural evolution in the choice movement," said Mr. Schroeder. "A very important corollary to the choice movement is the allowance of more choices. But we are not going to get more choices—substantially more—until we make it possible for new public schools to be created in ways that currently aren't possible in most states."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 10, 1991]

MINNESOTA'S CHOICE

(By Dave Durenberger)

In Congress and around the country a political logjam has developed over the question of school choice that threatens passage of President Bush's education reform initiative. Breaking it will require not just the usual dose of political compromise but a different understanding of the public interest in public education.

On one side in this debate, the president's toughest critics claim that school choice threatens students who don't change schools and are "left behind." Many critics also charge that choice is little more than a cynical smokescreen used by those unwilling to offer significant new financial support to existing schools.

The most vocal proponents of choice, on the other hand, sometimes give the impression that choice alone will solve all the tough problems now facing American education.

Meanwhile, there is a third voice in this debate which accepts the value of market forces but insists that choice be confined to public schools. In particular, such people resist the president's desire to let public funds follow parents who choose private schools that teach religion. This narrower debate—whether choice should include private schools—is now emerging as the single biggest challenge to President Bush as he navigates his America 2000 initiative through the Democratic Congress.

Unfortunately, by framing the choice debate in that manner, we're ignoring three important principles that have guided education reform initiatives in states such as Minnesota over much of the last decade.

The first of those principles—in response to the harshest of the president's critics—is to openly acknowledge that school choice cannot succeed on its own. In particular, school choice cannot succeed without more school choices. Just having the right to choose a school doesn't mean much if there aren't alternative choices to be made.

The reality of this first principle is tempered by a second: As long as local school boards have an "exclusive franchise" on starting and running new public schools, we'll never see a substantial increase in the number of school choices that can be made. Few Americans would accept a situation in which A&P insisted on an "exclusive franchise" to operate every grocery store in Washington. So why do we insist that only the local school board be allowed to start and operate public schools inside the boundaries of its district? Why not also allow parents to start new public schools? Why not allow teachers or community groups to do the same?

That in turn would force a third principle: that broader authority to run schools will require a new understanding of the public interest in public education. Public education shouldn't be defined by who owns the building or who hires the teachers. It should be defined by outcomes, by the Constitution, by who must be accepted, by who can't be excluded and by who pay the bills.

These three principles for designing choice programs are all incorporated in "chartered schools" legislation adopted earlier this year by the Minnesota state legislature. The chartered schools proposal was authored by Democratic legislators and enjoyed broad bipartisan support. Here's how the new Minnesota chartered schools law will work:

Groups of teachers will start by linking up with parents and community groups to define the type of school they want to start.

Some schools will focus just on at-risk kids. Others may place their emphasis on a particular curriculum area, such as math or science. Still others may focus on one age group of children or students who function less well in a traditional academic setting.

Once organized, each Minnesota chartered school must find a local public school board to be its sponsor. And the chartered school and school board must reach agreement on a contract that identifies the academic and other outcomes the school will meet. Beyond those contractual outcomes, the chartered school is exempt from all federal and state rules and regulations except rules protecting the health and safety of students and staff.

Under Minnesota's law, chartered schools are financed like other public school districts. State aid and local property tax revenues are allocated to the school on the basis of student population. So are other federal and state aids, like Chapter I funding for children needing special help in the classroom. Public and private grants may also be sought by chartered schools, but they may not charge tuition.

Because they're more autonomous and allowed to set their own rules, Minnesota's chartered schools don't fit a narrow and traditional definition of public schools. But at the same time, the new Minnesota law requires chartered schools to retain the underlying values of American public education.

For example, Minnesota chartered schools may not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, disability or ability to pay. They must accept all applicants they have room for. And they may not teach religion.

This unique blend of flexibility and the public interest makes Minnesota's new chartered schools law a positive model for tapping creative energies of teachers and empowering parents and communities all over America. But equally important, the new Minnesota law represents a fundamentally different way of framing the debate now raging in Washington between proponents of public and private school choice.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 10, 1991]

THE CHARTERED SCHOOL

The Fall offensive is about to begin in the on-again, off-again war for school choice. Congress is likely to take to the administration's latest proposal about as well as it took to tuition tax credits and vouchers. The topic will again sink into a political and ideological morass.

But the march of federal crusaders lags behind that of the states and cities. More than half the states now offer students options beyond their neighborhood schools, from dozens of interdistrict transfer plans to Milwaukee's court-contested vouchers allowing low-income children to attend nonsectarian private schools. The arrangements under the name of "choice" vary widely, and some are more successful and politically palatable than others. But the evident appeal of many is leading advocates to begin to tug at the boundary between public and private education. As Sen. Dave Durenberger explains on the opposite page, Minnesota has just invented the "chartered school."

The state that pioneered open enrollment now will allow licensed teachers to establish schools that are nonsectarian, free and open to all by writing a contract—or "charter"—with the local school board. In exchange for an agreement exempting them from many rules and regulations, these schools are to be held accountable for student performance. If after three years students don't achieve what's expected of them, the local board can terminate the contract. Each school will receive categorical state aid, as if it were a school district.

The chartered school idea bubbles up from a couple of wellsprings. One is peculiar to Minneapolis, where for years nonprofit social service agencies such as the Urban League have been running schools for at-risk kids under contract with the public district. Another is the more widespread movement toward greater autonomy for teachers. Unleash teachers, many argue, and you unleash innovation.

In fact, entrepreneurial (some would say renegade) teachers are coming forward with proposals. Will their plans amount to scholastic boutiques or something else? Will a local board really grant a license to a disaffected group of teachers? Will the interest expressed by Native Americans, Hispanics and the NAACP lead to schools that are in effect segregated? And if the work rules are so stifling, why not repeal them altogether?

Troubling questions aside, proponents such as Sen. Durenberger see in chartered schools a more attractive face on the monster that breathes fire whenever someone mentions school choice. The beast now asks people to choose between, to put it simply, Central High and St. Mary's Academy. Those who advocate the merits of choice simply want to increase the options within the public domain. Why not let anyone establish a school as long as it is accountable to a public authority and adheres to basic principles, such as nondiscrimination, open and free admissions and so forth? Public schools then become rather like public roads, built and maintained according to certain binding specifications.

The problem is that it's easier to construct a road that works than a school that works. Whether greater choice leads to greater commitment to schooling and higher achievement remains unclear. What is clear is that Minnesota and dozens of other places are beginning to offer interesting case studies for the debate over school choice that has remained largely theoretical.

[From the St. Cloud Times, Nov. 17, 1991]

GIVE CHARTERED SCHOOLS A CHANCE

When the 1991 Legislature voted to allow a limited number of chartered schools in Minnesota, it was over adamant opposition from state teachers unions.

Now that some interest in starting one of the independent, teacher-run schools has surfaced in St. Cloud, defensive skepticism still prevails.

Throwing out the rules that other publicly funded schools must abide by could put kids at risk, state teacher union officials have said. Some educators have also taken offense at the whole idea of an independently run school—as though it were a personal affront to their ability to meet the needs of all children in a traditionally run school.

Besides, skeptics say, there's already room for independent curriculum and staffing decisions in public schools. In St. Cloud, many schools are already benefiting from new ideas from site-based management teams.

Perhaps these critics are running scared because the chartered school concept could

represent a good start at chipping away the secure world of public school teachers—a world where years of service are rewarded equally, regardless of quality. This lock-step mentality has allowed burned-out teachers going through the motions to earn salaries and benefits equal to wonderfully creative teachers.

But the chipping away has already started. Many both inside and outside the education field have recognized that change is needed, and it's coming whether the lock-steppers like it or not.

The move toward site-based management and outcome-based education is happening in St. Cloud and in other Minnesota school districts. And some educators and some schools are blooming, including the Princeton elementary school teacher who's seeking permission to start a chartered school in St. Cloud and the staff of Public elementary school, Jefferson, which also has expressed an interest in being chartered.

But experimentation within the frameworks of traditional school districts will naturally be limited by the perceived need to keep things equal. Without the freedom to throw out traditional schedules and calendars and to make bold decisions without seeking permission from red-tape laden state and local bureaucracies, the experiments can only go so far.

With the help of state funding but without the fetters of the local school district administration structure and the union's teacher contract, a chartered school could show St. Cloud and other districts that learning can take place without a seven-hour day and a nine-month calendar. It can take place without authority being centered in a school office or a district board; the authority will be centered with the classroom teachers, the students and their parents.

This isn't really so radical. American society has flourished despite a preponderance in history of one-room schoolhouses and home schooling. Millions of children have become bright, contributing members of society after being schooled at their parents' knees, in mixed-age classrooms and in private or parochial schools.

The establishment of chartered schools is a natural extension of Minnesota's trend-setting open enrollment program. Both are innovative moves that will help encourage educators to create a variety of learning atmospheres and healthy competition.

Change is always difficult for some to accept. But the last people who should be balking at the challenge of opening new vistas in the field of education are teachers. Learning should be about experimenting and stretching, reaching and dreaming. It shouldn't be about fear and defensiveness about competition and risk.

The future belongs to those who dare to step boldly and to help shape the inevitable changes in education. A chartered school would help St. Cloud take one of those steps.

St. Cloud should be the site of at least one of the eight chartered schools allowed by the Legislature. With St. Cloud State University, a major educator of teachers, in its midst, this growing, progressive community should be a natural breeding ground for innovative education.

[From the Northfield News]

OUR VIEW: CHARTER SCHOOL COMING?

An exciting idea has started its way down the pipeline in the Northfield Public Schools.

A group of parents are seeking necessary board of education approval for a charter school. It is a potentially fantastic proposal that deserves serious consideration. However, any rush into uncharted waters using public funds when the education of adolescents are at stake would be ill-advised.

It is too soon to tell whether the proposed Cannon Valley Middle School can get off the ground in time for the 1992-93 school year—now only nine months away. There is a lot involved in physically setting up a new school that quickly.

Perhaps the even-bigger barrier is psychological. New relationships between the existing school structure and those who boldly propose a new way of schooling must be forged. Involving the community is another goal that will not be reached overnight.

Initial perceptions of some public school teachers and members of the public appear to be unfair. The proposed alternative middle school is not simply an attempt by some Prairie Creek Community School parents to get a chunk of public funding and extend their concepts to the next educational level.

The charter school, in fact, would allow licensed teachers the strongest voice on its board of directors, based on the new law's provisions. Any student in grades 6-8 would be eligible to seek inclusion in the school. A lottery system must be used to select students if demand is greater than the number of slots available.

The charter school advocates should stress that their proposal is designed to appeal more broadly than the focus of Prairie Creek. Students from that school are likely to make up less than half of those attending Cannon Valley Middle School.

The proposal for a new alternative middle school, based on charter school legislation, is an exciting and challenging one. The question of whether that idea can gain wide public support and become reality by next fall should be viewed separately.

If the school board and administration are uncomfortable with the timetable, they should avoid allowing that concern to cast a shadow over eventual adoption of a charter school plan.

Advocates of Cannon Valley Middle School should consider separating the two questions, as well. The opportunity to turn the vision of a charter school into reality in the Northfield area will not fade if the process slows down a bit. In fact, with greater public understanding and awareness, the chances for creating a successful chartered Cannon Valley Middle School seem quite bright indeed.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Dec. 15, 1991]

BEST CHOICE

With the suddenness of a summer storm, the great American debate over "school choice" swept into Harrisburg this month, whipped up a lot of hysteria, and then moved on. It got everyone's attention, but left the landscape largely unchanged. A lot of legislators—still staggering from gale-force lobbying—are probably praying they've seen the last of it, but that's unlikely. Pennsylvania needs to do a far better job of educating its young, and school choice is too important a concept to ignore.

It's unfortunate that what should have been a discussion of ideas came down to a bruising battle between powerful interest groups. The debate became framed as parochial schools versus public schools, the Roman Catholic Church versus teachers unions, the rich versus the poor. (Jack Grier, president of the teachers union in Easton, approached the issue with all the sensitivity of a grand wizard of the Ku Klux Klan. Calling the Catholic Church the "enemy" of public education, he said, "if the Catholic Church were to cease to exist and disappear today, it would be better for all of us.")

But choice, if it's done well, is not a zero-sum game. It's a win-win situation for the state's schoolchildren. Even the opponents seemed to grudgingly acknowledge the power of the idea by coming up at the last moment with an alternative choice plan that would have been restricted to public schools.

The principle behind all school choice plans is that only market forces can shake the complacency of public school systems that have few internal incentives to improve their product. Probably the most successful experiment so far has been confined to the public schools of a single district in New York's East Harlem. By allowing children to choose among a range of schools, and by freeing educators to start new schools, the administrators in East Harlem created a climate in which schools compete for children and in which the children, by all accounts, seem to flourish. Failing schools have been forced to close in East Harlem, but failing students have not been abandoned.

What made the Pennsylvania plan so controversial was that it sought to expand parental choice by providing vouchers to make it easier to send children to private and parochial schools. In many ways it was a crude piece of legislation, but that's not entirely the sponsors' fault. Faced with implacable opponents who were interested in killing the legislation, not perfecting it, they had no incentive to risk alienating any of their core supporters with refinements.

We hope that the choice issue will be revived next year in Harrisburg and that this time it will be properly framed as an effort to improve the quality of education in Pennsylvania across the board. To do that, the legislation should:

Offer incentives to provide greater choice within individual school districts, along the East Harlem lines.

Permit students to attend public schools outside their home districts without having to pay impossible tuition fees.

Allow parents, educators, universities and the like to create their own independent public schools that would be open to all comers but would have complete autonomy over their affairs.

Provide means-tested vouchers, on a sliding scale, to students who want to attend private and parochial schools. The vouchers might be as high as $2,500 for the poorest children, but only a few hundred dollars for those whose parents are solidly middle class. The idea would be to make this option available to children whose parents couldn't otherwise afford it without great sacrifice.

There should be little difficulty achieving consensus for allowing greater choice within the existing public school systems. But it would be wrong to stop there.

Minnesota this year adopted pioneering legislation permitting the creation of independent public schools that would be free from existing bureaucracies and union work rules, but entitled to receive the full share of state and local funding for each student.

The goal is to preserve the ideal of public education, while shedding many of the obnoxious trappings that have given it a bad name of late. What's more, education research has shown that schools with the greatest autonomy and esprit de corps get the best results with students.

Vouchers for non-public schools, especially parochial schools, remain the most con-

troversial part of the choice package. We support them on pragmatic lines—the nonpublic schools are up and running, providing an array of effective alternatives for parents who are unhappy with the local public schools. For poor families in Philadelphia, choice would be considerably more limited if the Archdiocese of Philadelphia's 106 elementary and 11 high schools weren't made more accessible through vouchers.

The House, shrinking from a genuine debate on choice last week, rejected the voucher plan as "unconstitutional." That's a matter for the courts to decide. An effective piece of choice legislation would include parochial schools, but allow that aspect of the plan to be set aside while the courts determined its legality.

Public school administrators and teachers union professionals could, no doubt, find much to dispute in the plan outlined above. What legislators have to keep asking themselves when they revisit this issue is: What's best for the kids?

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] concerning his intent in offering his amendment that expands on the allowable uses of funds authorized under section 202 for State-level initiatives.

The Senator from Massachusetts has included the establishment of new public schools including charter schools as an allowable State-level initiative that may be funded under section 202. Is it the Senator's intention to allow such funds to be used for startup assistance for chartered or outcome-based schools such as those authorized by the 1991 session of the Minnesota State Legislature?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that Minnesota law requires these chartered or outcome-based schools to be operated within the "special requirement" under S. 2 as amended that reads as follows: "A new public school established under subparagraph (B)(iii) shall be nonsectarian in its programs, admission policies, employment practices, and all other operations and shall not be affiliated with a nonpublic sectarian school or a religious institution."

It is also my understanding that Minnesota law requires these chartered or outcome-based schools to have open admission policies, accepting all students who choose to attend. If more students choose to attend such a school than may be accommodated, admission is on the basis of a lottery.

It is my understanding that Minnesota law requires these chartered or outcome-based schools to be authorized by and have an outcome-based contract with a public school district, as well as approval by the Minnesota State Board of Education.

It is my understanding that Minnesota law requires these chartered or outcome-based schools to employ certified teachers.

And, it is my understanding that Minnesota law prohibits these chartered or outcome-based schools from charging tuition.

Are these understandings correct?

Mr. DURENBERGER. They are correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. With these understandings, it is my intention that chartered or outcome-based schools as defined by Minnesota law will be eligible for funding under section 202(a)(3)(B)(iii).

Mr. DURENBERGER. What types of startup expenses would the Senator envision being eligible for funding for new charter schools under this provision?

Mr. KENNEDY. Presumably, States will be determining how these funds should be used to help establish new public schools including charter schools. But, my intention would be that such uses include startup expenses such as planning, curriculum development, equipment purchases, personnel recruitment and training, textbook purchases, and minor remodeling expenses that might be needed to meet local or State codes.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Section 301 (4)(D) as now amended defines a new public school as a public school that operates "under the authority of a State education agency or local education agency." Again, is it your intent that this definition apply to chartered or outcome-based schools as authorized by Minnesota State law?

Mr. KENNEDY. It is my understanding that chartered or outcome-based schools in Minnesota must be granted permission to operate by a local school district.

It is also my understanding that these schools must have a performance-based contract with their sponsoring school district that must be renewed and that may be terminated based on the schools' compliance with the contract. Are those understandings correct?

Mr. DURENBERGER. Yes; they are correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. With those understandings, it is my intent that the charter from a local school district and performance-based contract with that school district would constitute operating "under the authority of a State education agency or local education agency" as required of new public schools by section 301(4)(D).

Mr. DURENBERGER. I want to thank the Senator from Massachusetts for those assurances that it is his intent that chartered or outcome-based schools such as those authorized by Minnesota State law will be eligible for funding under sections 202 and 301 of S. 2, as amended.

I also want to thank the Senator for his willingness to add language to S. 2 authorizing startup funding for Minnesota's chartered schools, an important innovation in education reform that I trust will soon emerge in other States, as well.

Mr. KENNEDY. I would also like to thank the Senator for his efforts to expand the number and diversity of public school choices available in his and other States and for his leadership nationally in helping to improve the quality of education for all Americans.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL].

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise in support of this amendment, which I might well call the Wirth-Wellstone amendment, and think it should pass. The point here is whether the budget agreement of several months ago is still accurate, and pointing at the world today. The world events of the past several months, particularly in what was the Soviet Union, have made it clear that we can and should reorder our priorities set forth in the current budget agreement, and we should reduce military spending far beyond the limits of the budget agreement.

We can and should shift more funding into critically important domestic programs, such as education, health care, job training. In a Nation in the midst of such a serious recession, which approaches in my mind the dimensions of the Depression, such action is imperative.

I applaud the goals set forth in this resolution. It is clearly time that we fully fund Head Start, crucial that we insist more on elementary and secondary education, vital that we improve higher education opportunities for the economically disadvantaged, and extend grant and loan assistance to hard-pressed middle-income families.

In that regard, we will soon bring to the Senate floor the higher education reauthorization bill which seeks to realize many of the objectives set forth in this resolution.

Mr. President, I am glad to support this amendment. I think it is an excellent one. I hope that it meets with the approval of my colleagues.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, Members on our side are looking at the amendment, and a little additional time has been requested for that purpose. I am constrained at this point, unless the Senator would like to speak more in reference to this amendment, to suggest the absence of a quorum for the purpose of considering the amendment further.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order. Without objec-

tion, further proceedings under the quorum call will be waived.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wirth amendments Nos. 1490 and 1491 be temporarily laid aside so that I may offer an amendment and that, immediately upon the reporting of my amendment, it be laid aside and the Wirth amendment recur, and that immediately thereafter the Senate proceed to a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, we have no objection to the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1492

(Purpose: To amend Public Law 102-170 to allow certain funds to be used for any educational reform program enacted into law before a certain date)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] proposes an amendment numbered 1492.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 58, before the matter following line 7, insert the following:

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 401. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT

In the item relating to Educational Excellence in title III of Public Law 102-170 (105 Stat. 1130) insert "or any educational reform program" after "America 2000 educational excellence activities"

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the 1992 appropriations bill for Labor, HHS, and Education included a provision that provides $100 million in funding for education reform initiatives provided that legislation was enacted by April 1, 1992.

The appropriation language refers to "America 2000 educational excellence activities." The Department of Education has informed us that, since this bill is called the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act, they may not be able to spend the money currently in the appropriations bill.

If we want the money to be spent on this education reform bill this year, we must, according to the Department of Education, revise the language regarding America 2000.

This simple, technical amendment has been approved by Senator BYRD. It has also been explicitly approved by Congressman NATCHER, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee on Labor, HHS, and Education.

At the appropriate time I would urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, may I ask, under the agreement entered into, is it not now in order to lay aside that amendment and the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WIRTH] be now the pending business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. Amendment No. 1492 is, accordingly, under the agreement, laid aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 1491

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate resumes consideration of amendment No. 1491 by Mr. WIRTH, an amendment in the second degree to the Wirth amendment No. 1490.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order, the Senate will now transact morning business.

THE EDUCATION BILL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to again express my appreciation to the Members here today for their cooperation. We have been able to make good progress on the legislation. A number of these items are important and are related in one way or another to the central legislation that we have been addressing over the period of these last days. But they would have taken a considerable amount of time to examine properly, and our colleagues were cooperative enough to delay them so we might be able to finish consideration of this legislation. We have covered a variety of different provisions in the legislation.

We are grateful for the very considerable interest of the Members on both sides of the aisle to the substance of this legislation, and we look forward to a continued debate and discussion of the remaining amendments.

We have reduced the total number of areas to perhaps four or five, which may or may not be pursued in an active way for a vote on Tuesday. We will be prepared to debate those according to the consent agreement on Monday. We look forward to working with those who do have amendments and those who are thinking about amendments over the course of the weekend. We will be working with our colleagues on the Republican side to find ways to work through these various amendments and carry forward the spirit of the amendments. We look for ways in which we can cooperate as extensively as possible with the originators of the amendments.

So I thank all of the Members for their cooperation. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, if I understood the Senator from Massachusetts, he suggested the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the Senator from Mississippi. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, may I inquire, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is correct. The Senate is transacting morning business under an order that permits Senators to speak therein.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I will go forward for not more than 10 minutes. Then we can go on with the business of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized.

THE EDUCATION BILL

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise not to discuss any particular amendment to the bill but, rather the process which has brought us here. It was George Bush's desire to be the education President for all Americans, not just for Republican Americans. Therefore, he did not begin this process by trying to come up with some Republican plan. He sent us an innovative and creative education initiative on May 23, 1991. It was the result of several years of actively seeking a consensus of educators and American business and community leaders on ways to improve our national education system. He immediately sought—as is his character—bipartisan cooperation and support for this plan.

Since then, several interesting things have occurred with respect to the enactment of the President's initiative. The American people began associating the President with innovative education strategies for the future of our Nation. Polls showed most Americans believed that President Bush had better ideas when it came to rejuvenating our troubled education system. They also showed that it was vital and necessary to make certain creative changes in our education system so that future generations of Americans could more successfully compete in a global economy.

Second, whenever you undertake efforts to change the status quo, whether in health care, immigration, the environment, or the criminal justice system, you wind up ruffling the feathers of the entrenched special interest

groups which have a highly vested interest in maintaining that status quo. Typically, the special interest groups came right out of the woodwork to oppose the President's education initiative.

The combination of these special interest groups fearing interference with their own agenda and unchallenged power, and the fear that Republicans, might, just might—Heaven forbid—be perceived as being progressive on education, was an ominous threat to the survival of the President's education plan. Secretary Lamar Alexander scares those interest groups to death. He really does. He is bright, steady, knowledgeable, sensible—a real force for good. What we are seeing happen with this bill was born—not of policy differences—but of this difficult combination of political circumstances.

Prior to the President sending up the statutory language for the initiative he had announced in May 1991, the Senate Labor Committee approved a plan that would have done nothing more than maintain the status quo of the current education system, while throwing yet more Federal money at the problem.

We do not need more of the same. We need new ideas. These ideas come from the President. They come from our Governors, Democrat and Republican alike. They come from State departments of education, staffed by Democrats and Republicans alike, from business leaders and concerned parents. All of those ideas were incorporated into the President's America 2000 agenda.

That plan was supported by 31 Governors, Democrat and Republican alike, and most communities across the Nation. Citizens across the country answered the President's call for innovative and creative education by beginning an active crusade to establish America 2000 communities. They have laid the groundwork for the President's initiative. Why? Poorly educated young people who cannot produce are not good for business or productivity.

The President's school choice proposal was defeated yesterday. Prior to that we did pass a New American Schools initiative compromise. I endorsed that as a first step. However, the version we passed was dictated by political realities and was a substantially lightened version of the President's request. The President did get the flexibility he wanted to decrease burdensome bureaucratic regulations which stifle creativity, and that was done through an amendment sponsored by our respected colleague, Senator HATFIELD.

George Bush's plan was not intended to be a threat to the teacher's union in America. Please here that. This exercise has shown us that they, those teachers' unions, have a tendency—a reality would be the better word—to be threatened by their own inadequacies and their own rigidity. And they deeply desire to cling to business as usual in the education areas, to the detriment of parents and local boards, and all people who think they have a better idea of how their children should be educated.

Americans can see that rigidity illustrated when our graduates fall behind the international competitive curve, when they see the kind of graduates that come out of high schools in America. They do not need to look at tests or examinations or charts. They daily see the products of an inadequate educational system.

That old pitch, "Give us more money and we will provide you a better product," is a hollow cry. The American people have figured it out by now. Americans, especially parents of school aged children, and especially minority and poorer people, do not believe that at all. Here is our chance, a glimmering one, an inexpensive chance—a few demonstration projects, minimal activity—to change this dismal situation. So I hope we can still proceed toward that goal.

George Bush is not a Republican President offering a new education initiative. George Bush is an American President representing a vast majority of public spirited citizens, educators, community leaders, and business men and women, Democrat and Republican, who care deeply about the future of our national education system.

So, Mr. President, I think it is ugly and inappropriate to cast this cooperative and painstakingly thorough initiative as a partisan effort, and it does a great disservice to the goals the President has sought to achieve. We should be thinking about what is right for America; what is right for American education; what is right for American students, and it is for the people who feel deprived by the system that we are hoping, hoping and praying, we would see the changes which so far have been rather summarily dispatched.

The President does not want a Republican or a Democrat bill. He wants a bill that will innovatively utilize the best ideas of educators and community leaders. That should not be done for some partisan, political advantage but rather as a very real investment in the education of future generations of Americans.

I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the will of the Senate?

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed en bloc to the immediate consideration of Calendar Nos. 330 and 379; that the committee amendments, where appropriate, be agreed to; the bill be deemed read three times and passed; the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider the passage of these items be laid upon the table; and the preamble where appropriate be agreed to; that the consideration of these items appear individually in the RECORD; and any statements appear at the appropriate place.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXCELLENCE IN PUBLIC ARCHITECTURE ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1056) to provide for an architectural and engineering design competition for the construction, renovation, and repair of certain public buildings, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with amendments; as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italics.)

S. 1056

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Excellence in Public Architecture Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. PUBLIC BUILDING DESIGN COMPETITIONS.

Title IX of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 541 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"PUBLIC BUILDING DESIGN COMPETITIONS

"SEC. 905. (a)(1) No later than March 1, 1992, and no later than each March 1 thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to the Commission of Fine Arts and to Congress a list of all projects for the next fiscal year requiring approval under sections 7 and 11 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 606 and 610) for which architectural and engineering services for building design or site planning shall first be procured during such fiscal year. In consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts, the Administrator shall designate a substantial number of such projects for which architectural and engineering services shall be acquired through design competitions conducted under this section. For each project so designated, the Administrator shall designate the appropriate competition format in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(2) No later than October 1, 1992, the Administrator in consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts, shall issue model rules under which competitions under this section shall be conducted. The rules shall be in accordance with the provisions of this title and shall—

[**"(A) establish no fewer than three different model competition procedure formats,**

at least one of which shall provide for competitions lasting no longer than sixty days and eliciting preliminary design concepts only;

[''(B) require approval of the competition program for each project by the Commission of Fine Arts;]

''(A) establish no fewer than three different model competition procedure formats—

''(i) at least one of which shall provide for competitions lasting no longer than sixty days and eliciting preliminary design concepts only; and

''(ii) at least one of which (other than the format described under clause (i)) shall provide for public display of competitors' models;

''(B) require the submission of the competition program for each project to the Commission of Fine Arts for review and comment by the Commission;

''(C) provide for appointment of a project competition adviser and appointment of a project competition jury by the National Endowment for the Arts, in consultation with *the American Institute of Architects and* the Administrator;

[''(D) provide that, each jury shall include a representative of the General Services Administration and the principal Federal agency that shall occupy the project; and]

''(D) provide that, each jury shall include a representative of the General Services Administration, the principal Federal agency that shall occupy the project, and the American Institute of Architects; and

''(E) require the project jury to report its recommendations in writing with reasons for such recommendations.

''(3) The Administrator shall conduct each competition provided for under this section and may provide for fair and reasonable compensation for those architect-engineering firms or individuals required to render extensive design services in the course of participating in a competition. Compensation for a competition adviser and for all firms in a competition, including travel costs, shall not exceed one percent of the estimated project cost.

''(4) Project competition juries shall make recommendations for selection based upon the architect-engineering firms or individuals determined best able to produce a design that shall—

''(A) bear visual testimony to the dignity, enterprise, vigor, and stability of the United States Government;

''(B) embody the finest contemporary American architectural thought; and

''(C) where appropriate, reflect regional architectural traditions.

''(5) The jury shall recommend to the Administrator—

''(A) the firm with which the agency head shall negotiate under section 904(a);

''(B) the firm with which the agency head shall negotiate under section 904(b), if necessary; and

''(C) the order of all firms with which the agency head shall negotiate under section 904(c), if necessary.

''(6) The Administrator shall make the final selection. If the selection differs from the jury recommendation the Administrator shall document his reasons for the public record.

''(7)(A) Services of individuals who are not Federal employees as competition jury members and project competition advisers may be procured by the Administrator as temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

''(B) An individual who serves on a competition jury or as a project competition adviser under the provisions of this section shall not be required to file a financial disclosure report under section 101 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) because of such service.

''(b)(1) A firm which participates in a design competition for a project under this section and enters into a contract under this section and section 904 for such project may receive no more than eight percent of the total projects costs for architectural and engineering services.

''(2) The General Services Administration shall determine any fair and reasonable compensation for architectural and engineering services provided by a firm that participated in a design competition under this section, other than a firm described in paragraph (1).''.

SEC. 3. INCREASE IN FEE LIMITATION FOR CERTAIN ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES.

Section 304(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254(b)) is amended in the first sentence by striking out ''6 per centum'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''8 per centum''.

So the bill (S. 1056) as amended, was passed.

EMANCIPATION OF THE BAHA'I COMMUNITY OF IRAN

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 43) concerning the emancipation of the Baha'i community of Iran, was considered, and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, and the preamble, are as follows:

S. CON. RES. 43

Whereas in 1982, 1984, 1988, and 1990, the Congress, by concurrent resolution, declared that it holds the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all its nationals, including members of the Baha'i faith, Iran's largest religious minority;

Whereas in such resolutions the Congress condemned the Iranian Government's persecution of the Baha'i community, including the execution of more than 200 Baha'is, the imprisonment of thousands, and other oppressive actions against Baha'is based solely upon their religious beliefs;

Whereas the Congress has urged the President to work with other governments and with the United Nations in support of the rights of Iranian Baha'is;

Whereas recent reports indicate that most Iranian Baha'is, imprisoned on account of their religion, have been released, and some confiscated business and personal properties have been restored; and

Whereas, despite such actions affecting individual Baha'is, the Government of Iran continues to deny the Baha'i community the right to organize; to elect its leaders, to hold community property for worship or assembly, to operate religious schools, and conduct other normal religious community activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress—

(1) continues to hold the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all its nationals, including Baha'is, in a manner consistent with that Government's obligations under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international covenants which guarantee the civil and political rights of its citizens;

(2) notes that no executions of Baha'is have been reported for more than two years and that many Baha'is imprisoned on account of their religion have been released;

(3) expresses concern that, despite some recent improvements in the treatment of individual Baha'is, the Baha'i community continues to be denied legal recognition, and the basic rights to organize, elect its leaders, educate its youth, and carry on the normal activities of a law-abiding religious community;

(4) urges the Government of Iran to extend to the Baha'i community the rights guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and by other international agreements to which Iran is a party, including freedom of thought, conscience, and religion, and equal protection of the law; and

(5) calls upon the President to continue—

(A) to urge the Government of Iran to emancipate the Baha'i community by granting those rights guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international agreements to which Iran is a party;

(B) to emphasize that the United States regards the human rights practices of the Government of Iran, particularly its treatment of the Baha'i community and other religious minorities, as a significant element in the development of its relations with the Government of Iran; and

(C) to cooperate with other governments and international organizations, including the United Nations and its agencies, in efforts to protect the religious rights of the Baha'is and other minorities through joint appeals to the Government of Iran and through other appropriate actions.

CHILD ABUSE PROGRAMS, ADOPTION OPPORTUNITIES, AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION EXTENSION ACT OF 1991

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Labor Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2720, related to child abuse prevention, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2720) to extend for one year the authorizations of appropriations for the programs under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act and the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act, and for certain programs relating to adoption opportunities, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1493

(Purpose: To provide for a substitute amendment)

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator DODD, I send a substitute amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL], for Mr. DODD, proposes an amendment numbered 1493.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment (No. 1493) was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no further debate, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

So the bill (H.R. 2720), as amended, was passed.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill, as amended, was passed.

Mr. SIMPSON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the president pro tempore appointed Mr. DODD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. COATS, conferees on the part of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. BOREN):

S. 2160. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to elect a deduction or credit for interest on certain educational loans; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PRESSLER:

S. 2161. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to eliminate the loan origination fee for oilseeds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. MITCHELL (for Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. ADAMS and Mr. BINGAMAN)):

S. 2162. A bill to amend the International Financial Institutions Act to advocate and promote policies to encourage developing countries to reduce military and military-related expenditures and to dedicate an equitable allocation of resources for health and education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

(By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. BOREN):

S. 2160. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to elect a deduction or credit for interest on certain educational loans; to the Committee on Finance.

DEDUCTION FOR INTEREST ON CERTAIN EDUCATIONAL LOANS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, as we continue our deliberations on elementary and secondary education, today, I want to take a few minutes to discuss the costs of higher education and to introduce legislation, along with Senator BOREN, restoring tax benefits for student loans.

Today, there is no greater issue of concern to the American people than the economic problems our Nation is facing. Last December, as members of the Finance Committee, both Senator BOREN and I participated in a series of hearings regarding an economic growth package. Besides advocating middle income tax cuts, as well as many other components, Senator BOREN and I stressed the need to address our Nation's long-term needs by including a restoration of tax benefits for higher education in an economic growth package. We've subsequently written to President Bush emphasizing this need.

Mr. President, I've watched with a great deal of interest as reports on various provisions of the administration's growth package have been discussed by the media. I'm very encouraged that middle income tax cuts appear to be part of the package. There's no question that Americans are taxed too much, and they deserve tax relief now.

But, more needs to be done for individual taxpayers to help them with their specific educational needs. We all know that under the Tax Reform Act of 1986, the consumer interest deduction was phased out after the 1990 tax year. Unfortunately, educational expenses were lumped together with consumer interest and the deduction for student loan interest was also terminated. By taking this action, Congress effectively imposed an additional tax on individuals who are attempting to better themselves or their families through higher education.

Congress justified repealing the interest deduction on the grounds that it was a significant disincentive to saving. However, unlike loans for most other personal items, student loans have become a necessity for many students and their families who are unable to afford the rising costs of an education.

In addition, consumer interest, up to a limit, remains deductible if the loan is secured by a taxpayer's residence. Even if this home equity loan is used for educational expenses, the interest is deductible. Consequently, current law discriminates against middle and lower income taxpayers who are not fortunate enough to own a home and borrow on the home's equity.

With this in mind, I introduced legislation in 1987 to restore the interest deduction on student loans, and reintroduced this legislation in the first session of this Congress. At the time of reintroduction, I noted that I would be looking into ways to bring down the billion dollar cost of the full deduction. Working together, Senator BOREN and I have put together legislation that we are introducing today that will provide tax benefits for higher education at less than half the cost of the original bill.

Under our legislation, taxpayers can choose between a tax credit or deduction, depending on their needs. Both itemizers and nonitemizers will be eligible for benefits. In the past, only itemizers were able to qualify for a benefit, so many more people will be helped under this new bill. In an effort to bring down the cost, the credit or deduction will be limited to 4 years of a loan's payback term. This is a period when interest payments are the greatest and taxpayers are less able to afford the cost of the loan.

Mr. President, the present law precluding interest deductions or credits for higher education is neither fair nor productive, and it's time to make an adjustment. We all agree that education is a national investment which will be a determining factor in the future of America. A well-educated work force is vitally important if we are to compete effectively in the international marketplace. Restoring the interest deduction for student loans is an expression of the value we place on education and its role in maintaining the position of the United States as the leader of the free world.

I urge my colleagues to join me and the cosponsors of this legislation in supporting the education and future of America by adjusting the Tax Code to provide assistance to Americans for reasonable educational expenses.

I ask unanimous consent to print the bill in the RECORD following my remarks, and to follow with a statement by Senator BOREN.

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

S. 2160

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

SECTION 1. RESTORATION OF DEDUCTION FOR INTEREST ON EDUCATIONAL LOANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 163(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining personal interest) is amended by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (D), by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F), and by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

"(E) any qualified education interest (within the meaning of paragraph (5)), and".

(b) QUALIFIED EDUCATION INTEREST DEFINED.—Paragraph (5) of section 163(h) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(5) QUALIFIED EDUCATION INTEREST.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified education interest' means any interest which is paid or incurred—

"(i) on a qualified education loan during the first 48 months (whether or not consecutive) for which a payment is required to be made on the loan, and

"(ii) during a taxable year with respect to which the taxpayer elects to have this paragraph apply.

"(B) CERTAIN TAXPAYERS MAY NOT ELECT.—A taxpayer may not elect under subparagraph (A)(ii) to have this paragraph apply for any taxable year if—

"(i) an election is in effect under section 23 for such taxable year, or

"(ii) a deduction is allowed under this chapter for such taxable year for qualified residence interest (as defined in paragraph (3)) which is allocable to indebtedness the proceeds of which were used to pay for qualified higher education expenses (as defined in section 23(d)(2)) of the taxpayer, the taxpayer's spouse, or a dependent of the taxpayer.

"(C) QUALIFIED EDUCATION LOAN.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'qualified education loan' has the meaning given such term by section 23(d)(1)."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1991, but only with respect to loans the first required payment on which is after such date.

SEC. 2. CREDIT FOR INTEREST ON EDUCATION LOANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to nonrefundable personal credits) is amended by inserting after section 22 the following new section:

"SEC. 23. INTEREST ON EDUCATION LOANS.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—In the case of an individual who elects the application of this section, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to 15 percent of the interest paid or incurred by the taxpayer during the taxable year on any qualified education loan.

"(b) MAXIMUM CREDIT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) for the taxable year shall not exceed $300.

"(2) LIMIT ON PERIOD INTEREST PAID.—A credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) only for interest paid or accrued on a qualified education loan during the first 48 months (whether or not consecutive) for which a payment is required to be made on the loan.

"(3) CREDIT NOT TO EXCEED TAX ON EARNED INCOME FOR TAXPAYERS UNDER AGE 23.—If the taxpayer has not attained age 23 (or, in the case of a joint return, if neither the husband or wife have attained age 23) before the close of the calendar year ending with or within the taxable year, the credit allowed by subsection (a) for such taxable year shall not exceed the amount equal to the percentage of the taxpayer's regular tax liability for such taxable year which is the same as the percentage of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income for such taxable year which is attributable to earned income (as defined in section 911(d)(2)).

"(c) LIMITATIONS ON TAXPAYERS ELIGIBLE FOR CREDIT.—

"(1) CREDIT ALLOWED TO TAXPAYER ONLY IF NOT CLAIMED AS PERSONAL EXEMPTION BY ANOTHER TAXPAYER.—No credit shall be allowed by this section to an individual for the taxable year if a deduction under section 151 with respect to such individual is allowed to another taxpayer for the taxable year beginning in the calendar year in which such individual's taxable year begins.

"(2) CREDIT ALLOWED TO PARENT, ETC. ONLY IF DEPENDENT IS STUDENT AND PERSONAL EXEMPTION CLAIMED FOR DEPENDENT.—If the qualified education loan was used to pay the qualified higher education expenses of an individual other than the taxpayer or his spouse, no credit shall be allowed by this section for the taxable year with respect to interest on such loan unless—

"(A) a deduction under section 151 with respect to such individual is allowed to the taxpayer for such taxable year, and

"(B) such individual is at least a half-time student with respect to such taxable year.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) QUALIFIED EDUCATION LOAN.—The term 'qualified education loan' means any indebtedness incurred to pay qualified higher education expenses—

"(A) which are paid or incurred within a reasonable period of time before or after the indebtedness is incurred, and

"(B) which are attributable to education furnished during a period during which the recipient was at least a half-time student.

Such term includes indebtedness used to refinance indebtedness described in the preceding sentence.

"(2) QUALIFIED HIGHER EDUCATION EXPENSES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified higher education expenses' means qualified tuition and related expenses of the taxpayer, his spouse, or a dependent (as defined in section 152) for attendance at an eligible educational institution, reduced by the sum of—

"(i) the amount excluded from gross income under section 135 by reason of such expenses, and

"(ii) the amount of the reduction described in section 135(d)(1).

"(B) QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—The term 'qualified tuition and related expenses' has the meaning given such term by section 117(b), except that such term shall include any reasonable living expenses while away from home.

"(C) ELIGIBLE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'eligible educational institution' has the meaning given such term by section 135(c)(3), except that such term shall also include any institution conducting an internship or residency program leading to a degree or certificate awarded by an institution of higher education, a hospital, or a health care facility which offers postgraduate training.

"(3) HALF-TIME STUDENT.—The term 'half-time student' means any individual who would be a student as defined in section 151(c)(4) if 'half-time' were substituted for 'full-time' each place it appears in such section.

"(e) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—No credit shall be allowed under this section for any amount for which a deduction is allowable under any other provision of this chapter.

"(2) MARITAL STATUS.—Marital status shall be determined in accordance with section 7703."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 22 the following new item:

"Sec. 23. Interest in education loans."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1991, but only with respect to loans the first required payment on which is after such date.

• Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I am pleased today to introduce with my colleague Senator GRASSLEY legislation that addresses a tremendous burden placed on middle-income taxpayers dealt with my no other middle-income tax relief bill. The legislation we introduce today, which I have also included in my comprehensive Tax Fairness and Competitiveness Act of 1992, would allow a deduction or tax credit for the interest paid on student loans to finance the costs of higher education.

The stagnant economy has put one critical aspect of providing for our children—financially supporting their college educations—out of the reach of many Americans. Higher education expenses are typical of the double-bind in which many middle-income Americans often find themselves. Students of limited means can qualify for scholarships and grants, and children of wealthy parents have no worries when it comes to tuition costs. Middle-income taxpayers, however, earn too much to qualify for need-based financial aid. Middle-income children make up three-fourths of the college-age population, yet they receive only about 4 percent of student aid and scholarship. While the average cost of going to college ranges between $6,000 and $22,000 per year, the typical middle-income family has an average net worth of $60,000—most of it tied up in home equities.

As a result, most middle-income families must take out burdensome educational loans if they do not wish to abandon the hope of providing their children with college educations. Debt for graduating middle-income students and their parents ranges from $10,000 to $120,000, depending on the type of education the student received. Such a huge debtload discourages students from seeking higher education, as well as discouraging them from taking lower-paying public service jobs.

Of course, this is more than an issue of short-term relief for the middle-income taxpayer. The long-term economic health of this Nation is dependent on a skilled and educated work

force. If the Federal Government does not provide the economic stimulus to make higher education affordable by the largest segment of American society, the future holds little promise for our children.●

By Mr. PRESSLER:

S. 2161. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to eliminate the loan origination fee for oilseeds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

ELIMINATION OF LOAN ORIGINATION FEES FOR OILSEEDS

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, one reason I voted against the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 was the fact that the bill established a 2-percent loan origination fee for all supported oilseeds. This fee is discouraging participation in the soybean marketing loan program and is bringing in less revenue than originally estimated.

Mr. President, the loan origination fee was a bad idea when it was agreed to by budget conferees, throughout the country today are saying the fee was wrong. They simply are not entering into the oilseeds support programs. By discouraging farmers from entering the loan program, the fee jeopardizes the program itself. The fee is depressing commodity prices and reduces farmers' income protection. It should be eliminated.

One might ask why the fee discourages loan participation. Let me explain. The major commodity affected by the fee is soybeans. Today's loan rate for soybeans is $5.02 per bushel. If a farmer takes out a loan, the Government deducts its 2 percent—10 cents a bushel—before issuing the farmer's check. While the marketing loan for soybeans is set for a 9-month term, most farmers do not hold their loan for the full term. Remember, the farmer receives $4.92 per bushel if he takes out a loan, but must repay $5.02 per bushel, plus interest. The following chart reflects what the actual annual percentage rate would be on a soybean loan based on the number of months the loan is outstanding:

	Cost cents/ bushel	Annual percent rate
Months outstanding:		
1	12.4	30.1
2	14.7	17.9
3	17.1	13.9
4	19.4	11.8
5	21.8	10.6
6	24.1	9.8
7	26.5	9.2
8	28.8	8.8
9	31.2	8.4

Assumptions: CCC interest rate=5.625 percent (as of 10/10/91). Principal payback=$5.02. Loan Proceeds=$4.92.

Mr. President with the effective annual interest rate ranging as high as 30 percent, one can see why many soybeans farmers are not taking out soybean marketing loans.

When this fee idea originated, it was estimated that it would generate approximately $32 million in additional Government revenue. That estimate was based on previous participation rates in the Soybean Program. With the loan fee now in place, farmers are participating at a significantly lower rate:

As of January 7, 1991, soybean loan placement was 192 million bushels;

As of January 7, 1992, soybean loan placement was 136 million bushels, a drop of nearly 30 percent from the previous year.

Consequently, anticipated revenue from the fee has fallen. Based on the loan placement figures of January 7, 1991, the Government will generate only $20 million, not $32 million, from the fee.

Mr. President, the Marketing Loan Program is designed to prevent an unwieldy influx of soybeans into the market at harvest, and help promote an orderly marketing of soybeans. The oilseeds loan origination fee is undermining the basic premise of the Marketing Loan Program.

Mr. President, I thought the loan origination fee was unfair when it was enacted last year. I think the fee is unfair when it was enacted last year. I think the fee is unfair today. Over 10,000 soybean farmers in South Dakota also believe the fee is unfair, as do soybeans farmers throughout the Nation. The fee should be eliminated and that is the purpose of the bill I am introducing today.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for Mr. HARKIN, for himself, Mr. ADAMS, and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 2162. A bill to amend the International Financial Institutions Act to advocate and promote policies to encourage developing countries to reduce military and military-related expenditures and to dedicate an equitable allocation of resources for health and education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THIRD WORLD DEVELOPMENT AND THREAT REDUCTION ACT OF 1992

●Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, it's time for new priorities in America and countries around the globe. It's time to transform America's foreign policy from one focused on the plan of East-West relations to one with a truly global vision. We can no longer afford to ignore North-South divisions or the need to foster economic growth and human development in lesser developed countries of the Third World.

It's time to promote economic growth and cut worldwide military spending. And, it's time to recognize that economic growth with equity, human development and political democracy in Asia, Africa, Eastern Europe, and Latin America benefit the United States as well. Latin America already constitutes one of our most important markets. To the degree that their markets expand, so too will American jobs and our exports. We can help the developing nations of the world obtain the vast additional resources necessary to build schools, health clinics, and rural water systems—without increasing our contribution to foreign aid by 1 cent.

Mr. President, there is a wide consensus that large military expenditures impede economic and human development in developing countries by diverting capital and other resources away from productive public and private investment. A recent IMF working paper by Daniel Hewitt, as well as Robert McNamara's study prepared for the World Bank's Annual Conference on Development, conclude that international financial assistance "both enables and encourages a nation to spend more on the military." For this reason, I rise to introduce the Third World Development and Threat Reduction Act of 1992. The bill amends the International Financial Institution Act of 1977. It instructs the executive directors at the World Bank, the IMF, and all multilateral institutions to use U.S. voice and vote to promote policies that: First, redirect military spending in developing countries toward health, education, and productive enterprises; second, redirect health and education spending in developing countries to meet the needs of the impoverished majority; third, prohibit all assistance to countries which spend more on their military than health and education.

Mr. President, let me cite some facts on Third World military, health and education expenditures before elaborating on what my bill purports to do. Among the 97 poorest countries in the world, 27 countries allocated more money to their military than to education and health, 18 of which allocated more money to their military than to health and education combined. The United Nations Development Programme [UNDP] calculates Third World military expenditures at $173 billion in 1987 with a historic growth rate of 7.5 percent per year. A freeze on all Third World military expenditures would release $15 billion a year. My bill will encourage developing countries to reduce or at least freeze their military expenditures, which could redirect $150 billion over the next decade to raise the standard of living of their citizens, without costing the American taxpayer one dime. Research conducted by the World Bank indicates that raising the average educational level of the labor force by 1 year can raise GDP by as much as 9 percent. The World Bank estimates that 3 years of schooling as compared to zero raises GDP by 27 percent. "The World Bank Development Report 1991" also states:

> The educational status of adult women is by far the most important variable explaining changes in infant mortality and secondary school enrollments. An extra year of education for women is associated with a drop of 2 percentage points in the rate of infant mortality.

It is not enough Mr. President to encourage Third World governments to redirect military spending toward health and education. According to the U.N. spending in almost all developing countries is heavily biased toward higher education rather than basic education for the majority. And UNICEF points out that it is not atypical among developing countries for 75 percent of public spending on health to serve only the top 25 percent of the population. That's why my bill promotes policies which encourage Third World governments to redirect health and education spending in developing countries to meet the needs of the impoverished majority. We should be encouraging policies that help build developing countries from the bottom up, not the top down.

Mr. President, let me emphasize that this bill will enhance U.S. national security by increasing political stability in Third World countries, averting potential threats, and expanding markets for U.S. products. It will strengthen emerging democracies in the Third World by reducing the political influence of the military. It will also promote economic growth and increase the standard of living of the impoverished majority in Third World countries. And, we can do this without increasing foreign aid by 1 cent. Again, this is not only good morals, it's good policy and good economics.

Mr. President, I am proud to join with Senators ADAMS and BINGAMAN in introducing the Third World Development and Threat Reduction Act of 1992. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and ask for unanimous consent that the bill and accompanying material be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2162

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Third World Development and Threat Reduction Act of 1992".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS ACT.

The International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262c et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XXI—THIRD WORLD DEVELOPMENT AND THREAT REDUCTION

"SEC. 2001. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

"The Congress finds that—

"(1) a principal focus of the United States Government policy in the multilateral development banks has been and should be to foster greater economic growth and human development in the member borrowing countries of such banks;

"(2) large military and military-related expenditures in developing countries impedes economic and human development by diverting capital and other resources away from productive public and private investment; and

"(3) investment in basic education and health for the majority of a developing country's populations is not just social expenditure but an economic investment which leads to successful development.

"SEC. 2002. STATEMENT OF POLICY; PROHIBITION.

"(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—The Congress declares that, in order to promote economic growth in developing countries, it shall be the policy of the United States, in connection with the United States voice and vote in international financial institutions, vigorously to advocate and promote policies within such institutions designed to encourage developing countries—

"(1) to reduce military and military-related expenditures and to dedicate greater resources to health, education, and productive enterprises; and

"(2) to dedicate an equitable allocation of health and education resources to meet the needs of the majority of their populations.

"(b) PROHIBITION.—For the purpose of carrying out the policy described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States executive director to each international financial institution to oppose the making of any loan or the extension of any credit or guarantee by such institution to any developing country whose military expenditures as a percentage of gross product are greater than its expenditures on health and education.

"SEC. 2003. WAIVER.

"The prohibition contained in section 2002(b) shall not apply if the President submits a report to the Congress that to do so—

"(1) would result in grave harm to the national security of the United States; or

"(2) would endanger a democratically elected government facing armed aggression or the threat of armed aggression from—

"(A) a hostile neighboring country; or

"(B) a local insurgency whose existence presents an immediate danger to the survivability of the democratically elected government or an insurgency which is guilty of a consistent pattern of gross violations of human rights.

"SEC. 2004. DEFINITIONS.

"For purposes of this Act—

"(1) the term 'developing country' includes low income countries, middle income countries, and newly industrialized countries with a per capita income not in excess of $4,000;

"(2) the term 'international financial institutions' means the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the African Development Fund, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development; and

"(3) the term 'military expenditures' includes all expenditures needed for the maintenance and support of the armed forces, but does not include funds destined for civilian law enforcement unless such law enforcement is under the control of the military or a paramilitary organization.".

MILITARY EXPENDITURE VERSUS HEALTH AND EDUCATION

All data based on 1987 statistics;[1] 99 countries have per capita GDP's under $4,000.

27 Countries, among the 97 poorest, allocated more money to their military than to education and health, 18 of which allocated more money to their military than to health and education combined.[2]

*1. Mozambique, *2. Ethiopia, *3. Tanzania, *4. Chad, *5. Somalia, *6. Gambia, *7. Uganda, *8. China, *9. Yemen, *10. Pakistan, *11. Bolivia, *12. Egypt, *13. Sudan, *14. Angola.

*15. Nicaragua, *16. El Salvador, 17. Zambia, 18. Guyana, *19. India,[3] 20. Honduras, *21. N. Korea, 22. Cuba, *23. Peru, *24. Turkey, *25. Iran, *26. Iraq, *27. Syria.●

[1] Sivard, L. Ruth; World Military and Social Expenditures 1991, 15th edition (1991). Cross References: The State of the World's Children 1992, UNICEF (Oxford University Press). McNamara S. Robert; "Reducing Military Expenditures in the Third World," Finance & Development, Volume 3, (September 1991). McNamara S. Robert; The Post-Cold War and its Implications for Military Expenditures in the Developing Countries,—Paper prepared for the World Bank's Annual Conference on Development Economics, March 1991.

[2] *=countries that spend more on their military than on health and education combined. Discrepancies in data may arise from under reporting. Data is also unavailable for several countries, such as Yugoslavia and the newly independent states in the former Soviet Union.

[3] Recent data indicates that India's military expenditures are currently higher than health and education combined. (Military 3.5 percent of GNP, Health 0.3 percent of GDP, Education 0.5 percent of GDP).

MILITARY, EDUCATION, AND HEALTH EXPENDITURES FOR THE 71 POOREST COUNTRIES IN THE WORLD

[In millions of 1987 dollars]

	Military		Education		Health	
	Amount	Percent of GNP	Amount	Percent of GNP	Amount	Percent of GNP
1. Mozambique [1 2 3]	102	8.0	51	4.0	23	1.8
2. Ethiopia [1 2 3]	472	8.8	225	4.2	67	1.3
3. Tanzania [1 2 3]	171	5.3	116	3.6	35	1.1
4. Chad [1 2 3]	34	4.9	14	2.0	4	.6
5. Somalia [1 2 3]	23	2.4	6	.6	3	.2
6. Laos	.....	.....	3	.6	.....	.....
7. Nepal [3]	33	1.2	77	2.8	23	.8
8. Malawi	21	1.8	38	3.2	23	1.9
9. Zaire [3]	82	1.6	139	2.7	44	.9
10. Cambodia	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
11. Bangladesh [3]	291	1.7	345	2.0	105	.6
12. Sierra Leone [3]	5	.8	9	1.3	4	.6
13. Madagascar [3]	37	1.9	56	2.9	38	2.0
14. Gambia [1 2 3]	16	10.0	5	3.3	3	1.6
15. Uganda [1 2 3]	80	2.4	50	1.5	10	.3
16. Bukino Faso [3]	51	3.0	50	3.0	17	1.0
17. Mali [3]	61	3.3	62	3.3	14	.7
18. Burundi [3]	32	2.9	35	3.1	9	.8
19. Nigeria [3]	180	.8	349	1.5	51	.2
20. Zambia [2 3]	63	3.6	60	3.5	34	2.0
21. Vietnam	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
22. Guyana [2 3]	29	11.8	24	9.6	11	4.4
23. Burma [3]	190	1.9	198	2.0	73	.7
24. China [1 2 3]	13,418	4.4	8,235	2.7	4,269	1.4
25. Pakistan [1 2 3]	2,575	7.9	726	2.2	65	.2
26. Guinea [3]	60	3.0	60	3.0	20	1.0
27. India [2 3]	9,815	3.9	8,808	3.5	2,265	.9
28. Niger [3]	17	.8	67	3.2	15	.7
29. Rwanda	38	1.8	74	3.4	13	.6
30. Equatorial Guinea	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
31. Kenya [3]	237	3.1	543	7.1	153	2.0
32. Haiti	28	1.3	42	1.9	28	1.3
33. Ghana	45	.9	169	3.4	58	1.2
34. Indonesia [3]	1,367	2.1	2,197	3.4	335	.5
35. Togo [3]	43	3.6	78	6.5	20	1.7
36. Central Africa Republic [3]	19	1.8	53	5.0	13	1.2
37. Benin [3]	31	1.8	86	5.0	14	.8
38. Sri Lanka [3]	204	3.1	245	3.7	115	1.7
39. Yemen [1 2 3]	494	26.6	310	11.5	71	3.5
40. Lesotho [3]	20	2.9	29	4.2	12	1.8
41. Liberia [3]	26	2.4	43	4.0	19	1.8
42. Mauritania [3]	40	4.6	50	5.8	17	2.0
43. Zimbabwe [3]	390	8.1	506	10.6	178	3.7
44. Bolivia [1 2 3]	175	4.7	108	2.9	15	.9
45. Egypt [1 2 3]	2,339	8.2	1,704	5.9	327	1.1
46. Sudan [1 2 3]	800	6.0	563	4.2	27	.2
47. Philippines [3]	609	1.8	675	2.0	240	.7
48. Senegal [3]	96	2.2	197	4.5	48	1.1
49. Morocco [3]	800	5.0	899	5.6	161	1.0
50. Dominican Republic	50	1.1	67	1.4	80	1.7
51. Mongolia [3]	172	10.9	.....	.....	22	1.4
52. Papua New Guinea	42	1.4	148	5.0	89	3.0
53. Honduras [2 3]	190	5.0	188	4.9	125	3.3
54. Guatemala [3]	124	1.8	154	2.2	85	1.2
55. Swaziland	8	1.3	36	6.2	13	2.3
56. Nicaragua [1 2 3]	592	20.0	183	6.2	148	5.0
57. Ivory Coast	117	1.2	566	6.0	159	1.7
58. Thailand [3]	1,657	3.5	1,711	3.6	540	1.1
59. El Salvador [1 2 3]	177	3.9	98	2.1	42	.9
60. Ecuador [3]	208	2.1	340	3.5	181	1.9
61. Jamaica	25	1.0	132	5.2	71	2.8
62. Namibia	.....	.....	54	3.0	11	.6
63. Paraguay [3]	49	1.1	56	1.3	13	.3
64. Angola [1 2 3]	2,040	20.0	306	3.0	102	1.0
65. Congo [3]	92	4.5	111	5.4	43	2.1
66. Colombia [3]	273	.8	905	2.7	237	.7
67. Cameroon [3]	232	1.9	334	2.8	101	.8
68. North Korea [1 2 3]	5,840	20.0	.....	.....	250	1.0
69. Albania [3]	151	4.2	.....	.....	83	2.3
70. Botswana [3]	82	6.0	126	9.2	52	3.8
71. Tunisia [3]	492	5.4	494	5.4	201	2.2
Total	44,932	.....	34,388	.....	11,737	.....
Other relevant countries of interest:						
Turkey [1 2 3]	2,890	4.4	1,083	1.6	970	1.5
Chile [3]	575	3.3	823	4.7	357	2.1
Cuba [3]	1,296	7.2	1,116	6.2	540	3.0
Iran [1 2 3]	19,000	20.0	2,650	2.9	1,380	1.5
Iraq [1 2 3]	9,370	30.2	1,429	4.6	248	.8
Peru [1 2 3]	2,184	5.0	1,477	3.4	371	.8
Syria [1 2 3]	2,721	11.5	1,109	4.7	104	.4

[1] Countries that allocated more money to their military than education and health combined.
[2] Countries that allocated more money to their military than to education.
[3] Countries that allocated more money to their military than to health.

• Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Third World Development and Threat Reduction Act. We are faced with a new set of circumstances that we must take advantage of. The threat of war around the world has diminished. From Angola to El Salvador to Afghanistan, the prospects for peace have never been higher. Because of these recent events, we must seize the moment and promote policies that redirect military spending in developing countries toward health and education.

Mr. President, we must promote policies that redirect health and education spending in developing countries to meet the needs of the impoverished majority. We must promote policies that promote economic growth and increase the standards of living in Third World countries. Mr. President, the Third World Development and Threat Reduction Act will instruct the executive directors at the World Bank, the IMF and all multilateral institutions to use United States voice and vote to promote these policies.

Mr. President, let me cite some alarming statistics. Among the 97 poor-

est nations in the world, 27 countries allocate more money to their military than to their health and education programs. Of these 27 nations, 18 allocate more money to their military than to their health and education combined. At the same time, according to the U.N. Development Programme, a freeze on all Third World military expenditures could release $15 billion a year, possibly $150 billion over the next decade, to invest in the health and education of their citizens.

Mr. President, this bill makes sense because the conditions to freeze expenditures on military spending exist and at the same time we can promote economic growth in Third World countries without increasing our foreign aid by $1. We must lead the financial world by demanding policies that work toward economic growth and increasing the standard of living in the poorest countries in the world. Mr. President, the Third World Development and Threat Reduction Act is essential if we are to promote these policies and I urge my colleagues to support it.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 416

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 416, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the tax credit for increasing research activities.

S. 757

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 757, a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to respond to the hunger emergency afflicting American families and children, to attack the causes of hunger among all Americans, to ensure an adequate diet for low-income people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness because of the shortage of affordable housing, to promote self-sufficiency among food stamp recipients, to assist families affected by adverse economic conditions, to simplify food assistance programs' administration, and for other purposes.

S. 1087

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] were added as cosponsors of S. 1087, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

S. 1100

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1100, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide grants to urban and rural communities for training economically disadvantaged youth in education and employment skills and to expand the supply of housing for homeless and economically disadvantaged individuals and families.

S. 1156

At the request of Mr. PACKWOOD, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 1156, a bill to provide for the protection and management of certain areas on public domain lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management and lands withdrawn from the public domain managed by the Forest Service in the States of California, Oregon, and Washington; to ensure proper conservation of the natural resources of such lands, including enhancement of habitat; to provide assistance to communities and individuals affected by management decisions on such lands; to facilitate the implementation of land management plans for such public domain lands and Federal lands elsewhere; and for other purposes.

S. 1830

At the request of Mr. WOFFORD, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1830, a bill to require Senators and Members of the House of Representatives to pay for medical services provided by the Office of the Attending Physician, and for other purposes.

S. 1904

At the request of Mr. ADAMS, the name of the Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1904, a bill to amend title XI of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide assistance to institutions of higher education to enable such institutions to support programs that are designed to address urban campus and community crime issues.

S. 2064

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] were added as cosponsors of S. 2064, a bill to impose a 1-year moratorium on the performance of nuclear weapons tests by the United States unless the Soviet Union conducts a nuclear weapons test during that period.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 233

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SANFORD], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 233, a joint resolution to designate the week beginning April 12, 1992, as "National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 238

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 238, a joint resolution designating the week beginning September 21, 1992, as "National Senior Softball Week."

SENATE RESOLUTION 234

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 234, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the sale of 40 percent of McDonnell-Douglas' commercial aircraft division to the Taiwan Aerospace Corp.

SENATE RESOLUTION 245

At the request of Mr. DIXON, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 245, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate in support of United States workers and objecting to attempts by the Prime Minister of Japan to undermine the President's trade mission.

SENATE RESOLUTION 246

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 246, a resolution on the recognition of Croatia and Slovenia.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

NATIONAL LITERACY ACT

KASTEN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1482

Mr. KASTEN (for himself, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. SMITH, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. COATS, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. WALLOP) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 1479 proposed by Mr. NICKLES to the bill (S. 2) to promote the achievement of national education goals, to establish a National Council on Education Goals and an Academic Report Card to measure progress on the goals, and to promote literacy in the United States, and for other purposes, as follows:

Strike all after the word "SEC." and insert the following:

. STATE OPTION TO ESTABLISH LEARNFARE PROGRAMS.—Section 402(a) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" after paragraph (44);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (45) and inserting in lieu thereof "and;" and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(46) at the option of the State, provide that the needs of an individual will not be taken into consideration (or will be taken into consideration only in part) under paragraph (7) for any month if such individual—

"(A) is over the age specified in the applicable State compulsory school attendance law at which a child must begin to attend school, but under the age of 16; and

"(B) has, as determined by the State agency, failed without good cause to regularly attend an elementary, secondary, vocational school, or other appropriate school;

but if the needs of an individual are not considered (or are considered only in part) by reason of this paragraph, he shall still be considered to be receiving aid under this part for purposes of determining the eligibility for such aid of any other individual to whom paragraph (7) applies, and for purposes of determining eligibility for medical assistance under the State's plan approved under title XIX.".

(4) The effective date of this section shall be June 1, 1992.

METZENBAUM AMENDMENT NO. 1483

Mr. METZENBAUM proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2, supra, as follows:

In the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . STATE EDUCATIONAL FUNDING AND STATE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUNDING OR STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No State shall be eligible to receive Federal funds appropriated and or designated for State economic development purposes or State industrial grants, if such State or political subdivision, or agency or other entity of such State offers, permits or grants a tax incentive, as defined in subsection (b), that relieves a taxpayer from paying any State or local tax which would otherwise by payable for the direct or indirect support of primary and secondary education.

(b) DEFINITION OF TAX INCENTIVE.—For the purpose of subsection (a), the term "tax incentive" means the abatement of tax, the exemption from tax, the deferral of tax, the reduction of tax, the diversion of tax payments and/or the authorization of payments in lieu of taxes which are offered, permitted or granted to a private corporation for profit, a nonprofit community redevelopment corporation, an individual, or any other entity engaged in economic development, for the purpose of promoting new economic development and/or the retention and/or expansion of existing facilities within the State, and which results in a loss of revenue which, but for the abatement of tax, the exemption from tax, the deferral of tax, the reduction of tax, the diversion of tax payments and/or the authorization of payments in lieu of taxes, would be payable for education purposes.

NUNN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1484

Mr. NUNN (for himself, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BOREN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2, supra, as follows:

On page 2 of the Committee amendment, in the table of contents, strike the items relating to title III of the amendment and insert the following:

TITLE III—YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP

Sec. 301. Short title.
Sec. 302. Findings and purpose.
Sec. 303. Definitions.
Sec. 304. Institute for youth apprenticeship.
Sec. 305. Establishment of youth apprenticeship demonstration programs.
Sec. 306. Contracts.
Sec. 307. Youth apprenticeship demonstration program requirements.
Sec. 308. Coordination.
Sec. 309. Nondiscrimination.
Sec. 310. Notice, hearing, and grievance procedures.
Sec. 311. Nonduplication and nondisplacement.
Sec. 312. Evaluation.
Sec. 313. Executive Schedule.
Sec. 314. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 315. Termination and repeal.

TITLE IV—DEFINITIONS

Sec. 401. Definitions.

In title III of the Committee amendment, strike the title heading and all that follows through "sec. 301. definitions." and insert the following:

TITLE III—YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Youth Apprenticeship Act of 1992".

SEC. 302. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) many foreign countries, including Germany, Japan, Denmark, and Sweden, have national policies that—

(A) are aimed at effective employment preparation of youth who do not seek a college education; and

(B) include programs that provide occupational guidance to students and combine schooling with work experience;

(2) in Germany, almost all eligible students apply for vocational training, which substantially reduces the risk of unemployment for young people, and German firms spend $18,000,000,000 annually on vocational training;

(3) United States international competitiveness is being eroded because a substantial increase is occurring in jobs requiring greater skills and youth are unprepared to meet the new labor market demands;

(4) partly as a result of inadequate skills in the work force, the productivity growth of the United States has slowed dramatically over the past 10 years, with the country taking almost 3 years to achieve the same productivity improvement previously achieved in 1 year;

(5) while the United States still leads the world in productivity, the rate of productivity improvement is increasing much faster among competing nations;

(6) the economic position of United States high school graduates who do not seek a college education is deteriorating, with real earnings of the graduates declining by 28 percent from 1973 to 1986;

(7) about 9,000,000 of the 33,000,000 United States youth age 16 to 24, or 27 percent of the youth, lack the necessary skills to meet employer requirements for entry level positions;

(8) in the United States, apprenticeship training programs are providing valuable training services to—

(A) 300,000 apprentices enrolled in more than 40,000 federally registered programs; and

(B) 100,000 apprentices participating in nonregistered programs;

(9) attempts to expand apprenticeship training in the United States have been unsuccessful and the percentage of the civilian United States work force enrolled in federally registered apprenticeship programs fell from an already low .3 percent in 1970 to only .16 percent in 1987;

(10) federally registered apprenticeship training programs do not provide assistance to the average high school graduate, as evidenced by the fact that—

(A) fewer than 2 percent of United States high school graduates enter into youth apprenticeship training programs; and

(B) the median age of United States apprentices is 25;

(11) currently, there are at most approximately 3,500 United States high school students participating in school-to-work apprenticeship programs; and

(12) school-to-work apprenticeship programs can—

(A) allow students to become registered apprentices as the students complete high school;

(B) produce positive outcomes for the students, schools, and employers; and

(C) provide supervised work experience for the students during high school, promoting desirable work habits and developing knowledge and skills for the working world.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to develop and evaluate a range of youth apprenticeship programs that will—

(1) establish partnerships between secondary and postsecondary schools, employers, labor organizations, and community and civic leaders to bridge the growing gap in skills, income, and opportunity between college bound and noncollege bound youth;

(2) offer young people a better chance to gain marketable skills and incentives to remain in school and achieve better grades;

(3) establish a systematic transition for students from school to work by combining work experience for youth with a work-related curriculum;

(4) identify and develop competency standards for youth apprentices;

(5) instill a sense of pride, self-esteem, and purpose in youth apprentices;

(6) contribute to the public policy debate on youth apprenticeship programs; and

(7) test a range of approaches to youth apprenticeship programs.

SEC. 303. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this title:

(1) BOARD.—The term "Board" means the Board of Directors of the Institute.

(2) DISADVANTAGED YOUTH.—The term "disadvantaged youth"—

(A) means an individual (other than an individual with a handicap) who—

(i)(I) is a economically disadvantaged individual; or

(II) has academic disadvantages; and

(ii) requires special services and assistance in order to succeed in an apprenticeship training program; and

(B) includes—

(i) an individual who is a member of an economically disadvantaged family;

(ii) a migrant;

(iii) an individual with limited-English proficiency; and

(iv) an individual who is identified as a potential dropout from a secondary school.

(3) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED FAMILY; ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED INDIVIDUAL.—The terms "economically disadvantaged family" and "economically disadvantaged individual" mean a family and an individual,

respectively, that the Institute, or a partnership participating in a youth apprenticeship demonstration program, determines to be low-income, according to the latest available data from the Department of Commerce.

(4) INSTITUTE.—The term "Institute" means the Institute for Youth Apprenticeship, established in section 304.

(5) PARTNERSHIP.—The term "partnership" means a coalition of secondary and postsecondary schools, employers, labor organizations, and community and civic leaders, formed for the purpose of operating a youth apprenticeship demonstration program.

(6) POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL.—The term "postsecondary school" means a community college, junior college, technical institute, or area vocational school.

(7) POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—The term "postsecondary school demonstration program" means a demonstration program described in section 306(b)(3).

(8) SECONDARY SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—The term "secondary school demonstration program" means a demonstration program described in section 306(b)(2).

(9) YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—The term "youth apprenticeship demonstration program" means a demonstration program described in paragraph (2) or (3) of section 306(b).

SEC. 304. INSTITUTE FOR YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an Institute for Youth Apprenticeship that shall administer the programs established under this title. The Institute shall be an independent establishment, as defined in section 104 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) COMPOSITION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—The Institute shall be administered by a Board of Directors. The Board shall be composed of 21 members, including—

(1) a Chairperson, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(2) the Administrator of the Office of Work-Based Learning of the Department of Labor;

(3) the Director of the Division of Vocational and Technical Education of the Department of Education; and

(4) 18 members, appointed by the President—

(A) who shall include—

(i) nine individuals from among individuals nominated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(ii) nine individuals from among individuals nominated on the joint recommendation of the Majority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the Senate; and

(B) of whom—

(i)(I) six individuals shall be representatives of the education community;

(II) six individuals shall be representatives of labor and worker groups; and

(III) six individuals shall be representatives of the business community; and

(ii) individuals within each of the groups described in subclauses (I), (II), and (III) of clause (i) shall represent the national, State, and local community levels.

(c) TERM.—Each appointed member of the Board shall be appointed for a term of 5 years.

(d) VACANCIES.—Vacancies in the membership of the Board shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. The vacancy shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the duties of the Board.

(e) FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT.—

(1) MEMBERS.—Members of the Board appointed under subsection (b)(4) shall not be employees or officers under section 2104 or 2105 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson of the Board shall be an officer under section 2104 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) SUIT.—Members of the Board shall be immune from suit and legal process relating to acts performed by the members in their capacity, and within the scope of their functions, as members of the Board.

(g) COMPENSATION AND REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES.—

(1) UNCOMPENSATED SERVICE.—Members of the Board who are not employees of the Federal Government shall not be compensated for the performance of duties for the Board.

(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member of the Board shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons employed intermittently in the Government service, for each day the member is engaged in the performance of duties away from the home or regular place of business of the member.

(h) QUORUM.—A quorum shall consist of 14 members of the Board, except that 9 members may conduct a hearing.

(i) MEETINGS.—The Board shall meet at the call of the Chairperson or a majority of the members of the Board.

(j) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—The Chairperson, in consultation with the Board, shall appoint an Executive Director for the Institute.

(k) STAFF.—

(1) APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION.—The Executive Director of the Institute may appoint and determine the compensation of such staff as the Board determines to be necessary to carry out the duties of the Institute.

(2) LIMITATIONS.—The rate of compensation for each staff member appointed under paragraph (1) shall not exceed the daily equivalent of the rate for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, for each day the staff member is engaged in the performance of duties for the Institute. The Executive Director of the Institute may otherwise appoint and determine the compensation of staff without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, that govern appointments in the competitive service, and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, that relate to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(l) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Executive Director of the Institute may obtain the services of experts and consultants and compensate such experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, as the Board determines to be necessary to carry out the duties of the Institute.

(m) DETAIL OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—On the request of the Board, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education shall detail, without reimbursement, any of the personnel of the Department of Labor and the Department of Education to the Institute as the Board determines to be necessary to carry out the duties of the Institute. Any detail shall not interrupt or otherwise affect the civil service status or privileges of the Federal employee.

(n) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—On the request of the Board, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Education, and the heads of other pertinent Federal agencies shall provide, without reimbursement, such technical assistance and administrative support services to the Institute as the Board determines to be necessary to carry out the duties of the Institute.

(o) OBTAINING INFORMATION.—The Executive Director of the Institute may secure directly from any Federal agency information necessary to enable the Institute to carry out the duties of the Institute, if the information may be disclosed under section 552 of title 5, United States Code. Subject to the previous sentence, on the request of the Executive Director of the Institute, the head of the agency shall furnish the information to the Institute.

(p) GIFTS AND PRIVATE CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Executive Director of the Institute may accept on behalf of the Institute gifts or contributions from private sources for the benefit of the Institute or to carry out any of the functions of the Institute. No gift or contribution shall be accepted if the gift or contribution is conditioned on any expenditure of funds by the Institute.

(q) VOLUNTARY SERVICE.—Notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, the Chairperson of the Board may accept for the Board voluntary services provided by a member of the Board.

SEC. 305. ESTABLISHMENT OF YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.

After consultation with the Board, the Chairperson of the Board shall establish guidelines, criteria, and procedures for youth apprenticeship demonstration programs, including—

(1) developing recommended guidelines for an appropriate curriculum for each occupational field within the programs, including postsecondary courses to enable apprentices to supplement training after completion of the programs;

(2) establishing site criteria to be used in the selection of partnerships to develop and evaluate youth apprenticeship demonstration programs, including requirements that the programs be established in rural and urban areas in all regions of the country;

(3) establishing criteria for apprenticeship occupations, including requirements that demand exist for skill training in the occupations and that the occupations offer a career ladder for apprentices;

(4) establishing competency criteria for apprenticeships and trainers in specific occupational fields; and

(5) establishing certification procedures for apprentices and trainers.

SEC. 306. CONTRACTS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this title, the Executive Director of the Institute shall, to the extent appropriations are available, enter into contracts with eligible partnerships, to pay for the Federal share of developing and evaluating youth apprenticeship demonstration programs, in accordance with the requirements specified in section 307.

(b) CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall enter into contracts under this section with eligible partnerships that propose youth apprenticeship demonstration programs consistent with the criteria and procedures established under section 305.

(2) SECONDARY SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall enter into contracts with eligible partnerships to establish demonstration programs at the secondary school level.

(B) WAGE INCENTIVE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—The Board shall enter into a contract with an eligible partnership to establish at

least one demonstration program in which the Institute shall pay for 50 percent of the cost of the apprenticeship wage.

(C) DISADVANTAGED YOUTH DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—The Board shall enter into a contract with an eligible partnership to establish at least one demonstration program that shall train disadvantaged youth.

(3) POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—The Board may enter into contracts with two eligible partnerships to establish demonstration programs that solely involve students at the postsecondary school level.

(4) AWARDS.—The Board shall enter into contracts under this section on a majority vote of the Board.

(c) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to enter into a contract under this section, a partnership shall submit an application to the Executive Director of the Institute at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Executive Director may require. At a minimum, the application shall include—

(1) a description of the youth apprenticeship demonstration program proposed to be conducted by the partnership, including sufficient information to enable the Executive Director to determine whether the proposal of the partnership is consistent with the criteria and procedures specified in section 305;

(2) an assessment of the future work force needs of each area in which a youth apprenticeship demonstration program will be established and the manner in which the program will help provide skilled workers to meet the needs;

(3) a description of the activities to be offered through the youth apprenticeship demonstration program to students in the seventh grade or older;

(4) a description of the manner in which each school, employer, or other representative of a partnership shall participate in the partnership;

(5) a description of the manner in which the program will be administered by schools participating in the youth apprenticeship demonstration program, including the support and counseling staff available to students pursuing apprenticeships, which staff at a minimum shall include one full-time vocational counselor;

(6) a description of the manner in which in-service training for teachers will be provided and the manner in which such training will—

(A) be designed to train teachers to effectively implement apprenticeship training curricula;

(B) provide for joint training for all the teachers in the partnership; and

(C) provide for the training in weekend, evening, and summer sessions, institutes, or workshops;

(7) a description of the manner in which training programs will be provided for counselors and the manner in which such training will be designed to enable counselors to more effectively—

(A) recruit students for apprenticeship training programs;

(B) ensure that such students successfully complete high school and the apprenticeship training program; and

(C) assist such students in finding appropriate employment;

(8) a description of courses to be offered to students considering or participating in the apprenticeship program;

(9) a description of the work processes to which apprentices will be exposed;

(10) a description of the manner in which apprentices shall be selected;

(11) a description of the academic and technical skill levels to be achieved by apprentices on completion of the program;

(12) a description of the apprenticeship wage and employee benefits offered;

(13) an estimate of the amount of time to be spent by apprentices at the workplace during the school day;

(14) a plan for monitoring and evaluating apprentices and the youth apprenticeship demonstration program within each partnership; and

(15) an assurance that the partnership will comply with the matching requirement specified in subsection (d).

(d) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the costs of developing and evaluating youth apprenticeship demonstration programs shall be not more than 50 percent.

(2) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the costs may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, and services. Amounts provided by the Federal Government, or services assisted or subsidized to any significant extent by the Federal Government, may not be included in determining the amount of such non-Federal share.

SEC. 307. YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.

(a) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Each partnership that participates in a youth apprenticeship demonstration program shall be responsible for—

(1) program and curriculum development;

(2) coordination and quality assurances; and

(3) provision of information to the Institute for the assessment and evaluation of apprentices and training programs.

(b) SECONDARY SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The partnerships participating in secondary school demonstration programs shall provide apprenticeship training to students as appropriate for the grade level of the students.

(2) SEVENTH THROUGH TENTH GRADE STUDENTS.—The partnerships shall provide students in the seventh through tenth grades with an opportunity to learn about possible occupations through secondary school courses, site visits, job sampling, and employer visits to secondary schools. The partnerships shall also provide information about the youth apprenticeship demonstration program to the parents of students in the seventh through tenth grades.

(3) TENTH GRADE STUDENTS.—The partnerships shall provide students in the tenth grade with an opportunity to apply and interview for apprenticeships. Apprentices who successfully complete the tenth grade, pass a basic skills test, and successfully interview with employers may sign agreements with employers at the end of the academic year.

(4) ELEVENTH AND TWELFTH GRADE STUDENTS.—The partnerships shall provide training at work sites for students in the eleventh and twelfth grades, in combination with secondary school courses. The partnerships shall structure the training and educational requirements of students—

(A) so that students gradually increase the time spent at work sites from 30 percent in eleventh grade to 50 percent in the twelfth grade, depending on the structure of the program; and

(B) in such a manner as to allow the students to graduate and receive a high school diploma with other members of their class.

(5) SECONDARY SCHOOL GRADUATES.—The partnerships shall structure the training and educational requirements of secondary school graduates so that students spend 75 to 80 percent of program time at work sites and draw on postsecondary schools for supplementary theory and skill courses. The youth apprenticeship demonstration programs shall allow students in technical fields to take basic skills courses and apply them toward an associate degree.

(c) POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—Partnerships participating in postsecondary school demonstration programs shall provide on-the-job training to students to supplement academic courses taught in postsecondary schools.

(d) PAYMENT.—

(1) SECONDARY SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), employers participating in secondary school demonstration programs shall pay for 100 percent of the cost of wages to apprentices.

(B) SUBSIDIZED WAGE.—Employers participating in demonstration programs described in section 306(b)(2)(B) shall pay for 50 percent of the cost of the apprenticeship wage.

(2) POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—

(A) WAGES.—Employers participating in postsecondary school demonstration programs shall pay for 100 percent of the cost of the apprenticeship wage to apprentices.

(B) SCHOOL COSTS.—Individual students shall pay for the cost of taking continuing basic skills courses from a postsecondary school.

(3) AMOUNT.—Apprentices participating in the secondary and postsecondary school demonstration programs shall receive, at a minimum, an apprenticeship wage equal to the wage rate described in section 306(a)(2) of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1989 (29 U.S.C. 206 note).

(e) TRAINING.—Employers participating in the postsecondary school demonstration programs shall pay for the cost of on-the-job training.

(f) EMPLOYMENT.—The Institute shall encourage, but not require, employers participating in youth apprenticeship demonstration programs to place, or assist in placing, the apprentices in employment positions similar to the positions in which the apprentices received training.

(g) OTHER EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS.—Apprentices participating in youth apprenticeship demonstration programs shall—

(1) be covered by all applicable Federal and State laws regarding occupational health and safety; and

(2) receive the same employment benefits as full-time employees, commensurate with the length of service of the apprentices to the employer.

SEC. 308. COORDINATION.

The Institute shall—

(1) consult with the Office of Work-Based Learning of the Department of Labor and with the Division of Vocational and Technical Education of the Department of Education;

(2) provide technical assistance to partnerships participating in youth apprenticeship demonstration programs to assist the partnerships with strategic planning, curriculum planning, and coordination;

(3) operate an apprenticeship clearinghouse for the partnerships;

(4) disseminate model programs and practices to the partnerships;

(5) gather input from all sources regarding the labor mobility of apprentices; and

(6) comply with evaluation and report requirements specified in section 312.

SEC. 309. NONDISCRIMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any assistance provided under this title shall constitute Federal financial assistance for purposes of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.), title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.), the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.), and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.).

(b) NONDISCRIMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any individual with responsibility for the administration of a youth apprenticeship demonstration program that receives assistance under this title shall not discriminate in the selection of participants to the demonstration program on the basis of race, religion, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, or political affiliation.

(2) EXCEPTION.—This subsection shall not apply to an employer or educational institution that is controlled by a religious organization, if any, if the application of this subsection would not be consistent with the religious tenets of the organization.

(c) RULES AND REGULATIONS.—The Chairperson of the Board shall promulgate rules and regulations to provide for the enforcement of this section, including provisions for summary suspension of assistance for not more than 30 days, on an emergency basis, until notice and an opportunity to be heard can be provided.

(d) RIGHT OF ACTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General of the United States may file an action under this section in the appropriate district court of the United States against any organization or partnership under this title that violates this subsection.

SEC. 310. NOTICE, HEARING, AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) SUSPENSION OF PAYMENTS.—The Chairperson of the Board may in accordance with the provisions of this title, suspend or terminate payments under a contract providing assistance under this title whenever the Chairperson determines there is a material failure to comply with this title or the applicable terms and conditions of any contract entered into under this title.

(2) PROCEDURES TO ENSURE ASSISTANCE.—The Chairperson of the Board shall prescribe procedures to ensure that—

(A) assistance provided under this title shall only be suspended for not more than 30 days for failure to comply with the applicable terms and conditions of this title and only in emergency situations; and

(B) assistance provided under this title shall not be terminated for failure to comply with applicable terms and conditions of this title unless the recipient of such assistance has been afforded reasonable notice and opportunity for a full and fair hearing.

(b) HEARINGS.—Hearings or other meetings that may be necessary to fulfill the requirements of this section shall be held at locations convenient to the recipient of assistance under this title.

(c) TRANSCRIPT OR RECORDING.—A transcript or recording shall be made of a hearing conducted under this section and shall be available for inspection by any individual.

(d) STATE LEGISLATION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to preclude the enactment of State legislation providing for the implementation, consistent with this title, of the programs administered under this title.

(e) GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—State and local applicants that receive assistance under this title shall establish and maintain a procedure to adjudicate grievances from participants, labor organizations, and other interested individuals concerning programs that receive assistance under this title, including grievances regarding proposed placements of the participants in the projects.

(2) DEADLINE FOR GRIEVANCES.—Except for a grievance that alleges fraud or criminal activity, a grievance shall be made not later than 1 year after the date of the alleged occurrence.

(3) DEADLINE FOR HEARING AND DECISION.—

(A) HEARING.—A hearing on any grievance conducted under this subsection shall be conducted not later than 30 days after the filing of the grievance.

(B) DECISION.—A decision on any grievance shall be made not later than 60 days after the filing of the grievance.

(4) ARBITRATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—On the occurrence of an adverse grievance decision, or 60 days after the filing of the grievance if no decision has been reached, the party filing the grievance shall be permitted to submit the grievance to binding arbitration before a qualified arbitrator who is jointly selected and independent of the interested parties.

(B) DEADLINE FOR PROCEEDING.—An arbitration proceeding shall be held not later than 45 days after the request for the arbitration.

(C) DEADLINE FOR DECISION.—A decision concerning a grievance under this paragraph shall be made not later than 30 days after the date of the beginning of the arbitration proceeding concerning such grievance.

(D) COST.—The cost of an arbitration proceeding shall be divided evenly between the parties to the arbitration.

(5) PROPOSED PLACEMENT.—If a grievance is filed regarding a proposed placement of a participant in a program that receives assistance under this title, the placement shall not be made unless it is consistent with the resolution of the grievance pursuant to this subsection.

(6) REMEDIES.—Remedies for a grievance filed under this subsection shall include—

(A) suspension of payments for assistance under this title;

(B) termination of payments; and

(C) prohibition of the placement described in paragraph (5).

SEC. 311. NONDUPLICATION AND NONDISPLACEMENT.

(a) NONDUPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Assistance provided under this title shall be used only for a program that does not duplicate, and is in addition to, an apprenticeship program operating in the locality.

(2) PRIVATE NONPROFIT ENTITY.—Assistance made available under this title shall not be provided to a private nonprofit entity to conduct activities that are the same or substantially equivalent to activities provided by the State or local government agency in the locality that the entity resides in, unless the requirements of subsection (b) are met.

(b) NONDISPLACEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An employer shall not displace an employee or position, including partial displacement such as reduction in hours, wages, or employment benefits, as a result of the use by such employer of a participant in a program receiving assistance under this title.

(2) SERVICE OPPORTUNITY.—An employer shall not create a service opportunity under this title that will infringe in any manner on the promotional opportunity of an employed individual.

(3) LIMITATION OF SERVICES.—

(A) DUPLICATION OF SERVICES.—A participant in a program receiving assistance under this title shall not perform any services or duties or engage in activities that would otherwise be performed by an employee as part of the assigned duties of the employee.

(B) SUPPLANTATION OF HIRING.—A participant in any program receiving assistance under this title shall not perform any services or duties or engage in activities that will supplant the hiring of full-time workers.

(C) DUTIES FORMERLY PERFORMED BY ANOTHER EMPLOYEE.—A participant in any program receiving assistance under this title shall not perform services or duties that have been performed by or were assigned to any—

(i) presently employed worker;

(ii) employee who recently resigned or was discharged;

(iii) employee who is subject to a reduction in force;

(iv) employee who is on leave (terminal, temporary, vacation, emergency, or sick); or

(v) employee who is on strike or who is involved in a lockout.

SEC. 312. EVALUATION.

(a) EVALUATION BY THE INSTITUTE.—

(1) FINAL EVALUATION.—

(A) EVALUATION.—The Institute shall conduct an evaluation of all youth apprenticeship demonstration programs to determine the effectiveness of apprenticeship training and the most effective youth apprenticeship program structures for a nationwide youth apprenticeship program. The evaluation shall include an analysis of—

(i) the ability of the programs to prepare workers, particularly minorities and women, for the technical workplace;

(ii) the ability of such programs to increase the overall competency of the work force in the United States;

(iii) the level of academic and technical skills acquired by an apprentice in the programs;

(iv) the potential labor mobility of apprentices;

(v) the effectiveness of combining on-the-job training with classroom instruction;

(vi) the ability of the programs to encourage students to complete secondary school;

(vii) the ability of the programs to establish a more definite transition from secondary or postsecondary school to work;

(viii) the value of apprentices and the effectiveness of the program according to business; and

(ix) the direct and indirect costs and benefits of the demonstration program to the company and the individual student.

(B) REPORT.—The Institute shall prepare and submit a report to the President, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Education, the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, containing the evaluation described in subparagraph (A), and recommendations for legislative reform. The Institute shall submit the report not later than 9 months after the conclusion of the youth apprenticeship demonstration programs.

(2) INTERIM EVALUATION.—

(A) EVALUATION.—Not later than 24 months after the initiation of the youth apprenticeship demonstration programs, the Institute shall conduct an interim evaluation of the effectiveness of all the demonstration programs, including an assessment of the matters described in paragraph (1)(A) to the extent that the necessary data and information is available.

(B) REPORT.—The Institute shall prepare and submit a report to the President, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Education, the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives containing the evaluation described in subparagraph (A). The Institute shall submit the report not later than 33 months after the initiation of the demonstration programs.

(b) EVALUATION BY PARTNERSHIPS.—

(1) DATA COLLECTION AND ASSISTANCE.—Each partnership that participates in a youth apprenticeship demonstration program shall establish data collection mechanisms consistent with the needs of the Institute and provide to the Institute information for, and assistance in conducting, the final evaluation described in subsection (a)(1) and the interim evaluation described in subsection (a)(2).

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(A) EVALUATION.—Each partnership that participates in a youth apprenticeship demonstration program shall conduct an annual evaluation that contains summary information on the implementation and operation of the demonstration program including—

(i) the number and type of students enrolled in apprenticeship training;

(ii) a description of the type of activities in which the youth apprentices are participating, including the type of occupational training youth apprentices are receiving;

(iii) the effectiveness of the program in keeping youth in secondary or postsecondary school;

(iv) the reaction of businesses involved in the training program; and

(v) any other information that the Institute may require.

(B) REPORT.—Each such partnership shall submit an annual report to the Institute containing the information described in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 313. EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE.

Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Chairman, Board of Directors of the Institute for Youth Apprenticeship.".

SEC. 314. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1993, which shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 315. TERMINATION AND REPEAL.

(a) TERMINATION.—Not later than 69 months after the initiation of the youth apprenticeship demonstration programs, the Board and Institute shall be abolished, and all programs established by this title shall terminate.

(b) REPEAL.—Not later than 69 months after the initiation of the youth apprenticeship demonstration programs, this title and the amendments made by this title shall be repealed.

TITLE IV—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 401. DEFINITIONS.

DOMENICI AMENDMENT NO. 1485

Mr. DOMENICI proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2, supra, as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following new title:

TITLE VI

ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION OF TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

FINDINGS

SEC. 601. The Congress finds that—

(1) effective elementary and secondary schools require competent teachers and strong leadership;

(2) school systems would benefit greatly by recruitment pools of well-qualified individuals, such as scientists and engineers, from which to select teachers and principals;

(3) talented professionals who have demonstrated a high level of subject area competence or management and leadership qualities outside the education profession and who wish to pursue second careers in education often do not meet traditional certification requirements; and

(4) alternative certification requirements that do not exclude such individuals from teaching or school administration solely because they do not meet current certification requirements would allow school systems to take advantage of these professionals and improve the supply of well-qualified teachers and principals.

PURPOSE

SEC. 602. (a) It is the purpose of this part to improve the supply of well-qualified elementary and secondary school teachers and principals by encouraging and assisting States to develop and implement alternative teacher and principal certification requirements.

(b) As used in this part, the term—

(1) "alternative teacher and principal certification requirements" means State or local requirements that permit entry into elementary and secondary teacher and principal positions for individuals who have demonstrated a high level of appropriate subject area competence, or management or leadership qualities, in careers in or out of the education field, but who would not otherwise meet existing requirements for teaching or supervisory positions. Alternative teacher and principal certification requirements may recognize that—

(A) for teachers, a high level of demonstrated competence in an appropriate subject area may be substituted for traditional teacher certification requirements (such as teacher training course work); and

(B) for principals, a high level of demonstrated competence in administration and management may be substituted for traditional principal certification requirements (such as teaching experience or supervisory experience in the field of education); and

(2) "State" means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 603. For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated $25 million for fiscal year 1993.

ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 604. (a)(1) From the amount appropriated to carry out this part, the Secretary shall allot to each State the lesser of either the amount the State applies for under section 605 or an amount that is proportional to the State's share of the total population of children ages five through seventeen in all the States (based on the most recent data available that is satisfactory to the Secretary).

(2) If a State does not apply for its allotment, or the full amount of its allotment, under the proceeding paragraph, the Secretary may reallocate the excess funds to one or more other States that demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, a current need for the funds.

(b) Notwithstanding section 412(b) of the General Education Provisions Act, funds awarded under this part shall remain available for obligation by a recipient for a period of two calendar years from the date of the grant.

STATE APPLICATIONS

SEC. 605 (a) Any State desiring to receive a grant under this part shall submit an application, through its Governor, at such time, in such manner, and containing such information, as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(b) Each State application shall—

(1) describe the programs, projects, and activities to be undertaken; and

(2) contain such assurances as the Secretary deems necessary, including assurances that—

(A) funds awarded to the State will be used to supplement, and not to supplant, any State or local funds available for the development and implementation of alternative teacher and principal certification requirements;

(B) the State has, in developing its application, consulted with the State or local agency that certifies teachers and principals, as well as representatives of elementary and secondary school teachers and principals, local school systems, parents, and other interested organizations and individuals; and

(C) the State will submit to the Secretary, through the Governor, at such time as the Secretary may specify, a final report describing the activities carried out with funds awarded under this part and the results achieved.

(c) Sections 435 and 436 of the General Education Provisions Act, except to the extent that such sections relate to fiscal control and fund accounting procedures, shall not apply to this part.

USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 606 (a)(1) A State shall use funds awarded under this part to support programs, projects, or activities that develop and implement new, or expand and improve existing, alternative teacher and principal certification requirements.

(2) A State may carry out such programs, projects, or activities directly, through contracts, or through subgrants to local educational agencies, intermediate educational agencies, institutions of higher education, or consortia of such agencies.

(b) Programs, projects, and activities supported under this part may include, but are not limited to, the—

(1) design, development, implementation, testing, and evaluation of alternative teacher and principal certification requirements;

(2) establishment of administrative structure necessary to the development and implementation of alternative teacher and principal certification requirements;

(3) training of staff, including the development of appropriate support programs, such as mentor programs, for teachers and principals entering the school system through the alternative teacher and principal certification program;

(4) development of recruitment strategies; and

(5) development of reciprocity agreements between or among States for the certification of teachers and principals.

SEYMOUR AMENDMENTS NOS. 1486 THROUGH 1488

Mr. SEYMOUR proposed three amendments to the bill S. 2, supra, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1486

On page 53, line 7, strike "and".

On page 53, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

(13) projects to educate students in alcohol and drug awareness and prevention;

(14) projects to educate students in gang awareness and gang violence prevention; and

On page 53, line 8, strike "(13)" and insert "(15)".

AMENDMENT NO. 1487

On page 34, line 11, insert ", if such initiative permit parents of students served by a school and require parents that choose a school in accordance with this clause to participate in governance, management processes, or activities related to their children's education programs" before the semicolon.

AMENDMENT NO. 1488

On page 34, strike all beginning with line 8 through line 16, and insert the following:

(ii) initiatives to increase parental choice among public schools, including assessment of student needs and parent information and referral programs;

(iii) the establishment of new public schools, such as Essential Schools, Accelerated Schools, New American Schools, charter schools, Comer Schools, SMART Schools, and Schools of the 21st Century, in accordance with subparagraph (C); and

(iv) other activities developed in conjunction with local educational agencies that are designed to improve student achievement in the public schools.

SEC. 203. STATE APPLICATION.

On page 58, before line 1, insert the following:

(9) the term "SMART School" means a school that—

(A) offers curriculum options that best match the needs of the students served by the agency, such as college preparatory, vocational education, math and science, or cultural arts;

(B) recruits teachers with specialized skills, especially skills in mathematics, science, and bilingual education, from professionals in fields other than education;

(C) establishes alternative certification procedures for certifying the professionals described in subparagraph (B), that shall comply with applicable State requirements regarding alternative certification or State waiver requirements;

(D) permits parents of students served by the school, and requires parents that choose their child's school, to participate in governance, management processes, and activities relating to their children's educational programs; and

(E) in the case that such school is an elementary school which establishes a Head Start or other preschool transition program such as a Follow Through program, assists students within a school who were previously enrolled in Head Start or a similar program in making a transition to elementary school, and ensures that at-risk students will receive needed assistance.

CONRAD AMENDMENT NO. 1489

Mr. CONRAD proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2, supra, as follows:

On page 52, line 4, insert the following: "which may include comprehensive programs (developed with input from local, state and area business leaders) to provide options for those high school students unlikely to attend postsecondary school, that integrate essential academic instruction with technical skills, and provide the training necessary to succeed in a technical career.".

WIRTH (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1490

Mr. WIRTH (for himself, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PELL, and Mr. CONRAD) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2, supra, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING INVESTMENTS IN EDUCATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the needs of the nation's children and youth have been seriously neglected for more than a decade, as evidenced by a 56 percent increase in defense spending but only a 5 percent increase in programs targeted to America's children;

(2) the failure to invest in early childhood development, education, and job training programs has long term economic and social costs and consequences and poses a growing threat to the competitiveness and productivity of the nation;

(3) the investment in such programs is cost-effective because it saves the Federal Government greater sums in future outlays for special education, welfare, and law enforcement and contributes to deficit reduction;

(4) since the 1990 Budget Agreement, the world has changed dramatically as a result of the fall of communism, the democratization of Eastern Europe, and the far-reaching changes in the Soviet Union;

(5) there is a need for higher priorities for investments in human capital which are currently prohibited by the 1990 Budget Agreement;

(6) a comprehensive Federal education agenda must recognize and invest in the full range of educational programs, including the four essential areas of—

(A) early childhood development;

(B) elementary and secondary education;

(C) the school-to-work transition; and

(D) higher education;

(7) with respect to early childhood development—

(A) the number one national education goal is that all children should enter school ready to learn;

(B) experts agree that access to Head Start, immunizations, and adequate nutrition are essential to ensuring school readiness;

(C) despite 25 years of proven success, only 28 percent of all eligible children currently receive Head Start;

(D) despite the effectiveness of the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children, only 55 percent of eligible pregnant women and children are served;

(E) ensuring that all eligible 3, 4, and 5 year old children have the opportunity to participate in the Head Start program, and receive adequate nutrition and health care services are the most important steps that the Federal Government can take to improve educational performance; and

(F) the business community recognizes school readiness as the most important education goal and refers to this cost effective investment as basic to the survival of our free enterprise economy;

(8) with respect to elementary and secondary education—

(A) changing demographics are overwhelming the nation's educational system because increasing numbers of disadvantaged children are arriving at the school house door with severe barriers to learning;

(B) millions of children are denied access to essential educational and support services because proven Federal programs remain significantly underfunded; and

(C) many students leave middle grades without the skills necessary to become productive citizens in a dynamic, adaptable democracy;

(9) with respect to the school-to-work transition—

(A) at least half of American youth never enter college;

(B) the forgotten-half of America's youth become the front-line workers upon whom the nation's future productivity and competitiveness depend; and

(C) unless the Federal Government make the investments in human capital necessary to train front-line workers and become a nation of high skills, the America will be consigned to an irreversible future as a low-wage society with a declining standard of living; and

(10) with respect to higher education—

(A) over the last 15 years, the cost of college education has outpaced the cost of living, and higher education is increasingly out of reach for low- and middle-income Americans;

(B) unlike other industrialized democracies, the United States expects students and their families to bear the primary burden of paying for higher education; and

(C) although Pell grants have in the past helped many lower- and middle-income students meet their college expenses, today's students are increasingly being forced to rely on loans.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) legislation should be enacted that realigns the 1990 Budget Agreement to reflect the true priorities of the American people by shifting unnecessary military spending into domestic programs including early child development, education, and job training to promote the nation's long term economic growth and social well being; and

(2) the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 should be amended to permit the realization of a new domestic order through—

(A) investments that ensure that all eligible 4, and 5 year old children receive comprehensive Head Start services by 1997, at the full funding level provided for in the Augustus F. Hawkins Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1990, that the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children is available to every eligible pregnant woman and child, as well as investments in other critically important early intervention programs such as immunization, and comprehensive family support services;

(B) investments that ensure that elementary and secondary schools have the financial assistance necessary to improve educational achievement, promote student participation, and provide an educational environment that is conducive to learning including a constructive student-teacher ratio, as well as adequate funding for proven programs that enhance equity in education and provide the foundation to meet future challenges;

(C) investments in school-to-work transition initiatives that develop partnerships among all levels of government and the private sector to assist non-college bound youth and strengthen the training of workers

throughout their lifetime in the workplace; and

(D) investments that increase access to higher education by—

(i) expanding the Pell grant program to reach more low and middle income students and guaranteeing a Pell grant to all eligible students;

(ii) expanding student loan programs for middle-income students;

(iii) encouraging early intervention programs for at-risk youth to attend college; and

(iv) making more intensive efforts for the recruitment and training of teachers.

WIRTH (AND WELLSTONE) AMENDMENT NO. 1491

Mr. WIRTH (for himself, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PELL, and Mr. CONRAD) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 1490 proposed by Mr. WIRTH (and others) to the bill S. 2, supra, as follows:

Strike all after "SEC." and insert the following:

" . SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING INVESTMENTS IN EDUCATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the needs of the nation's children and youth have been seriously neglected for more than a decade, as evidenced by a 56 percent increase in defense spending but only a 5 percent increase in programs targeted to America's children;

(2) the failure to invest in early childhood development, education, and job training programs has long term economic and social costs and consequences and poses a growing threat to the competitiveness and productivity of the nation;

(3) the investment in such programs is cost-effective because it saves the Federal Government greater sums in future outlays for special education, welfare, and law enforcement and contributes to deficit reduction;

(4) since the 1990 Budget Agreement, the world has changed dramatically as a result of the fall of communism, the democratization of Eastern Europe, and the far-reaching change in the Soviet Union;

(5) there is a need for higher priorities for investments in human capital which are currently prohibited by the 1990 Budget Agreement;

(6) a comprehensive Federal education agenda must recognize and invest in the full range of educational programs, including the four essential areas of—

(A) early childhood development;

(B) elementary and secondary education;

(C) the school-to-work transition; and

(D) higher education;

(7) with respect to early childhood development—

(A) the number one national education goals is that all children should enter school ready to learn;

(B) experts agree that access to Head Start, immunizations, and adequate nutrition are essential to ensuring school readiness;

(C) despite 25 years of proven success, only 28 percent of all eligible children currently receive Head Start;

(D) despite the effectiveness of the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children, only 55 percent of eligible pregnant women and children are served;

(E) ensuring that all eligible 3, 4, and 5 year old children have the opportunity to participate in the Head Start program, and receive adequate nutrition and health care services are the most important steps that the Federal Government can take to improve educational performance; and

(F) the business community recognizes school readiness as the most important education goal and refers to this cost effective investment as basic to the survival of our free enterprise economy;

(8) with respect to elementary and secondary education—

(A) changing demographics are overwhelming the nation's educational system because increasing numbers of disadvantaged children are arriving at the school house door with severe barriers to learning;

(B) millions of children are denied access to essential educational and support services because proven Federal programs remain significantly underfunded; and

(C) many students leave middle grades without the skills necessary to become productive citizens in a dynamic, adaptable democracy;

(9) with respect to the school-to-work transition—

(A) at least half of American youth never enter college;

(B) the forgotten-half of America's youth become the front-line workers upon whom the nation's future productivity and competitiveness depend; and

(C) unless the Federal Government make the investments in human capital necessary to train front-line workers and become a nation of high skills, the America will be consigned to an irreversible future as a low-wage society with a declining standard of living; and

(10) with respect to higher education—

(A) over the last 15 years, the cost of college education has outpaced the cost of living, and higher education is increasingly out of reach for low- and middle-income Americans;

(B) unlike other industrialized democracies, the United States expects students and their families to bear the primary burden of paying for higher education; and

(C) although Pell grants have in the past helped many lower- and middle-income students meet their college expenses, today's students are increasingly being forced to rely on loans.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) legislation should be enacted that realigns the 1990 Budget Agreement to reflect the true priorities of the American people by shifting unnecessary military spending into domestic programs including early child development, education, and job training to promote the nation's long term economic growth and social well being; and

(2) the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 should be amended to permit the realization of a new domestic order through—

(A) investments that ensure that all eligible 3, 4, and 5 year old children receive comprehensive Head Start services by 1997, at the full funding level provided for in the Augustus F. Hawkins Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1990, that the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children is available to every eligible pregnant woman and child, as well as investments in other critically important early intervention programs such as immunization, and comprehensive family support services;

(B) investments that ensure that elementary and secondary schools have the financial assistance necessary to improve educational achievement, promote student participation, and provide an educational environment that is conducive to learning including a constructive student-teacher ratio, as well as adequate funding for proven programs that enhance equity in education and provide the foundation to meet future challenges;

(C) investments in school-to-work transition initiatives that develop partnerships among all levels of government and the private sector to assist non-college bound youth and strengthen the training of workers throughout their life-time in the workplace; and

(D) investments that increase access to higher education by—

(i) expanding the Pell grant program to reach more low and middle income students and guaranteeing a Pell grant to all eligible students;

(ii) expanding student loan programs for middle-income students;

(iii) encouraging early intervention programs for at-risk youth to attend college; and

(iv) making more intensive efforts to the recruitment and training of teachers.

KENNEDY AMENDMENT NO. 1492

Mr. KENNEDY proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2, supra, as follows:

On page 58, before the matter following line 7, insert the following:

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 401. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.

In the item relating to Educational Excellence in title III of Public Law 102-170 (105 Stat. 1130) insert "or any educational reform program" after "America 2000 educational excellence activities".

CHILD ABUSE PROGRAMS, ADOPTION OPPORTUNITIES, AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION EXTENSION ACT

DODD AMENDMENT NO. 1493

Mr. MITCHELL (for Mr. DODD) proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 2720) to extend for 1 year the authorization of appropriations for the programs under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act and the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act, and for certain programs relating to adoption opportunities, and for other purposes, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Child Abuse, Domestic Violence, Adoption and Family Services Act of 1991".

TITLE I—CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT ACT

SEC. 101. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.).

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Act is amended by inserting after the table of contents the following new section:

"SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

"Congress finds that—

"(1) each year, hundreds of thousands of American children are victims of abuse and neglect with such numbers having increased dramatically over the past decade;

"(2) many of these children and their families fail to receive adequate protection or treatment;

"(3) the problem of child abuse and neglect requires a comprehensive approach that—

"(A) integrates the work of social service, legal, health, mental health, education, and substance abuse agencies and organizations;

"(B) strengthens coordination among all levels of government, and with private agencies, civic, religious, and professional organizations, and individual volunteers;

"(C) emphasizes the need for abuse and neglect prevention, investigation, and treatment at the neighborhood level;

"(D) ensures properly trained and supported staff with specialized knowledge, to carry out their child protection duties; and

"(E) is sensitive to ethnic and cultural diversity;

"(4) the failure to coordinate and comprehensively prevent and treat child abuse and neglect threatens the futures of tens of thousands of children and results in a cost to the Nation of billions of dollars in direct expenditures for health, social, and special educational services and ultimately in the loss of work productivity;

"(5) all elements of American society have a shared responsibility in responding to this national child and family emergency;

"(6) substantial reductions in the prevalence and incidence of child abuse and neglect and the alleviation of its consequences are matters of the highest national priority;

"(7) national policy should strengthen families to remedy the causes of child abuse and neglect, provide support for intensive services to prevent the unnecessary removal of children from families, and promote the reunification of families if removal has taken place;

"(8) the child protection system should be comprehensive, child-centered, family-focused, and community-based, should incorporate all appropriate measures to prevent the occurrence or recurrence of child abuse and neglect, and should promote physical and psychological recovery and social reintegration in an environment that fosters the health, self-respect, and dignity of the child;

"(9) because of the limited resources available in low-income communities, Federal aid for the child protection system should be distributed with due regard to the relative financial need of the communities;

"(10) the Federal government should ensure that every community in the United States has the fiscal, human, and technical resources necessary to develop and implement a successful and comprehensive child protection strategy;

"(11) the Federal government should provide leadership and assist communities in their child protection efforts by—

"(A) promoting coordinated planning among all levels of government;

"(B) generating and sharing knowledge relevant to child protection, including the development of models for service delivery;

"(C) strengthening the capacity of States to assist communities;

"(D) allocating sufficient financial resources to assist States in implementing community plans;

"(E) helping communities to carry out their child protection plans by promoting the competence of professional, paraprofessional, and volunteer resources; and

"(F) providing leadership to end the abuse and neglect of the nation's children and youth.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1, the following new item:

"Sec. 2. Findings.".

SEC. 3. ADVISORY BOARD ON CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 102 (42 U.S.C. 5102) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $1,000,000 for fiscal year 1992.".

Subtitle A—General State Program

SEC. 110. GRANT PROGRAM FOR CHILD ABUSE NEGLECT PREVENTION AND TREATMENT.

Section 107 (42 U.S.C. 5106a) is amended—

(1) by striking out subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsection:

"(a) DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION GRANTS.—The Secretary, acting through the Center, shall make grants to the States, based on the population of children under the age of 18 in each State that applies for a grant under this section, for purposes of assisting the States in improving the child protective service system of each such State in—

"(1) the intake and screening of reports of abuse and neglect through the improvement of the receipt of information, decisionmaking, public awareness, and training of staff;

"(2)(A) investigating such reports through improving response time, decisionmaking, referral to services, and training of staff;

"(B) creating and improving the use of multidisciplinary teams and interagency protocols to enhance investigations; and

"(C) improving legal preparation and representation;

"(3) case management and delivery services provided to families through the improvement of response time in service provision, improving the training of staff, and increasing the numbers of families to be served;

"(4) enhancing the general child protective system by improving assessment tools, automation systems that support the program, information referral systems, and the overall training of staff to meet minimum competencies; or

"(5) developing, strengthening, and carrying out child abuse and neglect prevention, treatment, and research programs."; and

(2) by striking out subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) STATE PROGRAM PLAN.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a State shall annually submit a plan to the Secretary that specifies the child protective service system area or areas described in subsection (a) that the State intends to address with funds received under the grant. The plan shall describe the current system capacity of the State in the relevant area or areas from which to assess programs with grant funds and specify the manner in which funds from the State's programs will be used to make improvements. The plan required under this subsection shall contain, with respect to each area in which the State intends to use funds from the grant, the following information with respect to the State:

"(1) INTAKE AND SCREENING.—

"(A) STAFFING.—The number of child protective service workers responsible for the intake and screening of reports of abuse and neglect relative to the number of reports filed in the previous year.

"(B) TRAINING.—The types and frequency of pre-service and in-service training programs available to support direct line and supervisory personnel in report-taking, screening, decision-making, and referral for investigation.

"(C) PUBLIC EDUCATION.—An assessment of the State or local agency's public education program with respect to—

"(i) what is child abuse and neglect;

"(ii) who is obligated to report and who may choose to report; and

"(iii) how to report.

"(2) INVESTIGATION OF REPORTS.—

"(A) RESPONSE TIME.—The number of reports of child abuse and neglect filed in the State in the previous year where appropriate, the agency response time to each with respect to initial investigation, the number of substantiated and unsubstantiated reports, and where appropriate, the response time with respect to the provision of services.

"(B) STAFFING.—The number of child protective service workers responsible for the investigation of child abuse and neglect reports relative to the number of reports investigated in the previous year.

"(C) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—A description of the extent to which interagency coordination processes exist and are available Statewide, and whether protocols or formal policies governing interagency relationships exist in the following areas—

"(i) multidisciplinary investigation teams among child welfare and law enforcement agencies;

"(ii) interagency coordination for the prevention, intervention and treatment of child abuse and neglect among agencies responsible for child protective services, criminal justice, schools, health, mental health, and substance abuse; and

"(iii) special interagency child fatality review panels, including a listing of those agencies that are involved.

"(D) TRAINING.—The types and frequency of pre-service and in-service training programs available to support direct line and supervisory personnel in such areas as investigation, risk assessment, court preparation, and referral to and provision of services.

"(E) LEGAL REPRESENTATION.—A description of the State agency's current capacity for legal representation, including the manner in which workers are prepared and trained for court preparation and attendance, including procedures for appealing substantiated reports of abuse and neglect.

"(3) CASE MANAGEMENT AND DELIVERY OF ONGOING FAMILY SERVICES.—For children for whom a report of abuse and neglect has been substantiated and the children remain in their own homes and are not currently at risk of removal, the State shall assess the activities and the outcomes of the following services:

"(A) RESPONSE TIME.—The number of cases opened for services as a result of investigation of child abuse and neglect reports filed in the previous year, including the response time with respect to the provision of services from the time of initial report and initial investigation.

"(B) STAFFING.—The number of child protective service workers responsible for providing services to children and their families in their own homes as a result of investigation of reports of child abuse and neglect.

"(C) TRAINING.—The types and frequency of pre-service and in-service training programs available to support direct line and supervisory personnel in such areas as risk assessment, court preparation, provision of services and determination of case disposition, including how such training is evaluated for effectiveness.

"(D) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—The extent to which treatment services for the child and other family members are coordinated with child welfare, social service, mental health, education, and other agencies.

"(4) GENERAL SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT.—

"(A) AUTOMATION.—A description of the capacity of current automated systems for tracking reports of child abuse and neglect from intake through final disposition and how personnel are trained in the use of such system.

"(B) ASSESSMENT TOOLS.—A description of whether, how, and what risk assessment tools are used for screening reports of abuse and neglect, determining whether child abuse and neglect has occurred, and assessing the appropriate level of State agency protection and intervention, including the extent to which such tool is used statewide and how workers are trained in its use.

"(C) INFORMATION AND REFERRAL.—A description and assessment of the extent to which a State has in place—

"(i) information and referral systems, including their availability and ability to link families to various child welfare services such as homemakers, intensive family-based services, emergency caretakers, home health visitors, daycare and services outside the child welfare system such as housing, nutrition, health care, special education, income support, and emergency resource assistance; and

"(ii) efforts undertaken to disseminate to the public information concerning the problem of child abuse and neglect and the prevention and treatment programs and services available to combat instances of such abuse and neglect.

"(D) STAFF CAPACITY AND COMPETENCE.—An assessment of basic and specialized training needs of all staff and current training provided staff. Assessment of the competencies of staff with respect to minimum knowledge in areas such as child development, cultural and ethnic diversity, functions and relationship of other systems to child protective services and in specific skills such as interviewing, assessment, and decisionmaking relative to the child and family, and the need for training consistent with such minimum competencies.

"(5) INNOVATIVE APPROACHES.—A description of—

"(A) research and demonstration efforts for developing, strengthening, and carrying out child abuse and neglect prevention, treatment, and research programs, including the interagency efforts at the State level; and

"(B) the manner in which proposed research and development activities build on existing capacity in the programs being addressed.".

SEC. 111. GRANT PROGRAM FOR INVESTIGATION AND PROSECUTION OF CHILD ABUSE CASES.

Section 109 (42 U.S.C. 5106c) is amended—

(1) by striking out the section heading and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 109. GRANTS TO STATES FOR PROGRAMS RELATING TO THE INVESTIGATION AND PROSECUTION OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT CASES.";

(2) in subsection (a), by striking out paragraphs (1) and (2), and inserting in lieu thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(1) the handling of child abuse and neglect cases, particularly cases of child sexual abuse and exploitation, in a manner which limits additional trauma to the child victim;

"(2) the handling of cases of suspected child abuse or neglect related fatalities; and

"(3) the investigation and prosecution of cases of child abuse and neglect, particularly child sexual abuse and exploitation.";

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking out "and 107(e) or receive a waiver under section 107(c)" in paragraph (1);

(B) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3);

(C) by inserting "annually" after "submit" in paragraph (4); and

(D) by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: "; and

"(5) submit annually to the Secretary a report on the manner in which assistance received under this program was expended throughout the State, with particular attention focused on the areas described in paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (a).";

(4) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by inserting ", and maintain" after "designate"; and

(ii) by striking out "child abuse" and inserting in lieu thereof "child physical abuse, child neglect, child sexual abuse and exploitation, and child maltreatment related fatalities";

(B) by striking out "judicial and legal officers", in subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "judges and attorneys involved in both civil and criminal court proceedings related to child abuse and neglect";

(C) by inserting before the semicolon in subparagraph (C), the following: ", including both attorneys for children and, where such programs are in operation, court appointed special advocates";

(D) by striking out subparagraph (E); and

(E) by striking out "handicaps;" in subparagraph (F), and inserting in lieu thereof "disabilities; and"; and

"(G) by striking out subparagraph (G) and redesignating subparagraph (H) as subparagraph (G);

(5) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking out "the State task force shall" in the matter preceding paragraph (1), and inserting in lieu thereof "and at three year intervals thereafter, the State task force shall comprehensively";

(B) by striking out "judicial" and all that follows in paragraph (1), and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "both civil and criminal judicial handling of cases of child abuse and neglect, particularly child sexual abuse and exploitation, as well as cases involving suspected child maltreatment related fatalities and cases involving a potential combination of jurisdictions, such as interstate, Federal-State, and State-Tribal;";

(C) by inserting "policy and training" before "recommendations" in paragraph (2); and

(6) in subsection (e)(1)—

(A) by striking out "child abuse" and all that follows through "child victim" in subparagraph (A), and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "child abuse and neglect, particularly child sexual abuse and exploitation, as well as cases involving suspected child maltreatment related fatalities and cases involving a potential combination of jurisdictions, such as interstate, Federal-State, and State-Tribal, in a manner which reduces the additional trauma to the child victim and the victim's family";

(B) by striking out "improve the rate" and all that follows through "abuse cases" in subparagraph (B), and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "improve the prompt and successful resolution of civil and criminal court proceedings or enhance the effectiveness of judicial and administrative action in child abuse and neglect cases, particularly child sexual abuse and exploitation cases, including the enhancement of performance of court-appointed attorneys and guardians ad litem for children"; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by inserting ", protocols" after "regulations"; and

(ii) by inserting "and exploitation" after "sexual abuse".

Subtitle B—Community-Based Prevention Grants

SEC. 121. TITLE HEADING AND PURPOSE.

(a) TITLE HEADING.—The heading for title II (42 U.S.C. 5116 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—COMMUNITY-BASED CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT PREVENTION GRANTS".

(b) PURPOSE.—Section 201 (42 U.S.C. 5116) is amended—

(1) in the section heading to read as follows:

"SEC. 201. PURPOSES."; and

(2) by striking out subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"It is the purpose of this title, through the provision of community-based child abuse and neglect prevention grants, to assist States in supporting child abuse and neglect prevention activities.".

SEC. 122. DEFINITIONS.

Section 202 (42 U.S.C. 5116a) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking out "and" at the end thereof; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof "; and".

SEC. 123. STATE ELIGIBILITY.

Section 204 (42 U.S.C. 5116c) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or other funding mechanism"; and

(2) by striking out "which is available only for child" and all that follows through the end thereof, and inserting "which includes (in whole or in part) legislative provisions making funding available only for the broad range of child abuse and neglect prevention activities.".

SEC. 124. LIMITATIONS.

Section 205 (42 U.S.C. 5116d) is amended—

(1) by striking out paragraph (1) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new paragraph:

"(1) ALLOTMENT FORMULA.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts appropriated to provide grants under this title shall be allotted among eligible States in each fiscal year so that—

"(i) 50 percent of the total amount appropriated is allotted among each State based on the number of children under the age of 18 in each such State, except that each State shall receive not less than $30,000; and

"(ii) the remaining 50 percent of the total amount appropriated is allotted in an amount equal to 25 percent of the total amount collected by each such State, in the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year for which the allotment is being determined, for the children's trust fund of the State for child abuse and neglect prevention activities.

"(B) USE OF AMOUNTS.—Not less than 50 percent of the amount of a grant made to a State under this title in each fiscal year shall be utilized to support community-based prevention programs as authorized in section 204(a), except that this subparagraph shall not become applicable until amounts appropriated under section 203(b) exceed $10,000,000."; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) by striking out "trust fund advisory board" and all that follows through "section 101" in subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "advisory board established under section 102";

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (F) and (G), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A), the following new subparagraphs:

"(B) demonstrate coordination with other child abuse and neglect prevention activities and agencies at the State and local levels;

"(C) demonstrate the outcome of services and activities funded under this title;

"(D) provide evidence that Federal assistance received under this title has been supplemented with non-Federal public and private assistance (including in-kind contributions) at the local level (Federal assistance expended in support of activities authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 204 shall be supplemented by State assistance);

"(E) demonstrate the extent to which funds received under this title are used to support community prevention activities in underserved areas, in which case the supplemental support required under subparagraph (D) shall be waived for the first 3 years in which assistance is provided to a grantee described in this subparagraph;".

Subtitle C—Certain Preventive Services Regarding Children of Homeless Families or Families at Risk of Homelessness

SEC. 131. CERTAIN PREVENTIVE SERVICES REGARDING CHILDREN OF HOMELESS FAMILIES OR FAMILIES AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS.

Section 302(b) (42 U.S.C. 5118a(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking out "and" at the end thereof;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (6); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3), the following new paragraphs:

"(4) the provision of emergency housing-related assistance necessary to prevent the placement of children in out-of-home care, to facilitate the reunification of children with their families, and to enable the discharge of youths not less than 16 years of age from such area, including assistance in meeting the costs of—

"(A) rent or utility arrears to prevent an eviction or termination of utility services;

"(B) security and utility deposits, first month's rent, and basic furnishings; and

"(C) other housing-related assistance;

"(5) the provision to families, and to youths not less than 16 years of age who are preparing to be discharged from such care, of temporary rent subsidies necessary to prevent the initial or prolonged placement of children in out-of-home care, which subsidies are provided in an amount not exceeding 70 percent of the local fair market rental value and are provided for a period not to exceed 180 days; and".

Subtitle D—Child Abuse Treatment Improvements Grants

SEC. 141. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.

The Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMS

"SEC. 401. CHILD ABUSE TREATMENT IMPROVEMENTS GRANT PROGRAM.

"(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (hereafter referred to in this section as the 'Secretary'), acting through the Administration for Children, Youth and Families, may award grants to eligible entities to improve the treatment of children exposed to abuse or neglect and the families of such children, particularly when such children have been placed in out-of-home care.

"(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall—

"(1) be a State or local public or nonprofit private entity;

"(2) be responsible for administering or providing child welfare services (including out-of-home services); and

"(3) prepare and submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require including the information required under subsection (c).

"(c) CONTENTS OF APPLICATION.—An application submitted by an entity under subsection (b)(4) shall contain—

"(1) a description of the proposed program to be established, implemented or improved using amounts received under a grant, including the specific activities to be undertaken, the agencies that will be involved, the process that has been established for evaluating such activities, and the nature of any innovations proposed;

"(2) evidence of the need that the activity or program, to be conducted using amounts received under the grant, will address;

"(3) assurances that amounts received under the grant will be used to supplement, not supplant, existing funds provided by the State for child welfare purposes;

"(4) assurances that the applicant entity will provide not less than 20 percent of the total amounts needed to pay the costs associated with the program funded under such grant;

"(5) assurances that the applicant entity will provide information to the Secretary concerning the progress and outcome of the program to be funded under such grant;

"(6) a description of the procedures to be used to disseminate the findings derived from the program to be funded under such grant within the State;

"(7) a description of the extent to which multiple agencies will be involved in the design, development, operation, and staffing of the program to be funded under such grant; and

"(8) and other information determined appropriate by the Secretary.

"(d) USE OF FUNDS.—An entity may use amounts provided under a grant awarded under this section to—

"(1)(A) develop models of out-of-home care that are designed to promote the reunification of children with their families, including training and support components for foster parents to enable such parents to assist the birthparents with reunification efforts, except that such efforts must be determined to be in the best interest of the child;

"(B) develop comprehensive service approaches for child out-of-home care and for the families of such children, specifically focused on reunification; and

"(C) establish activities that are designed to promote visitation of parents and children, such as the establishment of neutral settings for structured visits between biological parents and children in care;

"(2) develop activities that are designed to support relatives caring for children who have been abused or neglected or children from families where substance abuse is present;

"(3) enhance the reimbursement and other support provided to foster parents, including relatives, to promote better recruitment and retention of foster parents;

"(4) develop activities and programs designed to—

"(A) promote the healthy physical, social, emotional, and educational development of children in out-of-home care and under child abuse preventive services supervision, including—

"(i) the conduct of comprehensive, multidisciplinary assessments of the physical, social, emotional, and educational development of such children, with particular attention given to the needs and strengths of the families of such children; and

"(ii) the development of services to meet such needs which involve multiple service agencies and alternative support systems within the community;

"(B) provide training for foster parents to address the physical, social, emotional, and educational needs of the children in their care; or

"(C) provide special programs to assist children with academic or developmental problems;

"(5) develop and implement programs that provide mentors, who are adults from the community or who are former foster youths, to youths in out-of-home care, in order to address their special needs, increase self esteem, and provide role models;

"(6) provide incentives that may be necessary to establish and recruit foster family homes for special populations, including children who are medically fragile or have other special physical, mental, and emotional disabilities, adolescent mothers and their children who are in care, and children who have been sexually abused;

"(7) hire staff with specialized knowledge in the areas of substance abuse, child development, education, health care, and adolescents, to provide support and act as a resource for caseworkers working with children and families with special needs in these areas; and

"(8) conduct other activities as the Secretary determines appropriate.

"(e) CONSIDERATIONS IN AWARDING GRANTS.—In awarding grants under this section the Secretary shall consider—

"(1) the geographic dispersion of the applicants for such grants;

"(2) the likelihood that the proposed service approach of the applicant would be transferable to other sites; and

"(3) the need for variety in the problems to be addressed by the applicants and in the models used to address similar problems.

"(f) ADMINISTRATION.—In administering the grant program established under this section the Administration for Children, Youth and Families shall—

"(1) require grantees to submit annual reports concerning the projects funded under such grants and a final report assessing the outcome of such projects;

"(2) arrange for the dissemination of project results through such means as the child welfare resource centers and the National Clearinghouse on Child Abuse and Neglect; and

"(3) provide for the evaluation of projects funded under this section.

"(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1992, and such sums as may be necessary in each of the fiscal years 1993 and 1994.".

SEC. 142. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.

The Act is amended in the table of contents in section 1(b) by adding at the end thereof the following new items:

"TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMS

"Sec. 401. Child abuse treatment improvements grant program.".

Subtitle E—Reauthorization of Certain Programs

SEC. 151. EMERGENCY GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 107A(e) (42 U.S.C. 5106a-1(e)) is amended by striking out "and such sums" and all that follows through the end thereof and inserting "such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1991, $40,000,000 for fiscal year 1992, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1993 and 1994.".

SEC. 152. GENERAL GRANT PROGRAMS.

Subsection (a) of section 114 (42 U.S.C. 5106h(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title, except for section 107A, $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1992, and such sums as may be necessary for each of this fiscal years 1993 and 1994. Of amounts appropriated under this section in any fiscal year—

"(1) 33⅓ percent of such amounts shall be made available in each such fiscal year for activities under sections 104, 105 and 106; and

"(2) 66⅔ percent of such amounts shall be made available in each such fiscal year for activities under sections 107 and 108.

A State may spend the entire amount provided to such State under this title in a fiscal year for the purposes described in subsection (a)(5) of section 107, except that subsequent to the date on which the amount appropriated and available under paragraph (2) exceeds $40,000,000, such State shall not spend in excess of 15 percent of such amounts for the purposes described in subsection (a)(5) of section 107.".

SEC. 153. COMMUNITY-BASED PREVENTION GRANTS.

Section 203 (42 U.S.C. 5116b) is amended—

(1) by striking out subsection (b);

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b); and

(3) in subsection (b) (as so redesignated), by striking out "such sums" and all that follows through the period and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000,000 for fiscal year 1992, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1993 and 1994.".

SEC. 154. PREVENTIVE SERVICES FOR CHILDREN OF HOMELESS FAMILIES OR FAMILIES AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS.

Section 306(a) (42 U.S.C. 5118e(a)) is amended by inserting ", and such sums as may be necessary in each of the fiscal years 1993 and 1994" before the period.

Subtitle F—Miscellaneous Provisions

SEC. 161. REPORT CONCERNING VOLUNTARY REPORTING SYSTEM.

Not later than April 30, 1992, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report concerning the measures being taken to assist States in implementing a voluntary reporting system for child abuse and neglect. Such reports shall contain information concerning the extent to which the child abuse and neglect reporting systems developed by the States are coordinated with the automated foster care and adoption reporting system required under section 479 of the Social Security Act.

TITLE II—CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES TEMPORARY CARE

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Children With Disabilities Temporary Care Reauthorization Act of 1991".

SEC. 202. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 206 of the Temporary Child Care for Handicapped Children and Crisis Nurseries Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 5117) is amended in the first sentence, by inserting before the period the following: ", and $20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1992 through 1994".

SEC. 203. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.

Section 205(a)(1)(A)(vi) of the Temporary Child Care for Handicapped Children and Crisis Nurseries Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 5117c(a)(1)(A)(vi)) is amended by striking out "(vi)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(v)".

SEC. 204. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect October 1, 1991, or on the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs later.

TITLE III—REAUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAMS WITH RESPECT TO FAMILY VIOLENCE

SEC. 301. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (42 U.S.C. 10401 et seq.).

SEC. 302. EXPANSION OF PURPOSE.

Section 302 (42 U.S.C. 10401) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking out "demonstration the effectiveness of assisting" and inserting in lieu thereof "assist"; and

(B) by striking out "to prevent" and inserting in lieu thereof "to increase public awareness about and prevent"; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting ", courts, legal, social service, and health care professionals" after "(including law enforcement agencies".

SEC. 303. EXPANSION OF STATE GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 303(a) (42 U.S.C. 10402(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking out "demonstration grants" and inserting in lieu thereof "grants"; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking out "demonstration grant" in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), and inserting in lieu thereof "grant";

(B) by striking out "demonstration grant" in subparagraph (A), and inserting in lieu thereof "grant"; and

(C) by striking out "particularly those projects" in subparagraph (B)(ii) and all that follows through the end thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the primary purpose of which is to operate shelters for victims of family violence and their dependents, and those which provide counseling, advocacy, and self-help services to victims and their children.".

SEC. 304. INVOLVEMENT IN PLANNING.

Section 303(a)(2)(C) (42 U.S.C. 10402(a)(2)(C)) is amended by inserting "State domestic violence coalitions" after "involve".

SEC. 305. CONFIDENTIALITY ASSURANCES.

Section 303(a)(2)(E) (42 U.S.C. 10402(a)(2)(E)) is amended by striking out "assurances that procedures will be developed" and inserting in lieu thereof "documentation that procedures have been developed, and implemented including copies of the policies and procedure,".

SEC. 306. PROCEDURE FOR EVICTING VIOLENT SPOUSES.

Section 303(a)(2)(F) (42 U.S.C. 10402(a)(2)(F)) is amended to read as follows:

"(F) provide documentation to the Secretary that the State has a law or procedure that has been implemented for the eviction of an abusing spouse from a share household;".

SEC. 307. PENALTIES FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.

Section 303(a)(3) (42 U.S.C. 10402(c)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "a 6-month period providing an" before "opportunity"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "The Secretary shall provide such notice within 45 days of the date of the application if any of the provisions of subsection (a)(2) have not been satisfied in such application. If the State has not corrected the deficiencies in such application within the 6-month period following the receipt of the Secretary's notice of intention to disapprove, the Secretary shall withhold payment of any grant funds to such State until the date that is 30 days prior the end of the fiscal year for which such grant funds are appropriated or until such time as the State provides documentation that the deficiencies have been corrected, whichever occurs first. State Domestic Violence Coalitions shall be permitted to challenge a determination as to whether a grantee is in compliance with, or to seek the enforcement of, the eligibility requirements of subsection (a)(2), except that no funds made available to State Domestic Violation Coalitions under section 311 shall be used to challenge a determination as to whether a grantee is in compliance with, or to seek the enforcement of, the eligibility requirements of subsection (a)(2).".

SEC. 308. GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBES.

Section 303(b) (42 U.S.C. 10402(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking out "is authorized to make demonstration grants" and inserting in lieu thereof ", from amounts appropriated to carry out this section, shall make available not less than 10 percent of such amounts to make grants";

(B) by striking out "and tribal" and inserting in lieu thereof ", tribal"; and

(C) by inserting "and nonprofit private organizations approved by an Indian Tribe for the operation of a family violence shelter on a Reservation", after "tribal organizations"; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking out "demonstration grant" and inserting in lieu thereof "grant";

(B) by striking out "and (E)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(E) and (F)"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "No entity eligible to submit an application under paragraph (1) shall be prohibited from making an application during any fiscal year for which funds are available because such entity has not previously applied or received funding under this section.".

SEC. 309. MAXIMUM CEILING.

Subsection (c) of section 303 (42 U.S.C. 10402(c)) is repealed, and subsections (d) through (g) are redesignated as subsections (c) through (f), respectively.

SEC. 310. GRANTS TO ENTITIES OTHER THAN STATES; LOCAL SHARE.

The section 303(e) (42 U.S.C. 10402(f)) (as so redesignated by section 309) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by striking out "demonstration grant" and inserting in lieu thereof "grant";

(B) by inserting "or an Indian Tribe" after "State";

(C) by striking out "35 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "20 percent";

(D) by striking out "55 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "35 percent";

(E) by striking out "65 percent in the third such year" and inserting in lieu thereof "and, for any year thereafter"; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking out "50 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "25 percent".

SEC. 311. SHELTER AND RELATED ASSISTANCE.

(a) SHELTER.—Section 303(f) (42 U.S.C. 10402(g)) (as so redesignated by section 309) is amended—

(1) by striking out "60 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "70 percent"; and

(2) by inserting before the period the following "as defined in section 309(4). Not less than 15 percent of the funds distributed under subsection (a) or (b) shall be distributed for the purpose of providing related assistance as defined under section 309(5)(A), and not more than 10 percent for the purpose of providing family violence prevention services as defined under section 309(5)(B)".

(b) DEFINITION.—Paragraph (5) of section 309 (42 U.S.C. 10408(5)) is amended to read as follows:

"(5) The term 'related assistance' means the provision of direct assistance to victims of family violence and their dependents for the purpose of preventing further violence, helping such victims to gain access to civil and criminal courts and other community services, facilitating the efforts of such victims to make decisions concerning their lives in the interest of safety, and assisting such victims in healing from the effects of the violence. Related assistance—

"(A) shall include—

"(i) counseling with respect to family violence, counseling by peers individually or in groups, and referral to community social services;

"(ii) transportation, technical assistance with respect to obtaining financial assistance under Federal and State programs, and referrals for appropriate health-care services (including alcohol and drug abuse treatment), but shall not include reimbursement for any health-care services;

"(iii) legal advocacy to provide victims with information and assistance through the civil and criminal courts, and legal assistance; or

"(iv) children's counseling and support services, and child care services for children who are victims of family violence or the dependents of such victims; and

"(B) may include prevention services such as outreach and prevention services for victims and their children, employment training, parenting and other educational services for victims and their children, preventive health services within domestic violence programs (including nutrition, disease prevention, exercise, and prevention of substance abuse), domestic violence prevention programs for school age children, family violence public awareness campaigns, and violence prevention counseling services to abusers.".

SEC. 312. ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS.

Section 304(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 10403(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "whichever is the greater of the following amounts: one-half of"; and

(2) by striking out "$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$200,000, whichever is the lessor amount".

SEC. 313. SECRETARIAL RESPONSIBILITIES.

Section 305(b)(2)(A) (42 U.S.C. 10404(b)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "into the causes of family violence";

(2) by inserting "most effective" before "prevention";

(3) by striking out "and (ii)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(ii)"; and

(4) by inserting before "and (B)" the following: "(iii) the effectiveness of providing safety and support to maternal and child victims of family violence as a way to eliminate the abuse experienced by children in such situations, (iv) identification of intervention approaches to child abuse prevention services which appear to be successful in preventing child abuse where both mother and child are abused, (v) effective and appropriate treatment services for children where both mother and child are abused, and (vi) the individual and situational factors leading to the end of violent and abusive behavior by persons who commit acts of family violence, including such factors as history of previous violence and the legal and service interventions received,".

SEC. 314. EVALUATION AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Section 306 (42 U.S.C. 10405) is amended—

(1) by inserting "and every two years thereafter," after "the first time after the date of the enactment of this title,";

(2) by striking out "assurances" and inserting in lieu thereof "documentation"; and

(3) by striking out "303(a)(2)(F)" and inserting in lieu "303(a)(2)(B) through 303(a)(2)(F)".

SEC. 315. FUNDING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS.

Section 308 (42 U.S.C. 10407) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 308. INFORMATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS.

"(a) PURPOSE AND GRANTS.—

"(1) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to provide resource information, training, and technical assistance to Federal, State, and Indian tribal agencies, as well as to local domestic violence programs and to other professionals who provide services to victims of domestic violence.

"(2) GRANTS.—From the amounts appropriated under this title, the Secretary shall award grants to private nonprofit organizations for the establishment and maintenance of one national resource center (as provided for in subsection (b)) and not to exceed six special issue resource centers (as provided for in subsection (c)) focusing on one or more issues of concern to domestic violence victims.

"(b) NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER.—The national resource center established under subsection (a)(2) shall offer resource, policy and training assistance to Federal, State, and local government agencies, to domestic violence service providers, and to other professionals and interested parties on issues pertaining to domestic violence, and shall maintain a central resource library in order to collect, prepare, analyze, and disseminate information and statistics and analyses thereof relating to the incidence and prevention of family violence (particularly the prevention of repeated incidents of violence) and the provision of immediate shelter and related assistance.

"(c) SPECIAL ISSUE RESOURCE CENTERS.—The special issue resource centers established under subsection (a)(2) shall provide information, training and technical assistance to State and local domestic violence service providers, and shall specialize in at least one of the following areas of domestic violence service, prevention, or law:

"(1) Criminal justice response to domestic violence, including court-mandated abuser treatment.

"(2) Improving the response of Child Protective Service agencies to battered mothers of abused children.

"(3) Child custody issues in domestic violence cases.

"(4) The use of the self-defense plea by domestic violence victims.

"(5) Improving interdisciplinary health care responses and access to health care resources for victims of domestic violence.

"(6) Improving access to and the quality of legal representation for victims of domestic violence in civil litigation.

"(d) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section an entity shall be a private nonprofit organizations that—

"(1) focuses primarily on domestic violence;

"(2) provides documentation to the Secretary demonstrating experience working directly on issues of domestic violence, particularly in the specific subject area for which it is applying;

"(3) include on its advisory boards representatives from domestic violence programs in the region who are geographically and culturally diverse; and

"(4) demonstrate the strong support of domestic violence advocates from across the country and the region for their designation as the national or a special issue resource center.

"(e) REPORTING.—Not later than 6 months after receiving a grant under this section, a grantee shall prepare and submit a report to the Secretary that evaluates the effectiveness of the use of amounts received under such grant by such grantee and containing such additional information as the Secretary may prescribe.

"(f) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall publish proposed regulations implementing this section. Not later than 120 days after such date of enactment, the Secretary shall publish final regulations.

"(g) FUNDING.—From the amounts appropriated under section 310, not in excess of 5 percent of such amount for each fiscal year shall be used for the purpose of making grants under this section.".

SEC. 316. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 310 (42 U.S.C. 10409) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 310. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of sections 303 through 309 and section 313, $85,000,000 for fiscal year 1992, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1993 and 1994.

"(b) SECTION 303(a) AND (b).—Of the amounts appropriated under subsection (a) for each fiscal year, not less than 80 percent shall be used for making grants under subsection 303(a), and not less than 10 percent shall be used for the purpose of carrying out section 303(b).

"(c) SECTION 308.—Of the amounts appropriated under subsection (a) for each fiscal year, not less than 5 percent shall be used by the Secretary for making grants under section 308.".

SEC. 317. LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS AND CONTRACTS AND GRANTS FOR STATE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COALITIONS.

Section 311 (42 U.S.C. 10410) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 311. GRANTS FOR STATE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COALITIONS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants for the funding of State domestic violence coalitions. Such coalitions shall further the purposes of domestic violence intervention and prevention through activities, including—

"(1) working with judicial and law enforcement agencies to encourage appropriate responses to domestic violence cases and examine issues including—

"(A) the inappropriateness of mutual protection orders;

"(B) the prohibition of mediation when domestic violence is involved;

"(C) the use of mandatory arrests of accused offenders;

"(D) the discouragement of dual arrests;

"(E) the adoption of aggressive and vertical prosecution policies and procedures;

"(F) the use of mandatory requirements for presentence investigations;

"(G) the length of time taken to prosecute cases or reach plea agreements;

"(H) the use of plea agreements;

"(I) the consistency of sentencing, including comparisons of domestic violence crimes with other violent crimes;

"(K) the restitution of victims;

"(L) the use of training and technical assistance to law enforcement and court officials and other professionals;

"(M) the reporting practices of, and significance to be accorded to, prior convictions (both felony and misdemeanor) and protection orders;

"(N) the use of interstate extradition in cases of domestic violence crimes;

"(O) the use of statewide and regional planning; and

"(P) any other matters as the Secretary and the State domestic violence coalitions believe merit investigations;

"(2) work with family law judges, Child Protective Services agencies, and children's advocates to develop appropriate responses to child custody and visitation issues in domestic violence cases as well as cases where domestic violence and child abuse are both present, including—

"(A) the inappropriateness of mutual protection orders;

"(B) the prohibition of mediation where domestic violence is involved;

"(C) the inappropriate use of marital or conjoint counseling in domestic violence cases;

"(D) the use of training and technical assistance for family law judges and court personnel;

"(E) the presumption of custody to domestic violence victims;

"(F) the use of comprehensive protection orders to grant fullest protections possible to victims of domestic violence, including temporary support and maintenance;

"(G) the development by Child Protective Service of supportive responses that enable victims to protect their children;

"(H) the implementation of supervised visitations that do not endanger victims and their children; and

"(I) the possibility of permitting domestic violence victims to remove children from the State when the safety of the children or the victim is at risk;

"(3) conduct public education campaigns regarding domestic violence through the use of public service announcements and informative materials that are designed for print media, billboards, public transit advertising, electronic broadcast media, and other vehicles for information that shall inform the public concerning domestic violence; and

"(4) participate in planning and monitoring of the distribution of grants and grant funds to their State under section 303(a).

"(b) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible for a grant under this section an entity shall be a statewide nonprofit State domestic violence coalition whose—

"(1) membership includes representatives from a majority of the programs for victims of domestic violence in the State;

"(2) board membership is representative of such programs; and

"(3) purpose is to provide services, community education, and technical assistance to such programs to establish and maintain shelter and related services for victims of domestic violence and their children.

"(c) ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS.—From amounts appropriated under this section for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the combined U.S. Territories an amount equal to ⅓₃ of the amount appropriated for such fiscal year. For purposes of this section, the term 'combined U.S. Territories' means Guam, American Samoa, the U.S. Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and shall not receive less than 1.5 percent of the funds appropriated for each fiscal year.

"(d) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING.—No funds made available to entities under this section shall be used, directly or indirectly, to influence the issuance, amendment, or revocation of any executive order or similar promulgation by any Federal, State or local agency, or to undertake to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by Congress, or by any State or local legislative body, or State proposals by initiative petition, except that the representatives of the entity may testify or make other appropriate communication—

"(1) when formally requested to do so by a legislative body, a committee, or a member thereof; or

"(2) in connection with legislation or appropriations directly affecting the activities of the entity.

"(e) REPORTING.—Each State domestic violence coalition receiving amounts under this section shall submit a report to the Secretary describing the coordination, training and technical assistance and public education services performed with such amounts and evaluating the effectiveness of those services.

"(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for each fiscal year to be used to award grants under this section.

"(g) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall publish proposed regulations implementing this section. Not later than 120 days after such date of enactment, the Secretary shall publish final regulations implementing this section.".

SEC. 318. REGULATIONS.

Section 312(a) (42 U.S.C. 10409(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this sentence, the Secretary shall publish proposed regulations implementing sections 303, 308, and 314. Not later than 120 days after such date of enactment, the Secretary shall publish final regulations implementing such sections.".

SEC. 319. FAMILY MEMBER ABUSE INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTATION.

Section 313(1) (42 U.S.C. 10409(1)) is amended by striking out "characteristics relating to family violence" and inserting in lieu thereof "develop data on the number of victims of family violence and their dependents who are homeless or institutionalized as a result of the violence and abuse they have experienced".

SEC. 320. GRANTS FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION CAMPAIGNS.

The Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 314. GRANTS FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION CAMPAIGNS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants to public or private nonprofit entities to provide public information campaigns regarding domestic violence through the use of public service announcements and informative materials that are designed for print media, billboards, public transit advertising, electronic broadcast media, and other vehicles for information that shall inform the public concerning domestic violence.

"(b) APPLICATION.—No grant, contract, or cooperative agreement shall be made or entered into under this section unless an application that meets the requirements of subsection (c) has been approved by the Secretary.

"(c) REQUIREMENTS.—An application submitted under subsection (b) shall—

"(1) provide such agreements, assurances, and information, be in such form and be submitted in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe through notice in the Federal Register, including a description of how the proposed public information campaign will target the population at risk, including pregnant women;

"(2) include a complete description of the plan of the application for the development of a public information campaign;

"(3) identify the specific audiences that will be educated, including communities and groups with the highest prevalence of domestic violence;

"(4) identify the media to be used in the campaign and the geographic distribution of the campaign;

"(5) describe plans to test market a development plan with a relevant population group and in a relevant geographic area and give assurance that effectiveness criteria will be implemented prior to the completion of the final plan that will include an evaluation component to measure the overall effectiveness of the campaign;

"(6) describe the kind, amount, distribution, and timing of informational messages and such other information as the Secretary may require, with assurances that media organizations and other groups with which such messages are placed will not lower the current frequency of public service announcements; and

"(7) contain such other information as the Secretary may require.

"(d) USE.—A grant, contract, or agreement made or entered into under this section shall be used for the development of a public information campaign that may include public service announcements, paid educational messages for print media, public transit advertising, electronic broadcast media, and any other mode of conveying information that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

"(e) CRITERIA.—The criteria for awarding grants shall ensure that an applicant—

"(1) will conduct activities that educate communities and groups at greatest risk;

"(2) has a record of high quality campaigns of a comparable type; and

"(3) has a record of high quality campaigns that educate the population groups identified as most at risk.".

SEC. 321. MODEL STATE LEADERSHIP INCENTIVE GRANTS FOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INTERVENTION.

The Act (as amended by section 320) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 315. MODEL STATE LEADERSHIP GRANTS FOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INTERVENTION.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Attorney General, shall award grants to not less than 10 States to assist such States in becoming model demonstration States and in meeting the costs of improving State leadership concerning activities that will—

"(1) increase the number of prosecutions for domestic violence crimes;

"(2) encourage the reporting of incidences of domestic violence; and

"(3) facilitate 'arrests and aggressive' prosecution policies.

"(b) DESIGNATION AS MODEL STATE.—To be designated as a model State under subsection (a), a State shall have in effect—

"(1) a law that requires mandatory arrest of a person that police have probable cause to believe has committed an act of domestic violence or probable cause to believe has violated an outstanding civil protection order;

"(2) a law or policy that discourages 'dual' arrests;

"(3) statewide prosecution policies that—

"(A) authorize and encourage prosecutors to pursue cases where a criminal case can be proved, including proceeding without the active involvement of the victim if necessary; and

"(B) implement model projects that include either—

"(i) a 'no-drop' prosecution policy; or

"(ii) a vertical prosecution policy; and

"(C) limit diversion to extraordinary cases, and then only after an admission before a judicial officer has been entered;

"(4) statewide guidelines for judges that—

"(A) reduce the automatic issuance of mutual restraining or protective orders in cases where only one spouse has sought a restraining or protective order;

"(B) discourage custody or joint custody orders by spouse abusers; and

"(C) encourage the understanding of domestic violence as a serious criminal offense and not a trivial dispute;

"(5) develop and disseminate methods to improve the criminal justice system's response to domestic violence to make existing remedies as easily available as possible to victims of domestic violence, including reducing delay, eliminating court fees, and providing easily understandable court forms.

"(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated under section 310, there are authorized to be appropriated to make grants under this section $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1993 and 1994.

"(2) LIMITATION.—Funds shall be distributed under this section so that no State shall receive more than $2,500,000 in each fiscal year under this section.

"(3) DELEGATION AND TRANSFER.—The Secretary shall delegate to the Attorney General the Secretary's responsibilities for carrying out this section and shall transfer to the Attorney General the funds appropriated under this section for the purpose of making grants under this section.".

SEC. 322. EDUCATING YOUTH ABOUT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

(a) GENERAL PURPOSE.—For purposes of this section, the Secretary of Education, hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary" shall develop model programs for education of young people about domestic violence and violence among intimate partners.

(b) NATURE OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall through grants or contracts develop three separate programs, one each for primary and middle schools, secondary schools, and institutions of higher education. Such model programs shall be developed with the input of educational experts, law enforcement personnel, legal and psychological experts on battering, and victim advocate organizations such as battered women's shelters. The participation of each such group or individual consultants from such groups is essential to the development of a program that meets both the needs of educational institutions and the needs of the domestic violence problem.

(c) REVIEW AND DISSEMINATION.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit the model programs, along with a plan and cost estimate for nationwide distribution, to the relevant committees of Congress for review.

(d) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated under this section for fiscal year 1992, $200,000 to carry out the purposes of this section.

TITLE IV—REAUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAMS WITH RESPECT TO ADOPTION

SEC. 401. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

Section 201 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 5111) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 201. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE.

"(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

"(1) the number of children in substitute care increased by nearly 50 percent between 1985 and 1990, as our Nations's foster care population included more than 400,000 children at the end of June, 1990;

"(2) increasingly children entering foster care have complex problems which require intensive services;

"(3) an increasing number of infants are born to mothers who did not receive prenatal care, are born addicted to alcohol and other drugs, and exposed to infection with the etiologic agent for the human immunodeficiency virus, are medically fragile, and technology dependent;

"(4) the welfare of thousands of children in institutions and foster homes and disabled infants with life-threatening conditions may be in serious jeopardy and some such children are in need of placement in permanent, adoptive homes;

"(5) many thousands of children remain in institutions or foster homes solely because of local and other barriers to their placement in permanent, adoptive homes;

"(6) the majority of such children are of school age, members of sibling groups or disabled;

"(7) currently one-half of children free for adoption and awaiting placement are minorities;

"(8) adoption may be the best alternative for assuring the healthy development of such children;

"(9) there are qualified persons seeking to adopt such children who are unable to do so because of barriers to their placement; and,

"(10) in order both to enhance the stability and love of the child's home environment and to avoid wasteful expenditures of public funds, such children should not have medically indicated treatment withheld from them nor be maintained in foster care or institutions when adoption is appropriate and families can be found for such children.

"(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this title to facilitate the elimination of barriers to adoption and to provide permanent and loving home environments for children who would benefit from adoption, particularly children with special needs, including disabled infants with life-threatening conditions, by—

"(1) promoting model adoption legislation and procedures in the States and territories of the United States in order to eliminate jurisdictional and legal obstacles to adoption; and

"(2) providing a mechanism for the Department of Health and Human Services to—

"(A) promote quality standards for adoption services, pre-placement, post-placement, and post-legal adoption counseling, and standards to protect the rights of children in need of adoption;

"(B) maintain a national adoption information exchange system to bring together children who would benefit from adoption and qualified prospective adoptive parents who are seeking such children, and conduct national recruitment efforts in order to reach prospective parents for children awaiting adoption;

"(C) maintain a National Resource Center for Special Needs Adoption to—

"(i) promote professional leadership development of minorities in the adoption field;

"(ii) provide training and technical assistance to service providers and State agencies to improve professional competency in the field of adoption and the adoption of children with special needs; and

"(iii) facilitate the development of interdisciplinary approaches to meet the needs of children who are waiting for adoption and the needs of adoptive families; and

"(D) demonstrate expeditious ways to free children for adoption for whom it has been determined that adoption is the appropriate plan.".

SEC. 402. MODEL ADOPTION LEGISLATION AND PROCEDURES.

Section 202 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 5112) is repealed.

SEC. 403. INFORMATION AND SERVICE FUNCTIONS.

Section 203 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 5113) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting ", on-site technical assistance" after "consultant services" in the second sentence;

(B) by inserting "including salaries and travel costs," after "administrative expenses," in the second sentence; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Secretary shall, not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this sentence, prepare and submit to the committees of Congress having jurisdiction over such services reports, as appropriate, containing appropriate data concerning the manner in which activities were carried out under this title, and such reports shall be made available to the public."; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking out paragraph (1) and redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1);

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) (as so redesignated) the following new paragraph:

"(2) conduct, directly or by grant or contract with public or private nonprofit organizations, ongoing, extensive recruitment efforts on a national level, develop national public awareness efforts to unite children in need of adoption with appropriate adoptive parents, and establish a coordinated referral system of recruited families with appropriate State or regional adoption resources to ensure that families are served in a timely fashion;";

(C) by striking out "and (B)" in paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "(B) the operation of a national resource center for special needs adoption; and (C)"; and

(D) by inserting ", and to promote professional leadership training of minorities in the adoption field" before the semicolon in paragraph (4).

SEC. 404. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 205 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 5115) is amended—

(1) by striking out subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsection:

"(a) There are authorized to be appropriated, $10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1992 through 1994, to carry out programs and activities under this Act except for programs and activities authorized under sections 203(b)(8) and 203(c)(1)."; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking out "$3,000,000", the first place that such appears, and all that follows through the end thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1992 through 1994, to carry out section 203(b)(8), and there are authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1992 through 1994, to carry out section 203(c)(1).".

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

A MEMORIAL TO FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT—AT LAST

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, on September 16, 1991, a truly historic event took place in West Potomac Park on the edge of the Tidal Basin in Washington, DC.

The occasion was the groundbreaking for a memorial to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and it has been a long time coming. Congress created a commission to determine a site and a design for the memorial in 1955, and reaching this point has been difficult and not without controversy. The site was selected and set aside, amongst the cherry trees of the Tidal Basin, in 1959, but settling on a design and funding for the memorial has been more difficult.

But now, all those difficulties have been resolved. The renowned landscape architect Lawrence Halprin has designed a memorial consisting of four outdoor garden rooms connected by contemplative passageways, with a variety of sculptures, bas-reliefs and chiseled quotations, all tied together by the ebb and flow of pools, streams, and waterfalls.

At the groundbreaking, the two cochairs of the Commission, Senators MARK HATFIELD and DANIEL INOUYE, spoke, as did Mike Wallace of CBS; David B. Roosevelt, grandson of Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt and son of Elliott Roosevelt, representing the President's family; and Frank Freidel, an historian and author. Deputy Secretary of the Interior Frank Bracken and National Park Service Director James Ridenour represented the administration.

Senator INOUYE spoke very movingly without a prepared text about his own memories of President Roosevelt. He told the audience about his army service in Europe with the 442d Regimental Combat Team his unit heard the tragic news of FDR's death in 1944. His entire unit, rather than being stunned and saddened into inaction, fixed bayonets and charged the enemy positions. As we all know, Senator INOUYE later lost his right arm in battle.

The other speakers that day had prepared remarks, and I think it would be of interest to many to be able to read them. At the conclusion of the ceremony, Senators INOUYE and HATFIELD, David Roosevelt and Secretary Bracken conducted the symbolic groundbreaking. This great task has finally begun.

I ask that the text of their remarks be included in the RECORD.

The text follows:

Mr. MIKE WALLACE. Senator Hatfield, Senator Inouye, Secretary Bracken, distinguished guests, it's a privilege to be with on this long-awaited day—the day when—finally, finally—ground is broken in this handsome park for the construction of a memorial to our late great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Now I would like you to meet the other guests here on the dais. I am pleased to introduce Mr. Lawrence Halprin, architect of this magnificent memorial. Mr. Halprin is renowned in America and abroad for having created some of the world's most beautiful outdoor spaces. Seated to his right is the Honorable Frank Bracken, Deputy Secretary of the Interior. Next is David Roosevelt, grandson of Eleanor and Franklin Roosevelt, and son of Elliott Roosevelt; to his right is Senator Daniel Inouye from Hawaii. Senator Inouye has served on the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission since 1970, and is one of the Commission's cochairs; next is Senator Mark Hatfield of Oregon, the other cochair, who has served since 1971.

This day is one which Senators Inouye and Hatfield have looked forward to for a long time. It is their dedication—in fact—that has made it possible. Next to them, the Revered James Ford, Chaplain of the House of Representatives; and James Ridenour, Director of the National Park Service.

There are many distinguished guests in the audience this morning, and while I cannot mention each one, I do want to introduce the members of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, and its Executive Director. They are Representatives Bill Green, Secretary of the Commission; Senators Alfonse D'Amato of New York and Carl Levin of Michigan. Representatives Hamilton Fish, Jr. and James Scheuer, both of New York, as well as Presidential appointees Edmund Brown, Former Governor of California; former Senator Jennings Randolph of West Virginia and Calvin Whitesell of Alabama.

The Executive Director of the Commission since 1988 is Frances Campbell. Frances is largely responsible for today's event, having planned and coordinated it.

We are especially honored to have with us the artists for the Roosevelt Memorial, some of the most highly acclaimed in the United States. Sculptors Leonard Baskin, Neil Estern, Robert Graham, Tom Hardy, George Segal, and master stone carver, John Benson. These artists will bring to life momentous events from the Roosevelt Presidency, through bronze sculptures and through FDR's quotations, carved in granite.

There will be—here—Leonard Baskin's evocative bronze portrait of President Roosevelt at his first inauguration, George Segal's depiction of a listener, intently focused on the powerful voice of President Roosevelt from his radio, Robert Graham's bas-relief and columns, depicting the suffering of the Great Depression, Neil Estern's sculpture of the First Lady, standing alone in the final room of the memorial, the great eagle created by Tom Hardy which will greet the visitor upon arrival at the memorial, and John Benson's stone carvings which will accompany these evocative works of art. All this will make a visit to this memorial an historical, educational and—I'm sure—an emotional experience. I would like to ask these artists to stand, if they will.

When David Roosevelt asked if I might like to serve as master of ceremonies here this morning, I thought right away of my mother and father.

They were—both of them—immigrants from Russia, and in our Brookline, MA, household, Franklin Roosevelt was a hero of mythic proportions. We children were made to feel that this extraordinary man in the White House cared about us, that there was a connection between him and us.

Those depression years were tough on all Americans who lived through them, but somehow we shared a feeling that FDR was going to guide us safely through. My NYA Job—my National Youth Administration Job at the University of Michigan, back in the 1930's, grading exam papers for a journalism professor—paid me thirty absolutely vital dollars each month for a year or two, and I somehow came to believe that FDR was responsible for that.

I never met him. I never saw him up close. But I did know Eleanor Roosevelt—just a little—back in the fifties, and when I interviewed her in 1957, I asked whether she didn't agree—unhappily—that a good many people hated her husband. "Oh, yes," she said, "a great many do still."

"There was a real core of hatred," she said, "the people who would call him, 'that man.' I remember one man," she said, "who rejoiced, actually, when he died. I suppose that is just a feeling certain people had—that he was destroying the thing they held dear. . . ."

Well, when FDR died, I remember vividly Arthur Godfrey's tearful radio description of the procession that led the caisson bearing the President's body through the streets of Washington . . . and the newsreels that showed the affection—and the sadness—etched into the faces of everyone who lined the streets here that day.

It is glorious that finally we Americans have a fitting memorial here in West Potomac Park. And I confess, I take a certain pride in having been invited to share this day with all of you.

The Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission was established away back in 1955; it has the dubious honor of being the

oldest "temporary" Federal Commission. The two most senior members of the Commission are Senator Daniel Inouye, appointed—as I said—in 1970 and Senator Mark Hatfield, in 1971.

Senator Hatfield joined the F.D.R. Memorial Commission at a critical juncture. After several designs had been proposed and rejected, the Commission was considering yet another in what seemed to be an endless series of plans. These two new Commissioners breathed new life into the Commission, giving it energy, vision—and a new direction.

Those who know Mark Hatfield will not be surprised by the key role he has played in the development of the F.D.R. Memorial, nor by the fact that a Republican Senator would take the lead in the development of a memorial to a four-term Democrat, for Mark Hatfield is a man with a keen sense of history, and he has particular interest in the history of the Presidency. Interestingly, one of Senator Hatfield's favorite subjects is Herbert Hoover, the great political adversary of Franklin Roosevelt. But for a Senator whose political life has been a remarkable example of bipartisanship, of independence, this is not unexpected.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce to you a man of integrity and a man of vision: Mark Hatfield.

Senator Hatfield. It is a very great privilege for me, as co-chairman of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, along with my dear friend and colleague, Senator Danny Inouye, to welcome all of you to this ceremony. There are some of us who wondered if we would live to see this day! And no one wanted to see it more than our long-time Chairman, the Honorable Eugene Keogh who, sadly, cannot see the fruit of his labors.

I want to offer an especially warm welcome to others of you who have been so intimately involved in the development of the F.D.R. Memorial design. It has been an extraordinary experience to work on this project with my fellow Commissioners, with several Secretaries of the Interior, with extremely competent officials of the National Park Service, and with the talented and creative Larry Halprin. And what a great pleasure it has been to become acquainted with members of the Roosevelt family.

Today, two generations of Americans sit together to witness these ceremonies. For one the memory of F.D.R. is living and personal. For the other, Franklin Delano Roosevelt is but a name from history. Therein lies a lesson for those of us who wield reins of power today: fame, indeed, is fleeting. The Roosevelt Memorial Commission was created 36 years ago by a generation that wishes to celebrate its shared experience of the F.D.R. Years. The harvest of its labor comes in the midst of a generation that knows little of our thirty-second President. The memorial resting on this ground will link these two generations and generations to come. It will establish a more lasting memory than that which death erases.

President Roosevelt was not simply a man of great deeds, he was a master of great symbols.

We sought to capture that symbolism in the design of this memorial.

F.D.R. was a man skilled in oratory.

We sought to preserve his words in this memorial. President Roosevelt's patrician, yet warm voice reached out from the podium and over radio to embrace his audiences.

We sought, in the same way, for this memorial to embrace, not stand apart from, its visitors.

The Commission paid particular attention to the special place reserved for the Memorial. Its location amidst three national political icons—one to the Father of our country, one to the expounder of our liberties, and one to the preserver of our union—is sacred ground.

We sought to preserve its sanctity and to maintain a proper relationship with the other memorials.

The waters of Warm Springs were therapy for President Roosevelt's weak limbs. The waters of naval history were his avocation. Thus, water, which surrounds this site, and water used artistically within it, are incorporated in the Memorial.

God blessed Franklin Roosevelt with many gifts. He was born to wealth and privilege. He was given that special blend of qualities which, being admirable by themselves, together make for greatness: his sharp intellect, his skill in the art of personal relationships, his self-assurance, and the strength of character to act boldly. God gave him a talent for the turn of a phrase. President Roosevelt's words fill our American vocabulary:

"We have nothing to fear, but fear itself",
"a day that will live in infamy",
"the Forgotten Man",
"a New Deal", and
"the Four Freedoms".

God also humbled Franklin Roosevelt, taking away through polio the use of his legs. As President he required assistance to take even a single step, and so he was most often photographed in a seated position. Yet, even today, those images are not ones of a weak invalid. Rather, more like a person bearing the aura of royalty. Franklin Roosevelt knew how to turn a weakness into a strength.

Today we commence building a place to honor that commanding presence which inspired us, called forth self-sacrifice, calmed our fears, and gave us hope for a brighter tomorrow.

Mr. WALLACE. Thank you, Senator Hatfield. And now, it is a privilege to introduce you to one of America's most esteemed historians.

Dr. Frank Burt Freidel, Jr. has written nine books on the life and administration of the President. His writings on President Roosevelt began with "Franklin D. Roosevelt: The Apprenticeship" in 1952—and his latest, published in 1990, is entitled "Roosevelt: A Rendezvous With Destiny." Dr. Freidel has been a professor of history at Oxford University, Harvard, Stanford, and the University of Washington. He is a fellow with the American Academy of Arts and Sciences . . . Dr. Frank Freidel.

Mr. FREIDEL. There could be no more fitting memorial to Franklin D. Roosevelt than the spacious garden with water flowing amid granite walls that will now take form on this site. It is a break with tradition, in keeping with Roosevelt's delight in innovation—in harmony with the past but symbolic of a new, less formal era. The memorials on each side of us, to Abraham Lincoln and Thomas Jefferson, and the monument to George Washington, in their architectural grandeur celebrate Washington and the solid foundations of the republic, Jefferson and the philosophy and arts of the American enlightenment, and Lincoln and the preservation of the Federal Union. This new memorial will remind us of Franklin D. Roosevelt's love of the out of doors and his emphasis upon nurturing the land; the inscriptions upon granite will celebrate his quest for a better, more secure way of life for the people of this nation and peoples everywhere.

Roosevelt was a towering figure of the twentieth century, one of the most fruitful architects of modern America and the modern world. The ideals that the Washington Monument and the Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials so well evoke were marked indelibly in his spirit. He drew upon these traditional values in his undertaking to modernize the nation and the world. Much as he loved the past, indeed out of his love for the past, he strove for the future. He was a man of vision and imagination, and above all of faith in God and in the nation.

Although he was not without vehement detractors, Roosevelt was warmly acclaimed for the vigorous, positive way in which he led the nation out of the depression crisis of the 1930s and in the struggle against totalitarianism during World War II. The electorate admired his vigorous optimism during frightening times, his concern for the threatened and dispossessed, and his leadership in striving for innovation. He demonstrated his hold on the minds and hearts of a majority of Americans by winning election to an unprecedented four terms.

I would like this morning to focus upon some of Roosevelt's essential strengths and contributions, some of the reasons why at this one remaining location in the American pantheon, ground is being broken for a memorial to him.

Roosevelt enjoyed a sheltered upbringing on the family estate at Hyde Park, New York, overlooking the Hudson River, where he was born in 1882, but he was also raised with a keen sense of responsibility. His mother would remind him of the scriptural admonition that from one to whom much is given, much shall be required. That too was the emphasis of Endicott Peabody, head of Groton School; already when he applied to Harvard, one of the Groton masters wrote upon his behalf that Franklin wished to enter public life. Above all there was the influence of his distant cousin, President Theodore Roosevelt, and of TR's niece, Eleanor Roosevelt, whom Franklin married in 1905. To the end of her life, Mrs. Roosevelt liked to relate how when she was engaged she arranged for Franklin to meet her at one or another spot in the lower east side of New York where she showed him conditions so miserable that he confessed he had not known they existed.

In 1910, Roosevelt began his political apprenticeship, winning election as a Democrat to the New York State Senate. He savored politics and was a quick learner. Although he admired Theodore Roosevelt and had voted for him in 1904, in 1912 he energetically supported the Democratic candidate, Woodrow Wilson, who upon election appointed him Assistant Secretary of the Navy, a position TR had filled at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War.

The two progressive presidents, Roosevelt and Wilson were both major and continuing influences upon Franklin D. Roosevelt. Frances Perkins who became acquainted with him at that time found him not very clear about the specific differences between TR's New Nationalism and Wilson's New Freedom. Later it was politically advantageous for him to ignore distinctions even if he might be well aware of them, for he was to become an advocate of many of the domestic and foreign goals of each, and to lure more than one of TR's Bull Moosers, must notably Harold L. Ickes, into his entourage.

Before he was forty, Roosevelt had established himself as a charming, dynamic young progressive. In Washington during the first World War he was effective in mobilizing the

Navy and learned much of use to him as commander-in-chief in the second World War. Time magazine hailed him in the 1920's as an achiever, a man who had known how to get things done. In 1920, while still in his thirties, he became the Democratic candidate for vice president; he emerged unscathed, a Democrat with a future.

The following summer that future seemed to evaporate when, vacationing at Campobello Island, he contracted polio. This handsome young man who had customarily bounded up stairs two at a time, was so seriously stricken that he was fortunate to survive. At a low point, late in 1921, his New York doctor was fearful that he would not again be able to sit upright without support.

On the contrary, Roosevelt strove indefatigably to regain the use of his legs, and assured acquaintances that he expected in six months to be walking without a limp. It was unthinkable at that time that anyone in a wheelchair could run for high office. With the aid and devotion of his wife Eleanor and of a resourceful assistant, Louis McHenry Howe, Roosevelt during the crisis managed to conceal his plight and through letters and statements to continue active in politics.

By the spring of 1922, Roosevelt was able publicly, with the aid of heavy braces and crutches, to create the illusion that he was no more than lame, not a paraplegic. Two years later he received a stirring ovation when he thus appeared at the 1924 Democratic convention to nominate Al Smith. Meanwhile he was undergoing various rigorous, often painful, methods of treatment in his effort to recover. He obviously suffered much private despair, but usually kept it well concealed. The waters at Warm Springs, Georgia seemed to help him most, and he invested much of his energy and resources into development of a treatment center there for himself and fellow polio victims. He was always, whatever the circumstances, a builder.

While Roosevelt was trying to regain use of his legs he won much sympathy and admiration for his determination. Further, he made shrewd political use of his disability, avoiding the shattering quarrels between the urban, wet Catholic wing of the Democratic party of the east, and the rural, small-town prohibitionist and Protestant Democrats of the south and west. He undertook, with some success, to be the unifier, the reconciler of differences. Although only in his forties, he was able to present himself as temporarily an elder statesman who would not run for office again until he had fully regained use of his legs.

The quest for office came sooner than he had anticipated. Smith, who had won the Democratic nomination for President in 1928, persuaded Roosevelt to aid the ticket by running for Governor of New York. Roosevelt, by dint of the physical energy he demonstrated in his campaigning, wearing braces, in one hand a cane and with the other gripping a strong arm, always with a broad grin on his face, did much to deflect attention from his infirmity. Smith clinched the issue by remarking that one did not have to be an acrobat to be Governor. By a narrow margin Roosevelt was elected against the Republican tide. During his years as Governor, Roosevelt demonstrated that indeed one did not have to be an acrobat. The press and newsreel cameramen cooperated, and his image both in New York and the nation was of a man rather lame, not one whose normal means of locomotion was a wheelchair.

It was the national economy that because seriously ill during Roosevelt's years as Governor of New York. The stock market crash of 1929 signalled the start of a great depression, acute by 1932 when Roosevelt was the Democratic candidate for President. Roosevelt campaigned against President Herbert Hoover with an air of confidence amidst the national and world crisis, carefully limiting his promises to generalities that would not alarm voters. On election night, after winning by a wide margin, he had to assume future responsibilities of enormous scope. It was not an entirely happy thought. To his son James, who helped him into bed, he uncharacteristically revealed his inner fears, that he might "not have the strength to do this job." He said, "After you leave me tonight, Jimmy, I am going to pray . . . [for] strength and guidance. . . . I hope you will pray for me, too, Jimmy."

Yet to the nation some weeks later, when he narrowly missed assassination in Miami, he demonstrated rare courage and resourcefulness, heartening in time of national despair. In private he was laying elaborate but confidential plans with his advisers, the "Brains Trust," to cope with the unparalleled conditions. A quarter of the nation's workers were unemployed. Grain prices were so low that midwest farmers were burning corn to keep warm, while in Chicago, Edmund Wilson reported, a widow scavenged for meat on a garbage-dump, taking off "her glasses so that she couldn't see the maggots." Yet groceries were advertising hamburger for five cents a pound. By inauguration day, March 4, 1933, a spreading crisis of confidence brought the closing of the nation's banks.

In his inaugural address, Roosevelt gave the demoralized nation thrilling reassurance by pledging a leadership of frankness and vigor. "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

A hundred days of dynamic action followed as the President sent Congress proposal after proposal for recovery legislation to reopen banks, stimulate business, and bring aid to agriculture. He obtained relief for the unemployed and those threatened by the loss of their homes or farms. Two innovations particularly interested him, the Civilian Conservation Corps to put unemployed men, mostly youth, to work improving forests, and the bold regional development scheme, the Tennessee Valley Authority, to prevent floods and produce electric power.

Roosevelt marshalled the powers of the presidency as had Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, undertaking to function impartially on behalf of bankers, businessmen, workers, farmers, and consumers. Congress enacted almost all of his proposals, making constructive modifications in many of them. The President recognized the contributions of Congress and was deeply committed to constitutional processes. When Mrs. Roosevelt remarked to him at one point when Congress was balking that a benevolent dictator might better attain reforms, he countered that one could not rely upon a dictator to remain benevolent.

In 1935, under conflicting pressures from both right and left, Roosevelt obtained from Congress a new far-reaching reform program, including the National Labor Relations Act, and the most momentous domestic achievement of the New Deal, Social Security, providing for the first time national old-age benefits and unemployment insurance.

By the time Roosevelt ran for re-election in 1936, the Nation was enjoying a considerable degree of recovery. In his acceptance address were some of his most famous words: "To some generations much is given. Of other generations much is expected. This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny." That destiny, Roosevelt declared, was to be found in the struggle against want and for the survival of democracy, a struggle that might hearten those in other countries that had surrendered their democracy. "We are fighting to save a great and precious form of government for ourselves and for the world."

Although Roosevelt ran against a notable Republican candidate, governor Alf M. Landon of Kansas, the President carried all but two states. In his second inaugural address he made a dramatic call for fresh reform:

"I see a United States which can demonstrate that, under democratic methods of government, national wealth can be translated into a spreading volume of human comforts hitherto unknown. . . . But here is the challenge to our democracy. . . . I see one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished."

Roosevelt saw the Supreme Court as a prime impediment to fresh domestic reforms and sought to add justices to stop the flow of decisions invalidating New Deal programs. During the ensuing debates in Congress, the Court upheld two key measures, the new labor legislation and the social security program. The so-called "court-packing" plan, which many supporters of Roosevelt had felt was unwise, now also seemed unnecessary. He suffered a humiliating defeat, but the flow of negative decisions had come to an end.

Other tribulations followed. Roosevelt wished to bring the budget more nearly into balance, and curbed deficit spending so sharply that the economy sunk from recovery into recession. After some months Roosevelt resumed spending and the course of recovery resumed. In 1938 he was under attack for allegedly trying in primaries to "purge" the Democratic party of conservatives opposed to his programs. In Congress, conservative Democrats joined with Republicans to block many of Roosevelt's proposals, but the President continued to advocate reforms.

Overshadowing domestic problems was the threat from aggressor nations in Europe and East Asia that the world would be plunged into a second World War. From the outset of his presidency, Roosevelt was fearful of Adolf Hitler, who came into power in 1933. Repeatedly, Roosevelt through collective security schemes tried to cooperate with threatened nations, but his hands were tied by Congress and a public fearful of being dragged into another war. The threatened nations hoped to appease Hitler, and because Roosevelt lacked clout did not take him very seriously.

Within the American hemisphere, Roosevelt early in his administration began to fabricate an ideal collective security system, what he called the Good Neighbor policy. He transformed the Monroe Doctrine from a unilateral manifesto into a mutual aid program against potential aggressors. It became a pilot project for the kind of peace keeping and economic and cultural development programs Roosevelt envisaged for the entire world.

As Germany and Japan became ever more threatening, Roosevelt in his 1936 campaign reassured the electorate with his emphatic statement that "I hate war"—words with which his opponents later taunted him. He was indeed ready to avoid war if at all possible, even willing to cooperate with the British in their efforts toward appeasement, to rectify what Hitler claimed were injustices against Germany. Or, he would take a

course more appealing to him, to impose economic sanctions, possibly a blockade, against an aggressor like Japan. But in 1937 by broaching the idea of a quarantine he frightened the nation and was forced to backtrack. He was powerless during the Munich crisis, which was to mark the failure of appeasement.

With the outbreak of World War II in September, 1939, Roosevelt began gradually to rally opinion behind his efforts to strengthen the defenses of the United States. In his role as commander-in-chief he took three great gambles. Immediately after the Munich debacle, feeling that it was the threat of German airpower that had forced France to give in to Hitler, he embarked the nation toward large scale airplane construction, far in excess of other military forces being developed. His second gamble was, secretly, in response to warnings Albert Einstein brought from nuclear physicists, to authorize research and development of the atomic bomb. The third, coming after the depressing collapse of France in June, 1940, was to conclude that besieged Britain could and must survive, and to provide all-out aid to Prime Minister Winston Churchill at the expense of the build-up of the forces of the United States. He exchanged fifty outmoded destroyers for New World bases, and subsequently supplied the British through one of his most clever devices, Lend-Lease. If a neighbor's house were afire, Roosevelt explained, naturally one would lend him a fire hose to extinguish the blaze. After Hitler suddenly invaded the Soviet Union in the summer of 1941, Roosevelt extended lend-lease aid to the Soviets also. These gambles demonstrated both courage and foresight, and they were successful. In addition, Roosevelt began to apply economic pressure (in effect, sanctions) against Japan to try to stem its advances into Southeast Asia.

Within the United States Roosevelt's policies brought bitter debate with isolationists and became the focal point of the election of 1940. Roosevelt defeated the Republican candidate, Wendell Willkie, to win an unprecedented third term.

In January, 1941, Roosevelt in his annual message to Congress enunciated a counterpart of Wilson's Fourteen Points:

"In future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms." These were freedom of speech and worship, and freedom from want and fear. In August, 1941, just over fifty years ago, Roosevelt met with Prime Minister Churchill at Argentina, Newfoundland, and they incorporated these aims in an Atlantic Charter.

Through the fall of 1941, American economic pressures failed to restrain the Japanese and negotiations toward a modus vivendi failed. On December 7, 1941, which Roosevelt characterized in his war message as "a date which will live in infamy," Japanese airplanes unexpectedly struck a devastating blow at Pearl Harbor. Three days later, Hitler and the Italian fascist dictator, Benito Mussolini, declared war on the United States.

As wartime commander-in-chief, Roosevelt focused much of his attention upon worldwide diplomacy and strategy. With Churchill he organized coalition warfare on a global scale, and established a grand alliance, which he called the "United Nations," to pursue the war to final victory. Roosevelt made many of the crucial decisions during pursuit of the war, to invade North Africa in 1942, to press the apprehensive Churchill to agree upon a cross-channel invasion in 1944, and to appoint General Dwight D. Eisenhower to lead the assault into Normandy.

During the war, Roosevelt gave much thought to planning the peace. Questions arose at the strategic conferences with Churchill, and became particularly critical at the Tehran and Yalta conferences, when they met with Joseph Stalin. Roosevelt was pleased that Stalin agreed after the defeat of Hitler to enter the war against Japan, but could obtain no workable guarantee that Stalin would permit democratic elections in nations the Soviet armies had occupied. He hoped for a friendly, cooperative relationship with the Soviet Union after the war in the new United Nations organization then taking shape, but in the spring of 1945 as the collapse of German forces became imminent, was braced too for unpleasantness. On April 11, 1945, he wrote Churchill that Soviet problems seemed for the most part to straighten out, but "we must be firm."

Beginning in 1944, Roosevelt's health had declined seriously. Nevertheless in the fall, campaigning in rigorous weather, he had given an appearance of fitness, and running against Thomas E. Dewey won election to a fourth term. By the time he returned from the Yalta Conference, he could not conceal his exhaustion. After several weeks he went to Warm Springs to rest, and there on April 12, 1945, died of a massive cerebral hemorrhage.

The news created a national, indeed a world shock. Churchill, tears in his eyes, told Edward R. Murrow, "One day the world, and history, will know what it owes to your President." The day before, Roosevelt had worked on a Jefferson Day address he was planning to deliver on April 13. The last typed line read, "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts today." To this he penned an added sentence: "Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

The Roosevelt Memorial that will take form here will be a reminder of that strong and active faith, and a challenge to the nation's and world's future.

Mr. WALLACE. Thank you, Dr. Freidel.

David Roosevelt is a grandson of Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt and a son of Elliott Roosevelt. For years, he has been actively engaged in the FDR memorial project. He was asked to offer testimony at hearings regarding appropriations for the memorial on two occasions, in 1989 and again in 1990, at times when neither his father, nor his Uncle James Roosevelt could represent the President's family. Indeed, David has represented the family at numerous commemorative events over the years, including the 50th anniversary of the first televised Presidential Address from the World's Fair in 1939, and the 200th anniversary of George Washington's inauguration. But his proudest achievement—at least in terms of family affairs—was the organization two years ago of the first "modern day" reunion of the FDR and the Theodore Roosevelt sides of this unique American family, which resulted—I understand—in a treaty, of sorts, of the mythical family differences.

I give you David Roosevelt.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am pleased to have been asked by the cochair to represent my family on this most auspicious and historical occasion. And I would like to add my welcome to all of you who have joined us today.

This ceremony marks the beginning of the end of a very, very long dream—at times a nightmare—for so many people. The actual work, as you have heard, began almost 37 years ago with the establishment of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission. But in reality, it had its birth just a few months following the death of my grandfather.

So, today, I would like to take a few moments to pay tribute to just a few of those people who never lost sight of the dream, who believed in what this memorial represents, and whose labor and dedication have brought us here this morning.

First, allow me to repeat myself. I am indeed proud, and a bit nervous, to say that I represent my family today. My nervousness stems from the fact that the diversity of my family can never be truly represented by anyone, so I shall be very cautious in choosing my words.

I am honored to serve as spokesman for several reasons. First, because today, I am proud to say, my entire family is lending its support to the FDR memorial—not only the descendants of Franklin and Eleanor, but those of my great-grand uncle Theodore, as well, many of whom are here today as a reminder of the important role he played in the lives of Eleanor and Franklin. Never let it be said that the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial has been less than a bipartisan effort.

I am humbled, and not the least saddened, to represent on this occasion the passing of the torch from one generation to the next. With the death of my Uncle Jim a few weeks ago, and my father, Elliott last October, both of whom were active in this project, I serve merely as their surrogate at this ceremony. Of course, during their lifetimes, all of my uncles and aunt contributed to this project, and particularly their strong beliefs that any memorial to their father should not be to the man himself, but to the ideals he engendered for future generations of Americans.

And so, I wish to thank not only Dad and Uncle Jim, but Anna, Franklin, Jr. and John, for their insight and counsel have made this memorial more than a mere monument—it will be a true lesson in democracy.

Two and one-half years ago, on April 5th, 1989, I was asked to offer testimony before the Subcommittee on Interior and its Chairman, the honorable Sid Yates. I had been told that the Hearings that day were critical to the future of the FDR Memorial—the approval of Chairman Yates and his committee was an absolute necessity for there to be appropriations in the future. It was difficult enough to sit at that witness table knowing how crucial these hearings were, knowing that my testimony would be preceded by such eloquent and important witnesses as Senator HATFIELD, Congressmen BILL GREEN and JIM SCHEUER, and LANE KIRKLAND, to name but a few, but perhaps the most awe-inspiring—and daunting—presentation I had to follow that day was that of one of the great orators of our day, the then Chairman of the FDR Memorial Commission, the late Claude Pepper.

On that day, Claude Pepper left his bed at Walter Reed Medical Center to give an impassioned plea for this memorial, and one of the most eloquent statements I've ever heard. I'd like to very briefly relate for you a few of his remarks from that day:

"The many reasons for erecting a memorial to President Roosevelt have been presented to this subcommittee many times in the past so I will not enumerate them again today.

"However, this memorial is important to me for personal reasons. When I was elected to the Senate from Florida in 1936, I had

heard President Roosevelt's inaugural address by radio. As he stood on the steps of the Capitol of the United States and looked in the face of a vast throng, he addressed the people of a country almost on its knees: Agony, anguish, hardship and struggle swept the land. The President told the people that the only thing they had to fear was fear itself and when he finished speaking the Nation knew it had a new leader and the hearts of the people swelled with new hope. My heart and my admiration went out to this new leader. So when I came to Washington my purpose was to help President Roosevelt to carry on his great work. There developed a warm friendship and close cooperation between President Roosevelt and me. I supported him with all my heart and strength because I knew America needed what he was trying to provide for it.

"It is the responsibility of our government to make available in this capitol city the memorial to President Roosevelt which will educate our people on the principles which have made our country great, and will inspire our citizens of today and those to come to live by those principles.

"In doing so we will recognize and insure that as long as Americans shall love liberty, as long as Americans shall be devoted to compassion for the needs of their fellowman, as long as Americans shall work for the great cause of peace, they shall cherish the memory and honor the name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt."

Ladies and gentlemen, that was the last official activity by our beloved Claude Pepper. He returned that day to Walter Reed, and died a few short weeks later. But should you think that his belief in this project was not genuine, let me tell you that when he was visited by President Reagan just days before his death, he again pleaded for the administration's continued support for this Memorial.

So today I think it is appropriate to dedicate this historic ground breaking ceremony to Senator Claude Pepper; a visionary, statesman and great leader in his own right—a great friend.

Perhaps the most common opposition to a memorial to my grandfather was that he himself did not want a monument. But, I would guess, Presidents Washington, Lincoln and Jefferson did not request, nor necessarily desire to be memorialized at least in a physical sense. However, those who preceded FDR recognized the importance of reminding future generations of the contributions made by Washington and Lincoln. FDR himself recognized the important lessons in our history represented by the Jefferson Memorial, which is why he insisted that this Memorial be completed.

So, while FDR believed passionately that he was fortunate to be able to serve the people of this Nation, and while his own immodesty perhaps did not allow him to recognize fully his role in the history of our Nation, he nonetheless recognized the importance of giving the people of America a tangible reminder of the ideals of our former great leaders.

While I will not judge the greatness of my grandfather, others have. Others have judged the importance of his contributions and his ideals. Others have judged, and decided that, despite his desires, this Memorial is important as a lesson—as a reminder—to future generations. Perhaps it will provide inspiration for some leaders of tomorrow, just as have the Lincoln, Washington and Jefferson Memorials. The people have spoken—it is their desire to remember his work by way of this Memorial.

Let me offer another quote—

"He lived in a world in which freedom of conscience and freedom of mind were battles still to be fought—not principles already accepted of all men.

"He loved peace and loved liberty—yet he was forced to choose between them.

"We judge him by the application of his philosophy to the circumstances of his life. But in such applying we come to understand that his life was given for those deeper values that persist throughout all time."

These words, so applicable to the life of FDR, were in actuality spoken by him as he dedicated the Jefferson Memorial on April 13, 1943.

Ladies and Gentlemen, as I close my remarks there are so many I would like to thank for their support—too many to name individually; Former commission members, Members of Congress, architects and artists, former Presidents and, naturally, President Bush and the current administration for his continuing support. Chairman Sid Yates and his subcommittee on the Interior for their vital assistance. I'd certainly be remiss not to mention the sponsors of today's ceremony, without whom today would not be possible.

And while I'm thanking people, let me mention one very special group of contributors. Not long ago there was a story about the Memorial in a newsletter sent to the Alumnae of the Civilian Conservation Corps, a group I've been honored to address on three occasions. As a result, the FDR Memorial received several small contributions from former CCC members—ordinary, everyday folks, yet true representatives of our American ideals; people whose very lives were touched by my grandfather. I thank them from the bottom of my heart.

Let me close by reciting for you some of the last words written by my grandfather on April 12, 1945, literally moments before he was fatally stricken—words which I believe are the true essence of this Memorial, the real lesson for tomorrow's generations:

"The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."•

THE HOLLYWOOD LIBERALS

• Mr. MACK. This Saturday, January 25, Harry Belafonte and a group of Hollywood liberals are scheduled to hold a rally in New York City to support Fidel Castro.

By aligning themselves with Fidel Castro, they have chosen to support one of the most tyrannical dictators in world history who, just a few days ago, executed a human being so he could extend his own political life. These Hollywood liberals who support Fidel Castro have lost touch with reality.

In the last few years we have seen the death of communism in the former Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe. Now the same Hollywood liberals, who in the past have supported antifreedom forces in El Salvador, Nicaragua, and elsewhere are once again trying to defend the bankrupt ideology of Castro's communism by sponsoring this rally.

The Hollywood liberals are using their right to free speech to praise Fidel Castro's policies while 90 miles from freedom's shore, Fidel Castro has issued a threat of possible imprisonment and execution if any Cuban dares to speak out against his policies. Apparently this irony is lost on the pro-Castro stars.

The lives of the Cuban people will not improve until Fidel Castro's communism is defeated by the momentum of freedom. Cuban people are waiting for the day when they too can join the rest of the world in declaring their freedom. They too realize that freedom is the core of all human progress.

To promote Fidel Castro's policy of torture, pain and tyranny, the Hollywood liberals themselves are placing shackles on the Cuban people. It is incredible to me that any group of people who have achieved such tremendous success in their profession in a land of freedom can support denying that same freedom to other people, especially to the good people of Cuba.

This is hypocrisy at its highest level.

Freedom, democracy, and respect for human rights are the values which have made the United States a beacon of hope to millions of people around the world. Freedom has swept the globe because free nations and free people have taken a stand against tyranny. The Hollywood liberals should be looking for ways to promote freedom rather than for ways to prolong tyranny.

The Cuban people have waited long enough for their Communist nightmare to end. That's why I believe now is the time for our government to make its current economic embargo against Cuba stronger and more effective.

By tightening a gaping loophole in the United States trade embargo against the Cuban government, we can limit Castro's access to the resources he needs to remain in power and to continue his repression of the Cuban people.

By staging this rally in support of Fidel Castro as scheduled, Mr. Belafonte and his Hollywood liberals are saying to the world that they would rather support Castro's dictatorship and its human rights atrocities than support freedom for the Cuban people.

Few of us would have dreamed that in our lifetimes we would witness the end of communism in the Soviet Union, freedom for the Baltic States and the destruction of the Berlin Wall. Freedom is an unconquerable force and Castro and his allies in Hollywood will not be able to prevent freedom from reaching the Cuban people.

We need to send a strong message of hope to the Cuban people and let the Hollywood liberals know that America's support for Cuba's freedom is unequivocal.•

DON'T FORGET OUR MENTALLY DISABLED

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, most of us in the Senate belong to a church or a synagogue back home, and if my col-

leagues are like I am, and you live in a small community far from the center of population of your State, you all too rarely get to your hometown to visit your home church or synagogue.

I happen to belong to Our Saviour Lutheran Church in Carbondale, IL, where the pastor is Robert W. Gray, who has shown a real interest in the problems of the homeless and the problems of mental illness that are a part of the homeless problem.

Some of my colleagues may remember that some years ago Senator DOMENICI and I introduced an amendment to see that some mental health funds go for work with the homeless, and I am pleased to say that these modest appropriations—and they are modest—are continuing.

But in a conversation with me recently, Pastor Gray told me he would be sending me a letter which outlines the concerns that he and a number of others have.

He has sent me a letter with his signature, as will as that of about 40 others.

I happened to see on the list that one of those who signed is Mary Gray, his wife, who is a mental health nurse.

This group of citizens suggests that we should not forget the whole area of mental health as we make our larger health care plans.

Inevitably, we will be pursuing the larger health care plans, and I hope we will keep in mind this plea.

I urge my colleagues to read the letter and ask to insert it in the RECORD at this point.

The letter follows:

CARBONDALE, IL,
January 2, 1992.

Senator PAUL SIMON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SIMON: As alternative health care plans are being considered, we would like to focus attention on a frequently overlooked segment of the population—people disabled by mental illness.

The treatment of mental illness can be costly for individuals, families, and taxpayers. Mental illnesses can impair people so that they cannot access financial resources for treatment; some cannot function well enough to work while others are ineligible for medicaid benefits or are unable to meet spend downs. Medications for the treatment of mental illness can be quite expensive—a 32 year old man with schizophrenia must depend upon his parents to pay for his monthly injection which may cost $120–$180 depending on the dosage. Appropriate and safe monitoring of some medications requires periodic blood tests; patients who cannot afford these tests are at greater risk for potentially dangerous side effects. Hospitalizations are often lengthy and expensive. Patients who are fortunate enough to be covered by private insurance find that the insurance coverage quickly runs out and families can rapidly deplete their savings. Individuals without insurance have no or very limited choices of where they can receive treatment. For someone, perhaps involuntarily committed, who has no financial resources it is very stressful to begin receiving hospital bills after a psychiatric hospitalization; recovery is jeopardized as stress often triggers further episodes.

Those with mental illness also experience other illnesses and face difficulties in obtaining treatment. Examples include the 30 year old man with schizophrenia who cannot afford treatment for exacerbations of his chronic hepatitis or the 40 year old woman with depression who has no funds, insurance, or medical card to pay for a mastectomy. People with a psychiatric history are often denied medical insurance even if they can afford it.

Health care reforms need to include people disabled by mental illness. People do not choose to have a mental illness. The major mental illnesses are brain diseases with genetic and biological components. These people and their families need the same consideration and access to health care as people with other illnesses. We hope that people with mental illness will be included in health care proposals in a fair and caring manner.•

TRIBUTE TO MUHAMMAD ALI'S 50TH BIRTHDAY

• Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a great American from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, Muhammad Ali. On January 17, the Louisville Lip turned 50 years young. He is a treasure not only to his native Louisville, but to the entire Nation as well.

Cassius Clay, as he was known during his youth, grew up in the west end of Louisville. As a 12-year-old boy, Clay had his bicycle stolen while attending a downtown fair. This was to be the turning point in his life. Determined to punish the thief, Clay was taken into the world of boxing by Louisville Police Officer Joe Martin. This is where the great Muhammad Ali began his dramatic rise to the top.

Ali's success came quickly, he won 100 of 108 amateur fights, capturing 2 national Golden Gloves titles as well as 2 national AAU titles. His crowning amateur glory came in the 1960 Rome Olympic Games where he was awarded the Gold Medal for light heavyweight boxing. From this success Ali entered the professional ranks. In 1964, at the tender age of 22, he beat Sonny Liston, a man many considered unstoppable, to become the heavyweight champion of the world. Ali would go on to capture the title three times and at the same time become a hero to millions.

There is, Mr. President, much more to this man than his sterling athletic achievement. His life is marked with boundless energy and enthusiasm. Muhammed Ali has become a hero to hundreds of millions of people throughout the world. He took his show around the world, fighting in 12 different nations throughout his illustrious career. Ali has an almost mystical presence, one which raises him above mere sports hero status. He rose above the racial strife of his time and lives his life to this day as a flawless example to all people. Despite his noted bravado, Muhammad Ali is a caring man with a love of life and humanity. And everyone loves Ali, Mr. President. This wonderful man would have approval ratings that everyone in this Chamber would envy.

So in honor of Cassius Marcellus Clay, Muhammad Ali, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in wishing him a prosperous and happy 50th birthday.

Mr. President, I would ask that the following articles by William Nack Young and Kentucky's own William F. Reed of Sports Illustrated be inserted into the RECORD. I would also ask that an article from USA Today by Tom Weir be included.

The material follows:

[From the Sports Illustrated, Jan. 13, 1992]

ONCE AND FOREVER

(By William Nack Young)

Cassius Clay was cruising west on Walnut Street, through the black part of Louisville known as the West End, consorting with the world from behind the wheel of a Cadillac convertible. It was the autumn of 1960. Clay was only 18, a few days away from his first professional fight and just beginning to yank the clapper in the national bell tower, the one he would use forever after to announce his arrival. Almost standing in the car, the youngster yelled over and over, to everyone he passed, "I'm Cassius Clay! I am the greatest!"

The girl sitting next to him, the one sinking shyly in her seat, trying to look as inconspicuous as possible in a pink Cadillac in the middle of black Louisville, was Wilma Rudolph, a 20-year-old college student who was visiting Clay from Tennessee State. They were a matched pair, two links on the fresh cuffs of history, as they drove that October afternoon. Clay was, by consensus, the finest amateur boxer in the world. Only two months before, at the Olympic games in Rome, the 178-pound youth had won the gold medal in the light heavyweight division by whipping Zbigniew Pietrzykowski, a portly coffeehouse keeper from Poland. The white trunks Clay showed off to West End neighbors on his return were stained a candy pink by the Polish fighter's blood. Rudolph was the fastest woman on earth. Her victories in three springs—the 100 and 200 meters and the 4×100-meter relay—had made her the first American woman to win three gold medals in a single Olympics.

The two athletes had become friends in the days they spent together in Rome. Clay was sweet on Rudolph, but he was too shy to tell her how he felt. His diffidence with girls was painful. He had fainted dead away the first time he kissed one, two years earlier, and it took a cold washcloth to bring him to. So he concealed his shyness in bravura.

"I can still see him strutting around the village with his gold medal on" recalls Rudolph. "He slept with it. He went to the cafeteria with it. He never took it off. No one else cherished it the way he did. His peers loved him. Everybody wanted to see him. Everybody wanted to be near him. Everybody wanted to talk to him. And he talked all the time. I always hung in the background, not knowing what he was going to say."

His six-year amateur career had taken him to many American cities, from San Francisco to New York, but the journey to Italy had been his first outside his native land, and gold medal and all, it had been a turning experience in his life. Clay's triumphant return to River City, with police sirens leading

the 25-car motorcade through the streets, raised a clamor usually reserved in those latitudes for the Kentucky Derby winner. Not since 1905, when cumbersome Marvin Hart whipped Jack Root to win the heavyweight championship of the world, had Louisville produced a fighter of such celebrity.

Now there he was, driving up Walnut Street, waving at the crowds and stopping at an intersection and rising to announce himself. "And this," he yelled, "this is Wilma Rudolph. She is the greatest!"

"Sit down," she said.

"Come on, Wilma, Stand up!"

Crowds were stopping on the street and craning to look inside the car. "No, I can't do that," she said.

"Yes, you can," said Clay. "Stand up, Wilma! Come on."

Wary of crowds, she began sinking lower, covering her face with her hands, trying to crawl inside the glove compartment, slowly disappearing in the cracks of the seat. It was no use. "Look!" Clay said, pointing down to her. "Here she is, down here! It's Wilma Rudolph. She is the greatest! And I'm Cassius Clay. I am the greatest! Come on, Wilma, stand up!"

There was no place to hide with Cassius Clay on Walnut Street. So she rose, reluctantly, for the gaping crowds. What would be the longest running circus in American sport was pushing off. "I saw him at the very beginning," says Rudolph. "It was bedlam. I always told him, 'You should be on stage.'"

On Walnut Street, of course, he already was. This was more than 31 years ago—in a different incarnation, as Muhammad Ali, he turns 50 on Jan. 17—and that rarest of all careers, spanning two decades and part of a third, was only beginning. On Oct. 29, 1960, in his first pro fight, he won a six-round decision from heavyweight Tunney Hunsaker, the police chief of Fayetteville, W.Va. Clay emerged unscathed and promptly crowned himself king. One of his cornermen for that fight was George King, a former amateur bantamweight from Louisville who first met the 12-year-old Clay when the youngster began hanging around trainer Fred Stoner's all-black boxing team at the Grace Community Center. With Rome and Hunsaker behind him, Clay was not a boy anymore.

"Where'd you get that name?" he asked King one day. "You ain't big enough to be a king. They ought to call you Johnson or somethin'. There's only one king."

"Who's that?" asked George.

"You're lookin' at him," Clay said.

Clay's days in Louisville were numbered. By the end of the year he had moved to Florida and was fighting out of Angelo Dundee's Fifth Street Gym in Miami Beach. Increasingly the town of his birth and boyhood became a place more of memory than of moment. Gone were the days when he skipped down the halls of Central High between classes, shadowboxing as he danced past knots of tittering students, stopping to throw a flurry that would fall just short of an incoming freshman's outgoing nose, then ducking into a washroom to box himself silly in front of a mirror. Gone was the laughter in the classrooms when Central's tall, scholarly principal, Atwood Wilson, would flip on the school intercom and, tugging on his suspenders, gravely intone his warning: "You act up, and I'm going to turn Cassius Clay on you." Gone were all those early mornings when young Clay raced the school bus for 20 blocks east down Chestnut Street, waving and grinning at the faces in the windows as he bounded past pedestrians scurrying to work.

"Why doesn't he ride to school like everybody else?" a sleepy-eyed young Socrates asked on the bus one day.

"He's crazy," replied one of Clay's classmates, Shirlee Lewis Smith. "He's as nutty as he can be."

Young Clay was an original, sui generis, a salad of improvisations—unpredictable, witty, mischievous, comical. An indifferent student, he lived within his own world during class, day-dreaming by the hour. "Most of the time, when he wasn't paying attention, which was often, he'd be drawing," recalls his senior English teacher, Thelma Lauderdale. "But he never gave me any trouble. Shy and quiet in my class. Meditative."

She never met the other Clay. Beyond her doors, flitting here and over there, he was forever a cutup. "He was a jolly-go-happy guy," says Jimmy Ellis, a boyhood friend who also went on to become heavyweight champion of the world.

"He was just a playful person," says Indra Leavell Brown, a friend of Clay's since childhood. "He had a lot of friends. We'd eat in the cafeteria, and he'd come in and crack his jokes and say little silly things and have all the table laughing."

"He always used to tell me he was in love with me," says Dorothy McIntyre Kennedy, who knew Clay from the time he was 12. "But he always made a joke out of everything. I never took him seriously. It was like he never wanted to grow up. He always wanted to be this person—the class clown."

Clay was different, all right, as elusive as the butterfly he would soon proclaim himself to be, inventing and reinventing himself as he went along. He dated Mildred Davis for a spell his senior year, and she remembers the Monday after he won the Golden Gloves championship in Chicago, when he showed up at school bearing in his hands, like an offering, a golden pendant. "A little gold glove, with a diamond embedded in it, on a gold chain," says Davis. "And he put it around my neck and said, 'I don't ever want you to take this off. I want you to wear this all the time.' And I said, 'Fine.' That was about 8:30 in the morning. At about 11, he came back and said, 'Someone else wants to wear it.' So he took it off and let someone else have it the rest of the day. And the next day, some other girl wore it. I never questioned him about it because he was always so silly. So silly. He wanted me to wear it forever, and I had it for about two-and-a-half hours."

Every day with Clay was an adventure, and Davis never quite knew what to expect from him. She hardly knew what to make of the bottle he was sipping from all the time. "He carried a bottle of water with fresh garlic in it," says Davis. "He would drink it, and he reeked of garlic. I remember asking him why he put the garlic in the water, and he said, 'I do that to keep my blood pressure down.' And he would do some of the craziest things with his eyes. He would come up to guys, make his eyes big, press his lips together and say, 'I'm gonna knock you out!' He always carried his money all folded up in a small change purse, like a little old lady. If you met him, there were things about him that you could never forget. Even in high school, he would always say, 'I'm not gonna let anyone hit me, as pretty as my face is. I'm almost as pretty as you.' He did have beautiful skin. And I'll never forget the night he said to me, 'Come on, I'll run you home.'"

That was the night of the variety show at Central High, a takeoff on The Jackie Gleason Show on television. "The girls would come out to announce the acts, and I was the last one, and I'd say, 'And away we go!'" says Davis. "Cassius was on the show that night. He was shadowboxing, as usual. That was his act. After the show he said, 'Come on, I'll run you home.' And I was thinking, He doesn't drive. How is he going to run me home?"

They left the school and started walking west on Chestnut. Pretty soon Clay began to jog in place next to her as she felt her way along the sidewalk in her high heels. "It was dark," says Davis. "He would run up ahead a block or two and jog back. He trotted beside me most of the way. That's what he meant by running me home. So I walked 13 blocks in my high heels. How crazy he was."

Davis and Clay took long walks together around Chickasaw Park that spring, watched television at the Clay house on Grand Avenue, sat together at her mother's dinner table over meat loaf and corn bread and cabbage. He was, at all times, unfailingly polite. "Would you like something to eat?" Mildred's mother, Mary, would ask. "Yes, ma'am," Cassius would say. Indeed, there was something old-fashioned about the way he viewed things.

"You know," he once told Mildred, "when we get married, you'll have to wear longer skirts."

"Why would I have to do that?" she asked.

"To look like a lady," he said.

That was not the only time he spoke of marriage to Davis. Clay always built models in his mind, including a make-believe world with a large, happy family of which he was the benevolent father. "We watched a lot of TV at his mother's house," recalls Davis, "and little kids would come over. He loved kids—he always liked to have five or six around him—and I remember one time, it was around Easter, and my mother wouldn't let me go to one of his fights. He came by after the fight, and we sat together on the front porch. At one point he said, 'Pretty soon we're gonna get married, and we're gonna get a real big house with a swimming pool. All the kids in the neighborhood are gonna come over—we're gonna have a lot of kids—and they'll swim in the pool.'"

Clay was his mother's son. Odessa Grady Clay was a sweet, pillowy, light-skinned black woman with a freckled face, a gentle demeanor and an easy laugh. Everyone who knew the family in those days saw the kindness of the mother in the boy. In his sophomore year, when he was still 15, Cassius began working after school in the Nazareth College library, across town, for 60 cents an hour. He carried books from floor to floor, dusted the volumes and the shelves, waxed the tables and dry-mopped the brown linoleum floors. The first day he walked into the library, Sister James Ellen Huff, the librarian, was struck by his shy, gentle manner.

"Do they call you Cash?" Sister Huff asked.

"No, ma'am, he said. "I'm Cassius Marcellus Clay."

"He had his mother's sweetness," says Sister Huff.

In fact, when Clay talked about his parents at all, it was of his mother. "Everything related to his mom," says Indra Brown. He would say, 'My mother comes first, before anybody. My mom will be treated right.'"

Of course, all the diversionary commotion he created in his life—the incessant shadowboxing and grandstanding, the flights of fantasy into becalmed worlds of aqua pools and frolicking children—mirrored and masked the chaos of his life at home, where violence and turmoil often came and went with his father, Cassius Sr., a gifted religious muralist and commercial sign painter. The old man,

chesty and fast-talking, had always cut a popular figure around town. "Everybody around Louisville knew Mr. Clay," says Yates Thomas, a boyhood pal of young Cassius'. "Up on his ladder painting signs."

And down along the streets, he moved from saloon to saloon, his rich singing voice belting out his favorite songs for the audiences bellying up to the bar. The elder Clay was a wild, free-roaming drunk and womanizer whose peregrinations around town made him a legend along the river's shore. "I just loved him," says West End liquor store owner John (Junior Pal) Powell, a longtime friend of Cassius Jr. "A fun-loving type of guy. But he did drink a lot. One time some lady stabbed him in the chest, and he came up to my apartment. I tried to get him to let me take him to the hospital, but he said, and he always talked real fast, 'Hey, Junior Pal, best thing you can do for me is do what the cowboys do. You know, give me a little drink and pour a little bit on the chest, and I'll be all right.'"

By the time he died, in 1990—of a heart attack, in his car, in a Louisville parking lot—Cassius Sr. had embroidered a long police rap sheet with his troubled history, most of it fueled by alcohol. Thomas Hauser, the author of Muhammad Ali: His Life and Times, an oral history of the fighter, says that an FBI investigation into Ali—initiated in 1966, the year before he refused induction into the armed forces—revealed that the elder Clay had been arrested nine times on charges that included reckless driving, disorderly conduct, and assault and battery. According to the file, Odessa thrice summoned the police seeking protection from her husband. The last file on him, obtained from the Louisville police department, showed he was arrested five times for drunken driving since 1975. Ali declines to talk about violence in the Clay household, but Hauser says he could imagine, in something that Ali once told him, a young Clay fleeing the early-morning chaos at home.

"I don't know what it was," Hauser recalls Ali saying, "but I always felt I was born to do something for my people. Eight years old, 10 years old; I'd walk out of my house at two in the morning, and look at the sky for an angel or a revelation or God telling me what to do. I never got an answer. I'd look at the stars and wait for a voice, but I never heard nothing."

The bars in Louisville closed at 2 a.m. Regardless of what things that go bump in the night drove the boy from his home at two in the morning, he would soon find his calling outside the thin walls of the bungalow on Grand Avenue. And when he did, predictably, he created another world for himself, floated through it, escaped into it until, at last, he used it to express himself like no other man of his time.

Clay was six pounds, seven ounces at birth, but by age three he had grown as big as a calf. One day, when he was still an infant, he jarred loose one of Odessa's front teeth. "We were lying in bed," she says, "and he stretched his arm out and hit me in the mouth. He just loosened the tooth. They couldn't straighten it. Finally it had to come out."

Cassius and his brother, Rudy, 18 months younger, would visit their uncle William Clay, and neighbors would bolt the doors. "One day they broke the birdbath in Mrs. Wheatley's yard," says William. "We called them the Wrecking Crew."

The sea change in his life occurred when, at age 12, he was attending a fair downtown and a rascal stole his new bike. Told a cop was downstairs in the Columbia Gym, Cassius went there to complain. In tears, he told his tale to the policeman, Joe Martin, who was training an amateur boxing team. "I'm gonna whip him if I can find him," said Cassius of the thief.

Martin remembers asking the boy if he could fight. "You better learn to fight before you start fightin'," Martin said.

Cassius looked around the gym at all the wondrous activity—the snap of the punching bags and the skipping of rope and the sparring in the ring. Finally, he said, "I didn't know this was here. Can I come?"

He was back the next day. "He didn't know a left hook from a kick in the ass," says Martin. "But he developed quite rapidly. I'd tell him what to do—how to stand, how to keep his arms and hands, how to punch. He'd be hitting the heavy bag, and I'd tell him, 'Cassius, there's a fly on that bag. I want you to hit him, but I don't want you to kill him. You got to turn the hand over. Snap punches. Phew! Phew!'"

Cassius loved to fire and turn the jab. Even at 12, when he was an 89-pound novice, he had a beguiling cocksureness that played well with the older amateurs in Louisville. George King first met Cassius during an intracity tournament at the Columbia Gym. Cassius was boxing for Martin's team, but he drifted over to Fred Stoner's team in the locker room and stood next to King, who was 21 years old and already married with a child. "I'm taller than you," Cassius said. "Do you think you could beat me?"

Soft laughter lifted among the older Stoner fighters. King smiled.

"Think you could stop this jab?" Cassius asked, throwing out two quickies. King pushed a jab toward Clay.

"My jab's quicker than yours," the boy said.

Rudell Stitch, then age 21, turned a thumb down. Fixing Stitch with a smirk, Cassius said, "Come on, I'll give you some of it, too."

All these years later, King's voice lilts at the memory. "We were down there, grown men, and he didn't give a damn," says King. "That's just the way he was. He'd pick at you, mess with your head, tease you to death. I kind of liked him. He was a neat lookin' kid, and he had all that personality. Everybody just took to him."

Over the next six years Cassius grew into a surpassing amateur boxer: 100 victories in 108 bouts; two consecutive national AAU championships, in 1959 and '60, both times as a light heavyweight; two straight national Golden Gloves titles, in '59 as a light heavy and the next year as a heavyweight; and, of course, an Olympic gold medal. "His secret was his unusual eye speed" says Martin. "It was blinding. The only other athlete I ever saw who had that kind of eye speed was Ted Williams. When he started fighting, Cassius was so fast with his eyes that you could give a guy a screen door and he wouldn't hit Cassius 15 times with it in 15 rounds. He was *different*. Quick as lightning for a big man, the quickest I ever saw."

He was born with phenomenal physical gifts, but unlike so many others, he nurtured them and squandered nothing. Indeed it was as if, in Martin's gym, Cassius had found the message in the silence of the stars. In high school he lived as ascetic an existence as possible for a teenager. Yates Thomas remembers Cassius showing up at school in the morning after buying two raw eggs and a quart of milk.

"He would break the eggs into the milk, shake it up and drink it." says Thomas. "He'd say, 'Now I'm ready to go to school. I'm the baaaaddest man in Looville!' All he thought of was fight-fight-fight. We used to go to a teenage place at night, and he'd stay till 10 o'clock, even on a Saturday night, and then he'd say, 'I'll see ya. I'm goin' home to bed.' He didn't smoke. He'd say, 'Ain't gonna put that stuff in my lungs.'"

At some point in his senior year Clay began to eschew pork, and for the same reason that he reeked of garlic. "Pork's not good for you," he warned Davis. "It raises your blood pressure." When Junior Pal offered him a grape soda early one morning as Clay was working out, Cassius waved him away. "The sugar and acid ain't good for you," he said.

Despite what was happening at home—or, more likely, because of it—he shunned alcohol. It was as if he were studying, high on his own Himalayan peak, the evanescent secrets of the butterfly. "He didn't chase women." Martin says. "And I never heard him say a curse word in my life. We used to go to a lot of towns, and he used to sit down and read a few pages of the Bible before he went to bed."

Clay's dalliances with women had far less to do with romance than with fantasy—his flirtations had the fizz life of a soft drink—and, according to Indra Brown, he was a virgin when he graduated from high school. "I know that for a fact, because he confided in me on things like that," she says. "He used to say to me, 'I will always have money. I'm not going to be a Joe Louis. Women are not going to drag me down. They are not going to be my downfall!'"

Late in his junior year he began doing experiments in the technique of kissing, and on his first try he nearly blew up the lab. Areatha Swint had first met Clay after a high school variety show, when she needed someone to walk her home. They dated for three weeks before he got around to asking her for a kiss goodnight. "On the night he did, it was late," Swint would recall in a newspaper memoir. "It must have been around 12:30 or one. We were being quiet because my mother had said there was no company after 12, and he didn't have any business being up that late because he was in training.

"I was the first girl he had ever kissed, and he didn't know how. So, I had to teach him. * * * When I did, he fainted. Really, he just did. He was always joking, so I thought he was playing, but he fell so hard. I ran upstairs to get a cold cloth. Well, when you live in the projects, a lot of times mother would wash and lay the towels on the radiator to dry. So I looked for one and got some cold water on it and ran back down the stairs."

She doused him with it. When he finally came to, Swint asked, "Are you O.K.?"

"I'm fine, but nobody will ever believe this," he said.

His shyness was such that at times the mere presence of girls struck him dumb. In 1959, recalls Wilbert (Skeeter) McClure, who was another young boxer, he and Clay were in Chicago for the Golden Gloves when Cassius began pestering him and a few other fighters to don their Golden Gloves jackets and head over to Marshall High, a largely black school, to meet some girls. McClure was in college and had no interest in high school girls, but Clay kept bugging him to go. McClure finally agreed, and so they visited the school for lunch. Girls were all over the place, eyeing this team of young gladiators with the new jackets. After Clay got his tray of food, he sat down, said nothing and never looked up.

McClure turned the needle. "You wanted to get us here," he said to Clay. "Come on. Do your thing."

Cassius sat frozen. Recalls McClure: "He was silent, staring at his plate and eating his food."

By this time, Clay was a minor celebrity back home. He had often been featured on *Tomorrow's Champions*, a local Saturday afternoon television program featuring young boxers, and his name had begun appearing in the Louisville Courier-Journal as far back as 1957, when he was 15 and he stopped a tough named Donnie Hall. The headline read: CLAY SCORES T.K.O. OVER HALL IN 4TH.

When Jimmy Ellis, a 17-year-old untutored roughneck from Louisville, saw that bout on *Tomorrow's Champions*, he went to the Columbia Gym to learn how to box. Says Ellis, "Hall was a friend of mine, and I figured, I can beat that other guy." So Ellis started fighting. History would soon be up to its old tricks, for it was Ellis, 11 years later, who would win the vacant heavyweight championship after Ali was stripped of it for having refused to serve in the military during the Vietnam War. Ellis traveled frequently with Clay in their amateur years, and what he remembers most vividly about Clay was his almost boundless capacity for work in the gym.

"I don't know where he got the energy," says Ellis, who now works for the Louisville parks system. "He'd box and box. He'd box three or four rounds with one guy. Then he'd sit down. Then another guy would come into the gym, and he'd go three or four rounds with him. Then he'd come out and hit the heavy bag. And then he'd go three or four rounds with another guy."

And anytime a professional fighter came to town, says Ellis, Clay would train where the pro was. Dundee brought light heavyweight Willie Pastrano to Louisville in 1957, and they were sitting in their hotel room one day when the phone rang. Dundee took the receiver and heard this: "My name's Cassius Marcellus Clay. I'm the Golden Gloves champion of Louisville, Kentucky. I'm gonna win the Golden Gloves, and I'm gonna win the Olympics in 1960, and I want to talk to you."

Dundee invited him up. For the next three hours, recalls Dundee, Clay picked and probed and prodded his brain, asking him how his fighters trained, what they ate, how far they ran, how much they hit the bags. "He was a student of boxing," Dundee says. "He was so inquisitive. A very interesting young man."

Two years later Dundee and Pastrano were back again—Pastrano was only four years away from winning the light heavyweight crown—training for a fight in Louisville against Alonzo Johnson. There was young Clay again, this time hustling Dundee for a chance to spar with Pastrano. Dundee turned him down—he did not believe in matching amateurs against pros—but the kid persisted: "Come on, come on. Let me work with him."

So Dundee finally yielded. Pastrano sparred one round with Clay, and the boy danced around him. "In and out, side-side, in and out," says Dundee. "Stick-stick-stick. Move-move-move. He was so quick, so agile, Willie couldn't do nothing with him."

Dundee called it off, saying, "Willie, baby, you ain't gonna spar no more. You're too fine, baby."

Pastrano wasn't buying. "—!" he said. "The kid kicked the hell out of me."

So much of what came to characterize Ali as a fighter—his tactics in and out of the ring—he began cultivating as an amateur. Ellis recalls Clay working on opponents' minds as deftly as he would soon work on their chins. Says Ellis, "We'd be fighting in the wintertime, in Chicago, and there'd be his opponent sitting there sniffling or blowing his nose. Cassius would say, 'Man, you got a cold? I'm gonna knock you out—cold! You can't beat me if you got a cold. I'm gonna knock you out!"

Martin says that long before Clay went beserk at the weigh-in before his first bout with Sonny Liston, in 1964, he had become a performer—even an artist—at the scales. He was being weighed on March 9, 1960, only hours before facing Jimmy Jones, the defending heavyweight titleholder in Chicago's Tournament of Champions, when he turned to his trainer. "Mr. Martin," Clay said, "are you in a hurry to get away from here tonight?"

"Not really," said Martin. "Why?"

Clay pointed to Jones and said, "This guy over here, I can get rid of him in one round if you're in a hurry. Or, if you're in no hurry, if you want me to box, I can carry him for three rounds."

"I'm in no hurry," said Martin.

"I'll let him go three," Clay said.

The kid spun Jones like a top. Clay slipped the champion's heavy artillery in the first round, and then, according to the Louisville Times, he "deftly outboxed him the final two rounds."

Clay was on a path to glory, only six months away from the Rome Olympics, and by then he was rising at four in the morning, before first light, to climb into his sweats and strap on his work boots with the steel toes. At that hour John Powell was usually done sweeping out the liquor dispensary where he worked, and he would listen to the wind blow outside. Recalls Powell: "I'd be sitting on the counter, and I could see his shadow coming around the corner from Grand Avenue." Clay was on his way to Chickasaw Park. Cold, dark winter mornings. You could see that shadow coming. Then here he comes, running by, with those big old Army brogans. He'd be the onliest person in the early morning. And I'd walk outside, and he'd stop and shadowbox. He once said to me, 'Someday you'll own this liquor store, and I'll be the heavyweight champion of the world.' Both of those came true, too.

Clay ran all over Louisville in those steel-toed boots—west to Chickasaw Park in the early morning, east down Chestnut racing the school bus, up and down Walnut Street, downtown and back again, the brogans clomping on the pavement, the fists flying, the litany always the same: "I'm gonna be the next world champion. You're gonna read about me. I'm the greatest!" At 10th and Walnut crowds of men used to gather around a peanut vendor, crack nuts and talk sports.

"Cassius Clay used to come up the street acting like he was hitting people," says Lawrence McKinley. "Shadowboxing and throwing punches in his heavy shoes. Nobody ever dreamed he'd be world champ."

One day one of the street-corner habitués, Gene Pearson, got tired of hearing the litany and vowed to put Clay in his place. "He ain't gonna be no champion," Pearson said. The next time Clay passed the corner, Pearson stepped out from behind a post and hit him with a straight right.

"Pow!" says McKinley. "As hard as he could. Clay liked to go all the way down. He went to his knees, just like he was gonna fall, and he stopped himself and looked up at Gene, and he stretched his eyes real wide and he came up and—whew!—he must have hit Gene 15 or 20 times, so fast you could hardly see the punches, and Gene started saying, 'Get him off me! Get him off me! Yeah, you're gonna be the champ.' And Cassius went right on running up the street. Never said nothin'. The next time Cassius came by, one of the guys said, 'Are you gonna hit him again?' And Gene said, 'Hey, champ!'

Clay was never a street fighter, and classmates can recall only one occasion when he was goaded into fighting. According to Indra Brown, the episode nearly brought Clay to tears. They were at a delicatessen across from the school when two kids began baiting Cassius, pushing him around and saying, "Come on, let's fight. You can fight." Clay kept backing off. "Leave me alone," he kept saying. "I don't want to do this. Leave me alone."

The boys pushed too far. "Cassius finally went after one of them," Brown says. "He floored him. A right hand. To the jaw. Cassius almost cried. I could tell by his voice. But that was the end of that. They never bothered him again."

He avoided all confrontations, including the civil rights demonstrations downtown in which blacks were involved during the late 1950s. Clay was born in a town where most of the public facilities were segregated. Until the barriers started coming down in the '50s, Chickasaw was the only park that blacks could use, and most of the libraries, restaurants and movie theaters were for whites only. Central was the all-black high school. When Clay was at Central, one of the teachers, Lyman Johnson, regularly led students on picket lines and lunch-counter sit-ins. Clay never participated, says Yates Thomas, except the one time that Thomas talked him into joining him on a picket line at a downtown restaurant.

Clay was standing on the sidewalk, says Thomas, when an eighth-floor window opened and a white woman emptied a bucket of water on the marchers below. "She emptied it right on his head," says Thomas. "She got him exactly. Water spilled all over him. He was just standing there."

That ended his career as an activist in Louisville. "He said he would never demonstrate again," says Thomas. "He never did." For years it was believed that Clay's activism began for real upon his return from the Olympics, when a Louisville restaurant refused to serve him and a white motorcycle gang threatened him. According to long-accepted Ali lore, Clay threw his gold-medal into the Ohio River. In fact, says Hauser, "he lost it." And while Clay was turned away from restaurants on many occasions, the biker incident never happened.

His life had become so consumed by the rigors of boxing—aside from all the roadwork, he trained in two gyms, with both Martin and Stoner—it was something of a wonder that he made it through Central at all. But in his junior and senior years, Clay had as his ally the most powerful man at Central, the principal. Atwood Wilson adored the young man. At assemblies Wilson would embrace him onstage and announce, "Here he is, ladies and gentleman: Cassius Clay! The next heavyweight champion of the world. This guy is going to make a million dollars!"

Academically Clay paddled in the doldrums—he ended up ranked 376th in a class of 391 students—but his failure at scholarship did not trouble the principal with the master's degree in education from the University of Chicago. What Wilson admired most of all was excellence, says Bettie Johnson, a counselor at Central, and no one at the school excelled at his job in life more than young Clay did. So the grades be

damned. Clint Lovely, a Central student at the time, recalls Wilson saying, "Cassius doesn't need to know anything but how to fill out his income tax. And I'm gonna teach him that."

With graduation drawing near, there was a powerful sentiment among some teachers not to permit Clay to graduate because, says Johnson, he wasn't going to pass English. Thelma Lauderdale required a term paper from her English students, and Clay had not done his. "He wanted to do it on the Black Muslims," recalls Johnson, "and the teacher did not feel that was acceptable. The subject was controversial at the time. You have to understand what was going on in black thinking prior to the militancy of the sixties. Black Muslims were considered by blacks as very, very questionable people. Cassius was not a militant, outspoken guy. He always had this mischievous twinkle in his eye, like he had a private joke he was telling himself. He just had this interest in the Muslims."

Before a faculty meeting in the music room, Wilson rose and delivered his Claim to Fame speech: "One day our greatest claim to fame is going to be that we knew Cassius Clay, or taught him." At this point, says the former school librarian, Minnie Alta Broaddus, "I thought, Maybe he knows something I don't know."

Wilson argued that Clay had a unique set of gifts, that he was going to be the heavyweight champion of the world and that he should not be held to the rules governing the average student. No one in the room was more of a scholar than the eloquent Wilson—he was ruthless with any teacher he perceived as mediocre—but here he argued that Clay was so exceptional that he should not be denied a diploma simply because he could not parse a sentence or quote from Macbeth. "The coaches all thought it was great because they were always trying to play guys who were ineligible scholastically," says Johnson. "The academic people were outraged because they thought we were letting our standards down."

Wilson was unmoved. "Do you think I'm going to be the principal of a school that Cassius Clay didn't finish?" he said. "Why, in one night, he'll make more money than the principal and all you teachers make in one year. If every teacher here fails him, he's still not going to fail. He's not going to fail in my school. I'm going to say, I taught him!"

The Claim to Fame speech carried the day. Clay fulfilled his term paper requirement when Lauderdale permitted him to give an oral presentation to her class, a travelogue on his adventures touring various American cities as an amateur boxer. He passed. At the graduation ceremonies on June 11, 1960, Clay received a standing ovation as he strode to get his diploma. It was, in a sense, a classic final performance for the clown who would be king.

"I remember when he graduated," says Davis. "All the guys had white shirts and ties under their caps and gowns. And dress shoes. He had on a T-shirt, and he walked down the aisle in his brogan work boots. With the steel toes."

It is more than three decades later, the autumn of 1991, and Muhammad Ali is sitting with his head back and his eyes closed in the high-backed leather chair in the office behind his house on a farm in Berrien Springs, Mich. His 50th birthday is two months away. Out back, a horse in a pasture is galloping along a fence. Dusk, in orange silks, approaches from the west. Ali rises slowly from his chair and begins moving sideways across the room, dancing, sliding in and out, shooting out the jab, shadowboxing, daydreaming.

"I'll win the heavyweight championship back when I'm 50 years old!" he says. "Isn't that somethin'? Is that powerful? They can pay $20 million or $50 million to whoever I fight. Holyfield or Tyson. This is gonna shake 'em up. It's like a miracle, a dream. Muhammad Ali is back! Can you picture this?"

Ali sweeps left and right across the rug, stops in front of the hall door and sets his feet. He throws a flurry, snaps a jab, crosses with an overhand right—Phew! Phew! Phew!—comes back to his toes, slips back into the chair. He is breathing heavily as he leans back and closes his eyes again. His left hand, resting on his chest, is trembling. The grin is childlike, mischievous.

"Can you believe it?" he says. "Dancin' at 50! . . . Ooooohhh. . . . Dancin' at 50. Maaannnn. It'll be bigger than the moon shot! I'm dedicatin' the fight to the baby boomers, the people who were six years old when I beat Sonny Liston. Now they're thirty-four. I'll do the Ali shuffle!"

Back on his feet, he rolls to the left, stops, stutter-steps a shuffle, dances left and pulls back his head, dodging punches here and sliding there. Ali is inventing himself again, dreaming again, picking and messing with all of the old ghosts in new fantasies.

"I get a hundred million," he says. "Did you hear me say that? A hundred million dollars! In the first 25 seats there'll be 25 presidents. President of Egypt. President of Syria. Gaddafi. Mobutu. Kings. Can you imagine the security? Maaaannnn. A hundred million dollars for architects and builders to build a big school. If you had a chance to build a school, wouldn't you? Imagine: the Muhammad Ali School of Technology or whatever. Seventy-five classrooms. Big kitchen. Auditorium. My dream is to make lectures in the school, to 300 kids! Take them off dope. In the school that I built. Can you imagine that?"

Yes, of course. Three hundred kids, a big, happy family at last. And they can all go swimming in the pool.

HOMAGE FROM A HOMEBOY

(By William F. Reed)

On a wall in my den I have a photograph of Muhammad Ali and me. It was taken in 1978, a few weeks before his second fight against Leon Spinks, in New Orleans, the one in which he won the world heavyweight championship for a record third time. We had just come back from an early-morning jog at his Deer Lake, Pa., training camp. Ali, a towel around his shoulders, is telling a story. I am gazing at him and smiling. When I look at the photo, as I did after reading the manuscript of Bill Nack's story on young Cassius Clay that appears in this issue, I like to think of us as a couple of homeboys sharing some story that would be appreciated only by people who happened to be kids in Louisville in the 1950s.

I've lived in Louisville most of my life and was only a year behind the young Cassius Clay in the city's public school system. Understand, I'm not saying that I knew him then. To the contrary, we were separated geographically and sociologically. I lived in the city's South End, which was, and still is, a mostly white, blue-collar area. He lived miles away, in the West End, an area that was rapidly becoming predominantly black as whites moved to the suburbs.

Nevertheless, as we discovered years later, there were experiences we had in common: watching local television shows such as T-Bar-V Ranch, starring Randy Atcher and Cactus Tom Brooks, and Funny Flickers, a cartoon program hosted by Uncle Ed Kallay; taking trips downtown to mingle in the bustle of Fourth Street, then the city's main drag, with all those bright lights and intimidating stores; and rooting for the football and basketball teams of the University of Louisville, which was one of the first schools in the South to recruit black athletes. If you were to ask me to name a Cardinal football player from those days, I would mention Johnny Unitas. If you were to ask Ali, I'm sure he would say Lenny Lyles, the university's first black star and later Unitas' teammate on the Baltimore Colts. I was with Ali once when he saw Lyles at a reception.

"There's Lenny Lyles," he said. "Man, when I was at Central High, he was a big football star. I thought he was something 'cause he had this 1957 Fairlane Ford. I didn't know that one day I'd have Rolls-Royces. That Ford was soooooo pretty, and I said one day I was going to be like that."

I've never been able to pinpoint when I first became aware of the young Clay. I know it was sometime in the mid-1950s, perhaps when I saw him on the local TV boxing show, "Tomorrow's Champions." That name, Cassius Marcellus Clay, caught your attention. I didn't know until later, and I'm not certain Ali knows to this day, that the original Cassius Marcellus Clay was a Kentucky statesman and Civil War-era editor who fiercely advocated the abolition of slavery. Ironically, when years later Clay became Muhammad Ali, he explained the name change by saying that he didn't want to be called after a white man.

But besides the Clay name, there was the Clay style. He was so pretty, so cunning, so outrageous. But not completely original. Then, as now, professional wrestling was popular in Louisville. Ali once told me that he copied a lot of his preening and posturing from Gorgeous George, who made frequent appearances in Louisville then, both in person and on TV.

I would like to be able to say that we all recognized the young Clay's talent right away, that we knew he was destined for immortality. However, the truth was, most people seemed to think of him mostly as a curiosity, a character. The best fighter in Louisville at the time was Rudell Stitch. When Stitch died on June 5, 1960—he drowned in the Ohio River while trying to save the child of another fighter—he was the second-ranked welterweight in the world. Later that year the young Clay partly replaced Stitch in the city's esteem by winning the light heavyweight gold medal at the Olympic Games in Rome.

I didn't get to know Ali until fairly late in his boxing career, after I had become sports editor of Louisville's morning newspaper, The Courier-Journal. To this day I'm confident he wouldn't recall my name if we met. But he would know that I'm from Louisville. Whenever I showed up at his training camp or one of his fights, he would tell his entourage, "This is my writer from Louisville," making it clear that I was to be treated with respect. I'm sure Ali had a warm spot for his hometown paper mostly because he always has remained fond of Louisville and loyal to it.

Once in the late 1970s, when I told Ali that the mayor of Louisville was being criticized for wanting to rename a street in his honor, he said, "The Bible says a prophet is without honor in his home. In Louisville they know me too well. I walk down the street and they

call me G.G. My mama says that's the first thing I ever said, and I tell her it stood for Golden Gloves or Greatest Gladiator. I don't go home for no praise, to have no streets named after me. I'm not great in Louisville to the people who know me." He winked. "But I'm proof that Louisville can produce the greatest in the world if it tries."

He is greatest, and we did get that street renamed.

He told me many times that after he retired, he would come back to live in Louisville at least two months a year. He hasn't done that, but he slips into town to see his mom as often as he can. "You know," he told me, "life is short. Things go so quick. But home always will be home." I'd like to think he was saying something like that when the photo in my den was snapped.

Happy 50th, Champ. From one homeboy to another.

---

50 WAYS WE'VE SEEN THE GREATEST GLOVER

(By Tom Weir)

Fifty reasons to wish Muhammad Ali a happy 50th birthday:

1. Float like a butterfly . . .
2. . . . Sting like a bee.
3. "I am the greatest."
4. The Ali Shuffle.
5. Rope-a-dope.
6. He did things for black pride that Don King can only dream about.
7. No one else had the guts to tell Sonny Liston and Joe Frazier just how ugly they were.
8. He introduced us to Angelo Dundee.
9. That smile.
10. With 255 career rounds in heavyweight championship bouts, he gave us more action than any other big man.
11. "Only last week I murdered a rock, injured a stone, and hospitalized a brick."
12. 32 cover photos for Sports Illustrated, the record.
13. The Louisville Lip.
14. "Was it a tough fight? Look at this face. I'm the prettiest thing that ever lived."
15. What other athlete could have negotiated the release of hostages in the Middle East?
16. The entourage, or as Dundee described them, Ali's "battery chargers."
17. "Man, I ain't got no quarrel with them Viet Cong."
18. He was a true world champion, fighting in 12 nations.
19. At the 1960 Olympics, Cassius overran Rome.
20. The way he could light up and energize a room.
21. The only man who could shut up Howard Cosell.
22. Long before Chris Berman entered the name game, Ali was dubbing his opponents "The Rabbit," "The Bear," "The Washerwoman" and "The Mummy."
23. The story about a young Cassius Clay's stolen red Schwinn, and how the cop he went to ended up being his first boxing teacher.
24. The all-time, textbook jab.
25. Without the Ali style to learn from, Sugar Ray Leonard wouldn't have been nearly as entertaining.
26. The Rumble in the Jungle.
27. He only made one Roach Motel commercial.
28. Like Ruth calling his shot, only Ali could call the round.
29. "I'm so mean I make medicine sick."
30. After he had danced and jabbed his way into our imaginations, against Frazier he also showed us he could take one hell of a punch.
31. "If you want to lose your money, bet on Sonny."
32. When he was facing jail, it was for a cause, not a crime.
33. He taught everyone where Zaire is.
34. The sports world's most famous face.
35. Even when he lost, sometimes it was good. How else could we have had that comedy-filled seven months when Leon Spinks was champ?
36. "I got speed and endurance. You'd better increase your insurance."
37. U.S. audiences got to see him fight somewhere other than in casino cities. Of 61 career fights, only seven were in Las Vegas.
38. When Ken Norton broke Ali's jaw, he still finished the fight.
39. The flying red tassles on those flying feet.
40. The Thrilla in Manilla.
41. "Now you see me, now you don't, George thinks he will, but I know he won't.
42. The Phantom Punch, even if it did take us another decade to realize he really was that fast.
43. He never went broke.
44. For the briefest of moments, he actually got us interested in Zora Folley, Joe Bugner and Chuck Wepner.
45. Bundini Brown, ever the picture of a devotee, always there in the corner.
46. "This might shock and amaze ya, but I'm going to destroy Joe Frazier."
47. Though he had his prime stolen from him, he didn't spend the rest of his career complaining about it.
48. When he was stopped in the 11th round by Larry Holmes in 1980, it was the only time he didn't go the distance in a defeat.
49. He never married Robin Givens.
50. The greatest chant in sports, the one you still hear every time he walks into an arena: "Ali . . . Ali . . . Ali."

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I believe that we have completed all of the business today.

I am advised that Senator KENNEDY is returning to the floor and will seek recognition to comment on the education bill and, in part, respond to the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

I do not believe there is any other Senator seeking recognition. What I would like to do is suggest that Senator KENNEDY be recognized, and if Senator SIMPSON also wishes to address the Senate, that he be recognized; and that, if agreeable to them, that upon the completion of their remarks, the Senate then stand in recess as under the order. Is that agreeable to the Senators?

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, that is certainly agreeable with this Senator and those on this side of the aisle.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I had not intended that to be the request. I will make the request that Senator KENNEDY be recognized to address the Senate and that if either Senator KENNEDY or Senator SIMPSON wish to address the Senate on any subject, they be recognized, and that upon the completion of their remarks, the Senate then stand in recess until 12 noon, Monday, as under the order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? No objection being heard, it is so ordered.

The Chair recognizes Mr. KENNEDY.

STRENGTHENING EDUCATION FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I was here just a few moments ago, and I felt that we were in our conclusion mode of the debate and discussion of this week, but the clear and eloquent and stirring voice of my good friend from Wyoming reached over into the rafters of the old Senate Office Building, so I thought I would make a few concluding remarks and address them to what I understand are some of the areas that have been raised by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. President, there has been a lot of talk about all of the new ideas that this President has on education. Well, they have had two ideas. One, private schools; use Federal taxpayers' money to support private schools. And the other idea was to have the Secretary of Education—located here in Washington, DC, a person that I admire and who is very committed to education,—make a judgment about selecting a school in each congressional district, and then another school in the State, two schools in the State—535 schools.

The object of this magnificent, innovative, creative ideas about how to solve the elementary and secondary education problems in our schools is not to do anything for the 83,000 public schools in this country, but to give more money to private schools. And then to allow one individual here—a busy man, with a wide range of different educational responsibilities—to find all of these new schools. How many of us can find ways, in various congressional groups, to spend $1 million?

This is the administration's enormously creative, bold, imaginative way of solving the problems that we are facing in the 83,000 schools across this country. Scarce resources? Give them to the private schools. Now, you may ask what is the basis for all these allegations? All you have to do is look back to May of last year, when they tried to take one of the best educational programs, the $6 billion Chapter 1 Program, and turn it into a voucher program so that all that money could be used, for private schools.

Then they introduce an amendment to use $30 million, to do some experiments and find out about whether private schools have a better result. I do not think I have heard a more cogent, telling, brief comment that reached the heart of this issue than was given by the distinguished Senator from

Rhode Island, Senator CHAFEE, about what the results of such a study would be.

And when Secretary Alexander was asked why they were proposing six districts, he said: "I would like to do it all that way." Let us clear away the fog here about exactly what this whole idea is, what this administration is trying to do, this President: privatize education, abandon the public schools. If that is business as usual, their program is business as usual. Because it is business; it is privatization of education.

I was interested when I heard that this is business as usual. That is the administration; they want to privatize it. It is difficult, to change elementary-secondary educational systems all across this country, in urban, rural, and poor areas. We know that, and we understand that, and as I mentioned yesterday, as some would like to say, the best way to cure it is like those who suggested in the Vietnam war: Let us destroy it to save it. That is what I hear, Mr. President.

And I am quite amazed to have this kind of assault on a Friday afternoon, after we tried to make some accommodation with the administration. It was 93 Members of this body, just earlier this week, that voted for the compromise that we made with Secretary Alexander and Senator COCHRAN and Senator KASSEBAUM. If that was so bad at that time, you would have thought at least some of those who were so critical of our efforts might have spoken up, objected, or even voted "no." There was bipartisan support for that.

It had the support of the Secretary of Education. It had his support, and I imagine in that sense, it had the President's support. They thought that that was a pretty good compromise. The Secretary did not achieve all he wanted, speaking for the President; neither did Senator COCHRAN or Senator KASSEBAUM; neither did those of us who have serious reservations about their approach but we compromised: 93 Members; 93 Members.

Mr. President, this bill would be on its way to the House of Representatives if it was not for the Members on the other side. It would be on the way. So I do not want to hear a great deal—maybe I will, whether I want to or not—about who is interested in education, when legislation was prepared to be acted on in the final days of the last session. It was objected to by a Member of that side of the aisle, not on this side of the aisle.

And when we were prepared to go to a vote, we find we are going to have a lot more debate about the Wirth-Wellstone amendment. What is it? It is to try to provide what the President had talked about in his campaign, what the President committed himself to in terms of early education, and what we still have not responded to: full funding for Head Start.

The President's own review panel, in evaluating the goal of early education, said we cannot evaluate it because we have no standard to evaluate it against. That is the most bizarre explanation I have ever heard.

Ernie Boyer, the head of the Carnegie Commission, has outlined it in detail. Ted Sizer has outlined it in detail. We can give you our own kind of evaluation that has been suggested by members of the committee. But no; no. Do not measure us on early education, because there is no way of knowing how to measure it. But we are for it. That happens to be the principal recommendation, again, in conclusion, of the President's panel.

So, Mr. President, I know at the early debate on this issue there was a claim of a lot of partisanship going on. As I said at the opening of this debate, it always seems to me that when you agree with those on that side of the aisle, you are a statesman; and when you differ, you are being partisan. We have seen that on issue after issue.

I did not know the word "partisan" had entered into this until the minority leader started talking about it the early part of the week, just before we spent 5 hours out in the President's office with Secretary Alexander trying to work on these measures, which 93 Members agreed to.

And then, when we were able to go on to these other measures, choice and others, where 58 Members rejected the proposals. We have been able to dispose, in terms of the measures that we resolved today and over the weekend of virtually all of them, I expect, without vote.

And then, when we were operating in good faith—recognizing that the Appropriations Committee has designated $100 million to be used for legislation that was to try to reflect the combined intent of Congress and the President, we are being fly-specked by the administration that said, "Oh, your particular legislation is not the exact same title that was included in that appropriation so we in the Department of Education do not really think that we will be warranted to expend the money on your program, but we will be able to spend it on ours."

Mr. President, I just feel that we had made some progress on some tough issues.

But I, for one, am not going to be silent when we have a broadside of a general kind of criticism. I mean, I thought we dealt with that in our opening statements but, I didn't expect it to come up again after we had some debate and discussion on these various issues. But, if that is where we are at, you know, that is where we are at.

Mr. SIMPSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I have often stood here on this side of the aisle and chatted amiably about various issues of the day across this aisle, with the senior Senator from Massachusetts. He is usually full of energy and enthusiasm. And I see those same traits in full, full display today.

I heard the senior Senator refer to the word "assault" upon his measure. I think, perhaps, as he was traversing the Capitol grounds, that he missed what I said and perhaps staff may have overestimated to him the comments of the Senator from Wyoming that took place while the Senator from Massachusetts was not in the Chamber. I was speaking in a marvelously calm demeanor about some defects in the committee bill, and then suddenly to be accused of an assault on his measure—leaves me speechless. It's almost an impossible situation. I can hardly proceed. However, I shall.

I would earnestly and respectfully request that my statement first be read by the senior Senator from Massachusetts and then responded to perhaps, after that, he will have a better opportunity to think about what I have said. And I also stated that I did support that compromise on the New American Schools Initiative.

But the hour is late and it is Friday, and I did speak my piece, something I wanted to do. I have watched education for a lifetime in public service, and I think that I may be one of the few Republicans ever to receive a very remarkable award, which I cherish, from the Wyoming Education Association for my work for education.

Sometimes education issues do get partisan. You will find that partisanship is the NEA itself, specifically, in its endorsement policies. If you look at who they support, there are not many Republicans. Let us deal with that honestly. That is just the way it is at the NEA.

They did not support this President or former Republican Presidents. They always have some remarkable reason for their lack of support. But there are not many Republicans in the ranks of those who are supported by the NEA and some of their affiliates.

But let me say this about specifics raised by Senator KENNEDY. Let us get the privatization issue in perspective. The support of private schools was not George Bush's idea. The idea was to give low-income parents the chance to give their kids a choice as to the kind of education they should receive, the kind of education the senior Senator from Massachusetts received, and that the Senator from Wyoming received, and all of us privileged people have received. That is what George Bush was doing. That is the perceived threat to the special interests.

And it is extraordinary to me to hear people of progressive bent speaking about the privatization of schools. In fact, the cry is coming up from minority parents who say: "Our children are

learning nothing, absolutely nothing, from a bunch of people who are more interested in their own preservation than they are interested in the welfare of our children. And we would like the opportunity to slip them away from this miserable system into a system that is good for them."

That is what we are talking about: A choice, a choice as to education that they should be entitled to receive.

Go look at the statistics. This is not driven by the rich, or preppies. This is driven by people like the people in Chicago who finally just took the system into their own hands because they said: This is monstrous!" These are people who are tired of deadweight teachers; tired of deadweight administrators; tired of administrative corporeal fat that just smothers school systems; tired of sluggards; tired of teachers who have gained tenure and protection and have lost their fire and their energy and their idealistic zeal—that is what they are tired of. And people who really know that, they do not want the same old business anymore.

They are really tired of business as usual. They are tired of hearing the pitch from some of the tough unions, and there are plenty of tough teachers' unions in America. They are tired of hearing the pitch: "Give us money and we will give you an educated citizenry." That is the phoniest argument of all time because that is what we have done: We have given them money and have been presented with some of the most illiterate citizens in the United States in these last years.

That is the bargain they made with the American public and that is the bargain that was broken. What they meant was, "Give us more money and we will preserve ourselves; we will preserve this system; we will preserve these inept and inadequate people; we will preserve this administrative overlay, layer upon layer; we will preserve these people who are not educating the citizens of the United States." That is what they will do with the money. And, if that is not business as usual, I do not know what it is.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. SIMPSON. I would. I will yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is the Senator familiar with what the requirements are in order to qualify for this money, as illustrated in the legislation?

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the money that is in this legislation that was proposed by the Secretary of Education is minuscule.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am talking about the bill that the Senator is criticizing.

Mr. SIMPSON. May I finish my remarks, please?

We cannot even get a test program, a demonstration program. The cost of education in the United States is billions of dollars, and here we are with a little, old pilot program that is perceived as such a great threat. If you do not believe it, all you had to do was look in the hall yesterday during the vote. I mean there they were, stacked out there clear down the steps as far as I could tell—every tough cookie teachers' union in the United States. That is what we are talking about.

We can go into the romance of bucks and all that. One million dollars a school district, picked by Democrat and Republican superintendents of education, and Democrat and Republican Governors. They did not have the confidence in those people to give them the chance to spend that money wisely because of the threat to their power. These folks, who are so threatened by anything innovative or creative, have not produced the quality we should expect in the last 20 years.

We can see folks who come here to apply for work. In some of those applications—there are spelling errors, and there are errors in sentence construction, and these are folks who are out of school! And they say: "I would like to work for you." They come out of colleges and universities, still with some of those instructive deficiencies. That is what I am saying.

It is not as if we were trying to take away money from other districts for these New American Schools. We were trying to establish a whole new funding process and give it to them.

I happened to go to school on the GI bill. I could have gone anywhere—well, there might have been a few places that would not have accepted me! But, nevertheless, I did go to a fine school, and the whole thing was choice. I could have gone anywhere I wanted to—including private schools. So the concept is not novel.

What is wrong with choice? What is wrong with choice for people who are just plain tired of the educational system in the United States?

But that is a great threat, a truly great threat. Not to the Senator from Massachusetts but to the entrenched.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would make two points. First of all, the selection of these 535 schools is by the Secretary—by the Secretary.

Second, you cannot get the money in this program, you cannot get the resources unless you are going to be involved in the kinds of programs illustrated between pages 51 through 53.

If I would listen to the Senator, it appears these school districts, the tired school districts, are entitled to the $1,000. I forget whether it was the Secretary of Education, who should have known better, or others talking about what our bill did, who came up with the $1,000 for every school district. You know, it is one thing having your legislation distorted and misrepresented by those that do not know about it, but we also take some umbrage at those who should know about it.

But I do apologize. If the Senator's criticisms are all about some schools which are not performing—so be it. So be it. The fact is that that is not what this legislation is about.

I have not heard the Senator discuss the particular provisions of the requirements that are included in here, that are attempting to try and, really, enhance the educational achievement for our young people and that have been demonstrated, as we mentioned the other day, in Dade County, FL. When they went to the school management program in a district down there, they went, as Superintendent Fernandez pointed out, from the selection of one out of two teachers, to one out of seven. One out of seven. They felt they could get the best teachers in this country moving toward school-based management, reduce the number of teachers, pay them more, and involve retirees in drama, in photography, and in sports programs as assistant coaches. And their only remuneration was to be able to attend those shows—or the art classes or the drama classes or to have lunch in the lunchroom with the various classes that they were instructing.

Twenty-five thousand people in Dade County, seniors, and retirees are involved down there. That kind of program is included in this legislation. that kind of a program, I daresay, would do more than the whole 535 of the President's programs.

We have tens of thousands of individuals and private companies and corporations helping K through 4. It improved dramatically K through 4. That kind of a program is right in this legislation.

So if it is a question of reciting all the bad that is taking place in our educational system, all of us can mention that. But other than making the general statement and comment, "oh, it is business as usual, the same old people standing out in the corridor," they do not give us at least the respect of being able to debate the different provisions in this legislation. I welcome the opportunity to do so, comparing ours to the President's program. I think we are entitled to that.

I cannot debate bad schools and people standing out in corridors. What I can debate is what is included, what the hearings have demonstrated, and what we are attempting to do. No one is suggesting that spending $400 billion in education in a wide variety of forms is going to reform the system even under the President's program. I am sure the Senator is not suggesting that.

But what we are trying to do is find those particular incidents in schools, not school districts, but schools, where parents, concerned teachers, innovative businessmen and women who are perhaps a part of the American Business Association, are reaching down into those schools, are creative, are imaginative, and are fired up with zeal

and idealism. We are talking about the 40 million young Americans who are going into our public schools.

God bless those wonderful young Americans who are privileged to go to, if it is a privilege, the private schools, but this committee and hopefully this Senate and this country are concerned with public schools. We might not have all the answers, but I hope that every nickel that we have that can be appropriated is going to be used in the areas of critical need.

The Federal share of education dollars in the last 10 years has gone down 30 percent. We do not expect this to make up the difference, but I hope the indignation that is demonstrated by my friend from Wyoming is going to be expressed for those young people down in Alabama who are going to have to be reduced to 4 days a week in school because of the reduction in Federal expenditures.

I can repeat and go through—we did earlier in the week—what has happened, particularly in the South, with the withdrawal and cutbacks in Federal expenditures in schools. This is not going to make up for that. This is not going to make up for that today. But what we can do is, with the kind of situation that the Senator has recognized, bring about spark and light from people at the grassroots, and they ought to be encouraged and that is what this legislation does. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I want to be very clear in stating that there are some very good things in this bill, S. 2. I was talking about some of the amendments. The fact that they represented the very small amounts of money. They were demonstration projects—minuscule attempts to do something different.

I certainly concur that the Senator from Massachusetts put in a tremendous amount of time on this legislation. He has held the hearings. I am not on the Labor Committee which oversees education. These views are mine and mine alone. They are not part of the Republican minority on this side of the aisle. These are views of mine in watching the education system.

I voted to establish the Department of Education. I took a little flak for that out in my country. I voted for that because I thought that we could limit some of the administrative overhead and even the salaries of some of the people under the various chapters of the federal education system. That went aglimmering.

The administrative costs involved in the Federal education system are absolutely tremendous. The Department of Education budget, I believe when I voted for—I think this is true and I ask my friend from Massachusetts, if I could, and I am not sharpshooting, but seeking inquiry—I believe when I voted for the Department of Education to be established that they said that the budget for the year would be $900 million. That was in 1979. The Department of Education total budget this year is $26 billion. What do we have to show for it? That is all I am saying.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield on those facts? We had the Guaranteed Student Loan Program worth $13, $14 billion operating during that period of time. I do not know what was considered part of the budget at that time and what was considered out. I do not have those figures right there. But the Guaranteed Student Loan Program was in effect when the Department of Education was formed.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, that may or may not be, but I do remember very distinctly that during the budget year of 1979, Education Department included an entire unrelated program of jobs, which bloated it again. There were a lot of materials and things that happened as we watched the education budget grow administratively. I think the people of America must remember that only about 8 percent of the entire education budget in America comes from the Federal Government; about 8 percent comes from the Federal Treasury.

I want to conclude that there are some good ideas in the New Schools Improvement Act—S. 2. The bill called for a $2 million investment to reinvent a national education goals panel. That was the same idea, the same panel that President Bush set up in 1990, following the education summit.

S. 2 was built on the creative ideas of the President. I think that is remarkable and it is the way it should be. But what we are talking about is not the abandonment of America's public schools as Senator KENNEDY has stated.

There seems to be more concern being expressed about the survival of public schools than the survival of some of our children in America. I am not saying all public schools are bad. I am saying that some of them are. I am also saying that some private schools are bad. But they can be improved. And why not take the little leap for a million bucks for one New American School in every congressional district, a little leap of faith and let them try some new things? Let the educators, State departments of education, and the community and business leaders try some new ideas, creative ideas.

Let me tell you, I have heard the comments about business being involved in the privatization of the schools. That is not a correct statement. Business ought to be involved in the education of our citizens because business in America will not be able to hire some of these dunderheads unless they change the same. Unless business has not figured it out, there will be no business in the United States of America when you have an illiterate society of people who are not receiving a proper education.

Why would business not be involved? They would simply be unable to function and they have understood that. The Japanese, I hear that talked about all the time—largely in opposition to the President—and the Japanese situation and the fact we cannot compete. There is a reason for that. We all know that our citizens would never follow the Japanese education plan. There would never be the discipline. No parent in America would want to do that. They would not want to do that with their children in that way.

So we have a bill before us. We will have some more votes. There will be a conference committee. There will be a final vote here. I do not know what the President will do with this measure, whether it is so far from his original idea or that of the Secretary of Education.

There will be good things there. There will be bad things there. There will be disappointments. There will be victories. It took a long time to do it, but all I am interested in is when we are finished it would seem to me we ought to try a little something different because whatever we have been doing as business as usual—let me define that again, business as usual is "Give us more money and we will give you an educated citizen," and that bargain was broken." Every single test, every single survey shows that that bargain was not kept. I say since that bargain was broken let us try something new.

We will never get it on the scale those on our side of the aisle want to a have, but maybe we could do it in some type of compromise where you could get a few bucks for new things, new ideas to do something we all agree we want to do, and that is having a better educated population in the United States as we face a tremendously competitive world.

I thank the Chair.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JANUARY 27, 1992

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until 12 noon on Monday, January 27; 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 that the Senate then resume consideration of S. 2, the education bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY, JANUARY 27, 1992

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order, the Senate will now stand in

recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

Thereupon, at 3:20 p.m., the Senate recessed until Monday, January 27, 1992, at 12 noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NEARLY $63 BILLION IN U.S. ARMS EXPORTS IN FISCAL YEAR 1991

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1992 the Committee on Foreign Affairs received a quarterly report in compliance with section 36(a) of the Arms Export Control Act. That report includes a complete tabulation of U.S. arms exports in fiscal year 1991.

The United States sold $22.981 billion in foreign military sales—government-to-government sales—in fiscal year 1991; sold $805.9 million in military construction; and issued licenses and approvals for a total of $39.109 billion in commercial sales of defense articles and services. This is a total of $62.896 billion in U.S. arms exports in fiscal year 1991.

Transfers to the Middle East comprised $16.608 billion of FMS sales, $800.8 million of military construction, and $5.974 of commercial military sales. United States arms sales to the Middle East in fiscal year 1991 totaled $23.383 billion, or 37 cent of all United States sales of defense articles and services.

Tables from the section 36(a) report follow:

Total value of defense articles and services sold to each country/purchaser as of Sept. 30, 1991 under foreign military sales

[In millions of dollars]

Algeria	2.2
Antigua-Barbuda	.8
Argentina	13.9
Australia	229.7
Austria	32.8
Bahrain	74.9
Barbados	.5
Belgium	105.9
Belize	.2
Benin	(1)
Bolivia	[2] 30.7
Botswana	.8
Brazil	22.5
Brunei	(1)
Cameroon	(13)
Canada	170.8
Cape Verde	(14)
Central African Republic	(1)
Chad	1.3
Chile	5.9
Colombia	[5] 58.5
Costa Rica	.3
Denmark	77.4
Djibouti	[6] 1.5
Dominica	.6
Dominican Republic	1.8
Ecuador	7.6
Egypt	[7] 1,965.6
El Salvador	[8] 80.6
Equatorial Guinea	.3
Finland	(1)
France	76.4
Gabon	(19)
Gambia	.1
Germany	323.2
Greece	401.7
Grenada	.7
Guinea	.1
Honduras	[10] 9.8
India	2.0
Indonesia	38.1
Israel	370.4
Italy	77.8
Ivory Coast	.3
Jamaica	2.7
Japan	845.3
Jordan	.8
Kenya	10.3
Korea (Seoul)	448.7
Kuwait	[11] 209.5
Luxembourg	.2
Madagascar	.4
Malawi	(1)
Malaysia	4.0
Mali	[12] .2
Malta	.1
Mauritania	*
Mexico	10.5
Morocco	265.4
Nepal	.5
Netherlands	334.2
New Zealand	12.4
Niger	[13] 1.1
Nigeria	1.8
Norway	85.5
Oman	1.1
Panama	3.6
Paraguay	(1)
Peru	6.7
Philippines	165.3
Portugal	415.3
Qatar	.1
Rwanda	.1
Sao Tome and Principe	.3
Saudi Arabia	[14] 13,685.4
Senegal	[15] .8
Sierra Leone	1.0
Singapore	81.3
Spain	106.1
St. Kitts and Nevis	.9
St. Lucia	.7
St. Vincent and Grenadines	.8
Sweden	4.1
Switzerland	11.6
Taiwan	480.0
Thailand	108.5
Togo	(116)
Tonga	.3
Trinidad-Tobago	.7
Tunisia	15.4
Turkey	220.7
United Arab Emirates	17.7
United Kingdom	215.3
Uruguay	.6
Venezuela	39.3
Zaire	1.8
International Orgs	131.6
Classified totals [17]	843.7
Total	22,981.6

[1] Less than $50,000.
[2] $1,800,000.
[3] $48,500.
[4] $9,700.
[5] $922,300.
[6] $665,000.
[7] $264,300,000.
[8] $768,200.
[9] $77,700.
[10] $338,200.
[11] $146,900,000.
[12] $87,400.
[13] $223,300.
[14] $389,600,000.
[15] $124,300.
[16] $48,500.
[17] See classified addendum to CPD.

NOTE.—Details may not add due to rounding. Construction values are excluded.

LICENSES/APPROVALS FOR THE EXPORT OF COMMERCIALLY SOLD DEFENSE ARTICLES/SERVICES—SEPT. 30, 1991

[In thousands of dollars]

Country/purchaser	October to December	January to March	April to June	July to September	Cumulative
Algeria	369	4,001	315	4,621	9,306
Andorra	0	(1)	31	11	42
Antigua	0	0	0	1	1
Argentina	19,327	21,446	3,276	55,290	99,339
Australia	193,177	141,198	549,213	159,702	1,043,290
Austria	954	7,723	32,287	2,692	43,656
Bahamas	3,201	2	7	1	3,211
Bahrain	4,742	557	448	11,047	16,794
Bangladesh	365	604	10	4,358	5,337
Barbados	200	56	2	86	344
Belgium	79,229	47,151	72,177	83,752	282,309
Belize	8	3,175	5	9	3,197
Bermuda	10	23	10	24	67
Bhutan	29	14	0	40	83
Bolivia	4,348	976	1,110	152	6,586
Botswana	20	2,004	3,918	1,218	7,160
Brazil	64,321	219,412	4,311	44,854	332,898
British Virgin Islands	0	0	12	0	12
Brunei	1,313	152	587	199	2,251
Bulgaria	500	238	250	250	988
Burundi	1	0	22	0	23
Cameroon	44	0	1,648	0	1,692
Canada	7,808	186,406	61,933	20,623	276,770
Cayman Islands	2	35	1	28	66

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

59-059 O—96 Vol. 138 (Pt. 1) 17

LICENSES/APPROVALS FOR THE EXPORT OF COMMERCIALLY SOLD DEFENSE ARTICLES/SERVICES—SEPT. 30, 1991—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Country/purchaser	October to December	January to March	April to June	July to September	Cumulative
Central African Republic	0	0	5	0	5
Chad	0	0	0	506	506
Chile	19,229	6,001	6,274	41,123	72,627
China	18,830	28	2,726	3	21,587
Colombia	16,531	543	19,859	8,675	45,608
Comoros	0	17	0	0	17
Costa Rica	3,334	24	155	26	3,539
Cyprus	645	15	50	597	1,307
Czechoslovakia	0	11	84	0	95
Denmark	12,730	77,282	47,106	25,063	162,181
Dominica	(1)	0	3,865	5	3,870
Dominican Republic	1,597	3,522	606	110	5,835
Ecuador	3,542	4,025	233	6,642	14,442
Egypt	598,098	248,225	74,948	69,469	990,740
El Salvador	3,183	107	71	145	3,506
Faroe Islands	0	879	0	0	879
Fiji	7	0	25	5	37
Finland	3,131	3,775	40,977	16,614	64,497
France	119,244	679,412	250,262	159,752	1,208,670
French Guiana	70,331	16,079	79,200	55	165,665
French Polynesia	151	0	14	0	165
Gabon	301	1	477	279	1,058
Germany, Federal Republic of	1,616,281	218,755	1,888,407	499,736	4,223,179
Ghana	34	13	0	5	52
Greece	43,534	26,574	98,723	55,256	224,087
Greenland	1	0	0	0	1
Grenada	4	(1)	0	0	4
Guadeloupe	0	13	0	0	13
Guatemala	3,371	166	35	226	3,798
Guinea	0	38	188	91	317
Guyana	75	66	2	5	148
Haiti	0	58	3	2	63
Honduras	17,458	267	205	954	18,884
Hong Kong	4,938	529	4,017	34,018	43,498
Hungary	0	16	0	2	18
Iceland	78,003	79,136	123	20,147	177,409
India	20,247	7,161	54,640	3,100	85,148
Indonesia	50,736	66,755	26,271	72,972	216,734
Ireland	1,091	383	137,154	6,133	144,761
Israel	410,036	354,004	835,331	592,470	2,191,841
Italy	238,259	160,532	101,646	199,976	700,413
Ivory Coast	1	3	0	(1)	4
Jamaica	3,278	94	482	126	3,980
Japan	603,524	1,251,823	882,633	594,145	3,332,125
Jordan	2,780	373	1,652	10,469	15,274
Kenya	5	3,023	29	1	3,058
Korea	505,344	228,012	1,357,497	227,987	2,318,840
Kuwait	0	1,420	9,439	6,638	17,497
Lebanon	485	103	2	25	615
Liechtenstein	0	3	1	12	16
Luxembourg	5,398	51,703	22,467	26,068	105,636
Macau	6	149	25	25	205
Malaysia	58,408	18,249	28,204	63,898	168,759
Maldives	36	0	0	0	36
Mali	0	2	0	0	2
Malta	0	0	7	0	7
Martinique	0	0	0	(1)	(1)
Mauritania	16	0	0	0	16
Mauritus	0	36	0	(1)	36
Mexico	99,110	178,563	41,230	115,199	434,102
Monaco	1	(1)	20	(1)	21
Morocco	7,198	9,565	7,735	6,180	30,678
Mozambique	0	25	4	0	29
Namibia	1,552	929	272	448	3,201
Nepal	0	0	0	512	512
Netherlands	103,023	75,074	97,721	82,566	358,384
Netherlands Antilles	163	246	33	96	538
New Caledonia	4	0	1	31	36
New Zealand	36,936	71,854	27,559	6,278	142,627
Nicaragua	0	0	0	23	23
Niger	0	0	1	0	1
Nigeria	5,311	4,682	7,640	11,764	29,397
Niue	(1)	0	0	0	(1)
Norway	49,249	109,003	115,935	58,347	332,534
Oman	1,358	1,517	1,211	1,022	5,108
Pakistan	20,415	21,782	44,370	41,061	127,628
Panama	1,419	5,014	1,225	1,153	8,811
Papua-New Guinea	541	108	5	485	1,139
Paraguay	228	4,241	750	278	5,497
Peru	2,540	35,535	2,751	1,187	42,013
Philippines	27,446	2,543	15,642	33,580	79,211
Poland	0	0	25	0	25
Portugal	5,832	11,156	81,583	58,033	156,604
Qatar	243	516	998	75	1,832
Reunion	0	150	0	0	150
Romania	0	0	645	0	645
Saudi Arabia	1,182,000	162,316	515,344	476,144	2,335,804
Senegal	26	20	6	586	638
Sierra Leone	0	0	20	0	20
Singapore	113,820	20,890	72,883	101,147	308,740
Spain	141,438	98,268	110,760	64,448	414,914
Sri Lanka	3,190	634	(1)	20,623	24,447
St Helena	0	(1)	0	0	(1)
Sudan	0	8	0	0	8
Suriname	41	3	1	0	45
Svalbard and Jan Mayen	102	46	1	0	149
Swaziland	29	0	27	6	62
Sweden	71,503	18,627	39,323	63,686	193,139
Switzerland	150,623	100,651	73,791	99,254	424,319
Taiwan	329,927	251,285	234,813	301,899	1,117,924
Tanzania	1	2	90	0	93
Thailand	37,500	26,426	31,145	86,516	181,587
Togo	101	3	0	0	104
Tonga	0	0	3	0	3
Trinidad & Tobago	3,224	21	15	12	3,272
Tunisia	258	12	634	348	1,252

LICENSES/APPROVALS FOR THE EXPORT OF COMMERCIALLY SOLD DEFENSE ARTICLES/SERVICES—SEPT. 30, 1991—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Country/purchaser	October to December	January to March	April to June	July to September	Cumulative
Turkey	677,618	216,812	118,116	96,332	1,108,878
Uganda	4,000	0	0	0	4,000
United Arab Emirates	28,086	179,711	115,777	36,005	359,579
United Kingdom	461,293	907,413	259,300	9,865,579	11,493,585
Uruguay	660	151	3,444	2,704	6,959
Venezuela	29,771	46,992	10,006	19,949	106,718
Western Somoa	0	0	(1)	0	(1)
Yemen (Sanaa)	0	0	0	2	2
Yugoslavia	36,403	18	4,971	4	41,396
Zaire	0	0	3,002	0	3,002
Zambia	0	48	4	1	53
Zimbabwe	1,005	528	83	11	1,627
International Organizations	27,659	46,087	31,138	212,716	317,600
Worldwide total	8,577,046	6,754,050	8,779,496	14,998,803	39,109,395

[1] Less than $500,000.

Note.—Details may not add due to rounding.

Source: This information was prepared and submitted by the Office of Defense Trade Controls, State Department.

LEGISLATION TO EXTEND HEALTH BENEFIT COVERAGE TO RECENTLY UNEMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS

HON. DAN GLICKMAN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 [COBRA], requires employers to allow former employees to continue to purchase their health benefits under their former plan for 18 to 36 months after the end of their employment. The former employee pays the full cost of the coverage, including a 2 percent fee to cover the employer's administrative costs.

Recently, I hosted a town hall meeting addressing health care. Several of my constituents mentioned that because of the current economic problems it has become difficult to secure a replacement job, and soon their option to purchase health benefits under COBRA would expire. I do not believe it is right for these people to be both jobless and unprotected in the event they need medical benefits.

With this in mind, I am introducing legislation today to extend COBRA coverage to 60 months. My bill also eliminates the distinction of coverage based on how the employee-employer relationship was terminated. Presently, if an employee quits, he is entitled to twice the period of coverage that a laid-off employee may receive. That makes no sense.

The intent of Congress enacting the continuation of health benefits provision in COBRA was to ensure no American went without health coverage while between jobs. The strong economy at that time caused Congress to believe 18 months would be sufficient for a terminated employee to find new work. But the current tough economic times are keeping a greater number of people unemployed for longer than 18 months. Since Congress has extended unemployment benefits, and may do so again in the coming weeks, we also should extend the amount of time former employees may hold onto health coverage while unemployed.

This bill is a small, but important first step in helping our constituents survive these tough economic times, and will provide the security of continued health insurance to those who do not have the security of a job. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO U.S. MARINE SGT. SEAN LEWIS COCKRELL

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding individual, U.S. Marine Sgt. Sean Lewis Cockrell of Dallas, TX.

Sergeant Cockrell joined the Marine Corps Reserve in January 1983, and attended recruit training at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego. After recruit training he was transferred to Camp Pendleton, CA for Infantry Training School. His leadership abilities earned him the position of squad leader and platoon guide. After graduating in the top 10 percent of his class, Sergeant Cockrell was assigned to Company B, 23d Marines in Austin, TX, and was later transferred to Battery O, 5th Battalion, 14th Marines. In December 1984, he was accepted for assignment to active duty.

Since 1984, Sergeant Cockrell has excelled in his duties. He distinguished himself as top honor graduate from the fire finder radar operator course at Fort Sill, OK. He performed his primary duties as radar operator and assistant radar team leader, and additional duties as Headquarters Battery Regiment marksmanship training instructor while stationed at Camp Pendleton. Because of his exceptional marksmanship skills, Sergeant Cockrell was selected as a member of the 11th Marines Rifle and Pistol Team.

In 1988, serving as a corporal, he was transferred to the 12th Marines, in Okinawa, Japan, for duties as section leader. Sergeant Cockrell was responsible for the training and welfare of 30 marines. He made numerous deployments to mainland Japan and Korea supporting exercises between United States and allied nations. He was then selected as platoon sergeant for operations platoon, responsible for the training and welfare of 90 marines. In 1989, he was assigned as regimental primary marksmanship instructor. From July to November 1990, after being transferred to Dallas, TX, as regimental radar operations chief, he prepared his radar platoon for imminent combat duty in Southwest Asia.

After arriving in Al Jubal, Saudi Arabia, in December 1990, Sergeant Cockrell and his radar platoon supported the 10th Marines artillery operations. On February 24, while attached to the 10th Marines, Sergeant Cockrell's radar teams supported the main attack on Kuwait City and the liberation of Kuwait. Then, attached to the Tiger Brigade, 2d Armored Division, the radar teams helped to support the attack on the Republican Guard forces located west of Kuwait City. Exposed to continuous, hostile enemy fire, Sergeant Cockrell's radar teams distinguished themselves by identifying over 260 enemy weapons locations during a 4-hour period.

Sergeant Cockrell is now being honored as "Marine of the Year" by the U.S. Marine Corp. While serving with the Tiger Brigade, he countered Iraqi artillery fire along the highway from Kuwait City to Basra, Iraq, and helped secure control of that important strategic position. His courage and commitment during this life threatening situation have earned him this honor along with the sincere gratitude of our Nation.

I believe Sergeant Cockrell is representative of the fundamental strength and bravery that all our American troops possess. I know I speak for everyone when I say thank you for representing our country and the great State of Texas in such a courageous manner.

TRIBUTE TO THE BESSEMER AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR 70TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CLAUDE HARRIS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the efforts of the Bessemer Area Chamber of Commerce, of Bessemer, AL, as they celebrate their 70th anniversary. The city of Bessemer certainly gives credit for the growth in its economy and educational and cultural excellence in part to the chamber. Throughout the 70 years of operation, the chamber has worked toward achieving its goal of making Bessemer "a better place to live and conduct business."

Bessemer's economy is driven by various small manufacturing concerns, including fiberglass fabrication, chemical production, and machinery production. These smaller industries have worked together, helping the city in its growth toward industrial diversification. The

Bessemer Area Chamber of Commerce, which now boasts approximately 500 members, has worked with these industry leaders in aiding Bessemer's transformation from a city dominated by a few businesses to one where a variety can contribute to the city's economy.

Bessemer's 32,000 residents are grateful for the chamber's foresight and efforts in creating new business opportunities for their community. I pay tribute to this institution's goals and progress over the past 70 years, and I am confident that the Bessemer Area Chamber of Commerce will continue to prosper in the years to come.

THE DAVIS-CASTRO HOME: CARING FOR SEVERELY MEDICALLY DISABLED CHILDREN IN A HOME-LIKE SETTING

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the Davis-Castro Home for severely impaired children, its director, Pat Davis, and its program coordinator, Barbara Scheimber. The Davis-Castro Home, scheduled to open January 27, 1992, is like no other intermediate care facility in Los Angeles County: It will offer personal and humane care to children who would otherwise be confined to a State hospital while saving taxpayers almost $200,000.

Jesus Castro was physically abused and nearly drowned in a backyard pool at the home of his step-grandmother and grandfather at the age of 6. Jesus spent his remaining 4 years confined to a State hospital, nearly blind and a spastic quadriplegic. The Davis-Castro Home was created by Patricia Davis, a registered nurse and foster mother who, for a year, kept space open in her home with the hope that Jesus would live there. After Jesus died, Ms. Davis and others were determined to create a new resource so that children such as Jesus could be cared for in a homelike environment.

The Davis-Castro Home will address the needs of severely disabled children, their families, and foster families wishing to welcome one of these children into their lives. Professional staff will work with the families of the disabled, educating them with respect to the complex medical and emotional needs of such children and the psychological insights into taking care of the disabled. For children who are able to be placed at home, the Davis-Castro Home will serve as a transition house. Residents from the department of neurology at Cedars-Sinai Hospital will provide physician staffing, and the home will be staffed with 24-hour nursing care as well as physical and occupational therapists. Each child medically capable of attending school will be transported to school at a site off grounds.

The establishment of such an important innovation in the health care of disabled children deserves great praise and admiration. It is my pleasure to bring this outstanding achievement to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, and to ask that they join me in saluting the efforts and future successes of the Davis-Castro Home.

TRIBUTE TO CONGREGATION B'NAI DAVID

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this year, 1992, marks the centennial year for an important institution in the 17th Congressional District of Michigan.

Congregation B'nai David, Detroit's largest traditional synagogue, has been serving the Jewish community as a house of prayer, study, and dedicated service throughout the last hundred years. Founded by 11 Russian Jews on May 2, 1892, B'nai David is today the fourth oldest Jewish congregation in the Detroit metropolitan area.

The founders, men of deep piety and scholarship, instituted a tradition of spiritual leaders of character and learning whose dedication and invaluable counsel have continually fostered lives of service and righteousness. Over the last century, the members of the congregation have taken inspiration from their affiliation and have contributed in a variety of ways to the philanthropic and spiritual life of our community.

I wish to take this occasion to wish Congregation B'nai David many more years of service and spiritual leadership in our midst. May they go from strength to strength as they begin their second century.

THE ECONOMY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, January 15, 1992, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE ECONOMY

The economy appears to have weakened again after a modest improvement during the summer. Now a year and a half old, this recession is the longest since the end of World War II and it is hard to find grounds for optimism that a strong recovery is imminent.

Many are asking an important question, "What should we do about the recession?" We should also be asking the more fundamental question, "How can we restore healthy long-term growth and raise the standard of living of the average American family?" Some policies that look appealing for getting us out of the recession look less appealing when we consider their impact on the budget deficit and long-term growth.

Short-Term Problems and Solutions: Evidence that we have not come out of the recession is abundant. The index of leading economic indicators has turned negative and consumer confidence has plunged. Businesses have been laying off workers and claims for unemployment insurance have been rising. Most forecasts for the coming year suggest that we will have modest growth of about 2.2%, which will not be enough to lower the unemployment rate much. Inflation should remain relatively low at about 3.4%.

Primary responsibility for getting us out of the recession continues to lie with the Federal Reserve. It made a dramatic move to lower interest rates in December, cutting the discount rate a full point to 3.5%. I wish the Fed had taken this kind of aggressive action sooner, and I do not expect the economic indicators suddenly to blossom. But lower interest rates will have an important positive impact on the economy. Mortgage interest rates are coming down and housing affordability is improving. Lower interest rates make it more attractive for businesses to invest in modernization and expansion.

In principle, fiscal stimulus through increased government spending or tax cuts could be a useful complement to lower interest rates in promoting a healthy recovery. But such a stimulus package would have to be carefully targeted and clearly temporary. Reducing tax receipts or increasing spending on a permanent basis would be disastrous for the budget. The federal government is already spending nearly three dollars for every two that it takes in.

Longer-Term Problems and Solutions: Much of the short-run hardship for those who have lost their jobs can be relieved by an adequate unemployment insurance system. And recovery from the recession, however welcome, will not cure the more fundamental problems worrying the American people: poor productivity growth, declining competitiveness, stagnant wage growth, and growing income inequality.

Hourly pay of the average American worker is only 3% higher now, after adjusting for inflation, than it was at the depth of the previous recession in 1982. This stands in marked contrast to the years from 1948 to 1973 when wages grew 3% per year. Families had to work harder and longer to get ahead in the 1980s. More than in any previous period since the end of World War II, upper-income families and workers achieved disproportionate gains in their standard of living. These problems of growth and fairness were evident before the recession and they will persist after the recovery if we do not adopt more sensible policies.

The reason for these problems is not hard to find. Productivity is not growing as fast as it must to provide satisfactory growth in wages and incomes. American businesses have achieved increases in output per hour of about 1% per year over the last decade, while the Japanese have raised their productivity four times faster.

Much of the responsibility for improving productivity rests with the private sector. But government has a role to play as well. We must stop neglecting public investment in infrastructure, technology, and the quality of our workforce. And we must stop encouraging consumption at the expense of investment. The economy is not going to strengthen fundamentally until we boost saving and investment. And that won't happen until we bring down the budget deficit. Government borrowing crowds out money for private investment and drives up interest rates. It is a drain on our already meager pool of savings.

Steps to Promote Recovery, Growth, and Fairness: Congress is currently considering a number of antirecession measures. And the President will offer his own program in his State of the Union Message. I am convinced that we have to resist the temptation to

make politically popular tax cuts the centerpiece of any recovery program. Any tax cut large enough to matter for the recovery will be too large in terms of the budget deficit. And there is a real danger that we could have a taxcut bidding war between Congress and the President that would get out of hand, widening the deficit and driving up interest rates.

I do not think we need a new tax cut. But tax reform that tries to restore some of the progressivity we have lost in the last decade makes sense to me on fairness grounds. It also makes sense to implement any tax reductions for lower- and middle-income taxpayers now, when they can provide some fiscal stimulus, and to defer the tax increases that balance these cuts until a year from now when the economy is stronger.

The investment tax credit may well be the most effective way to stimulate a stagnant economy if it is instituted only on a temporary basis. A temporary credit encourages needed investment now without permanently distorting investment decisions. To minimize the budget costs, the credit could be limited to investment over and above the amounts companies were likely to invest anyway.

There is also some merit in proposals to increase grants to state and local governments as part of an antirecession package. They have seen their revenue sources dry up in the current recession. Without some relief they will be forced to cut back on their investments in infrastructure and education.

I support the moves in Congress today to cut defense spending and use the savings from Pentagon cutbacks to pay for deficit reduction and some more investment-oriented spending such as better health care, education, housing, and transportation. This reorienting of our budget priorities is critical, but I continue to believe that we must stick to our commitment to bring the deficit down.

Summary: The economy's underlying problems have been some 20 or more years in the making, and they are not easily solved. I am convinced that more than anything, the United States needs to think of its long-term needs. It is very tempting to think that the answer to our economic problems is to reduce taxes. But the real challenge is to increase national saving and redirect our public and private spending toward more productive long-term investments.

THE RIGHT TO CHOOSE

HON. JOHN W. COX, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. COX of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in defense of the right to choose. This past week, we celebrated the 19th anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in the historic Roe versus Wade case. The celebration, however, was marred by the knowledge that the Supreme Court is on the brink of overturning this vital decision. Roe set a precedent in this country saying for the first time that women had the right to a safe and legal abortion if they deemed it necessary. We all assumed the days of back-alley abortions were over and a woman's right to choose would no longer be infringed.

Unfortunately, in the last few years this right has been on a slippery slope toward extinction. A pregnant woman can no longer walk into a family planning clinic and get an honest answer when she asks about her options. The District of Columbia cannot use its own locally raised revenue to help fund abortions for low-income women. Medicaid funds cannot be used to fund abortions even in cases of rape or incest. Women stationed overseas at U.S. military bases are prohibited from getting abortions at U.S. medical facilities. And now, in light of the Supreme Court's decision to hear the Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania versus Casey case, women face a possible 24-hour waiting period and a stipulation requiring their husbands' consent for an abortion.

Frankly, I am scared for my two daughters. I was encouraged by the 1973 Roe decision, thinking they would grow up in a world where freedom of choice was a national priority. Now as I watch my daughters turn into independent women, it is impossible for me to rationalize the repression they may face. I cannot look them in the eye and tell them our country is regressing, rather than keeping step with the future.

Mr. Speaker, polls show that a clear majority of people in this country are pro-Choice. I stand here today to reaffirm my dedication to the battle to maintain reproductive freedom as a fundamental right for all women. I am hopeful that others will join me in this fight, because it will not be easy, and it may not be successful, but nonetheless it is necessary. The Justices of the Supreme Court must be aware that further infringements on rights granted by the Constitution will not be tolerated.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES C. SANDERS

HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the remarkable achievements of our friend, James C. Sanders, one of the most respected Administrators in the 39-year history of the U.S. Small Business Administration.

Jim came to the SBA after starting and building a successful small business himself, an insurance firm in California. Tapping into that insight and experience, among many other admirable qualities, President Reagan appointed Jim Sanders as the 14th SBA Administrator, a position he served with honesty and distinction for 4 challenging years.

And, Mr. Speaker, challenging may be an understatement of the tasks and tribulations Jim faced as this Government's top spokesman for small business. As I'm sure you will recall, it was during Jim's watch that the Office of Management and Budget began its quest to eliminate the only Federal agency solely dedicated to the promotion and protection of our Nation's 20 million small enterprises.

Putting aside his personal interests, and clearly recognizing the formidable forces opposing him, Jim Sanders stood up for the SBA and small business. We in Congress, and entrepreneurs across America, remain in his debt for the courageous, and successful, battle he fought.

To have simply saved the SBA from the ill-swung arc of the budget ax would be enough to warrant our recognition and thanks today, but Jim accomplished so much more, too much, indeed, to list here. But we should note a few.

Jim Sanders devoted his considerable talents to initiate programs to specifically—and uniquely—help women and minority entrepreneurs. The Office of Private Sector Initiatives was created to forge new private-public partnerships devoted to helping small businesses and the communities they serve so well. Economic development programs that focus on promoting investment in long-term, productive assets were expanded under his tenure. And it was under his guidance that the magnificent Small Business Innovation and Research Program grew wings.

Beyond these individual accomplishments, however, was the attitude Jim Sanders brought to the SBA. He approached the agency as a business, one that should serve its clientele effectively and efficiently, which meant protecting the taxpayers' dollars as well.

And he invigorated the many fine public servants at the SBA by encouraging teamwork, leadership, and creativity—and by giving managers and employees alike the room they needed to exercise those talents.

Mr. Speaker, it's a telling story that a piece of tire rubber mounted on a plaque adorned Jim's office as a reminder that it is out in the field, not in Washington, where the SBA's rubber met the road to help small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, Jim Sanders characterizes the best of what makes our country, and our Nation's small businesses, great: A commitment to excellence and the principles that guide it, a dedication to the free enterprise system, a loyalty to those who work with him, and the courage to defend them all.

On behalf of our Nation's small businesses and all of us who have had the pleasure to know him and work with him, I extend my thanks and best wishes to Jim and his wife, Maureen, as they retire to new, exciting endeavors in California.

IN RECOGNITION OF GAIL DUNCAN-CAMPAGNE, RECIPIENT OF THE STERLING HEIGHTS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CITIZEN OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gail Duncan-Campagne, who has recently been named Citizen of the Year by the Sterling Heights Chamber of Commerce. This award represents Ms. Duncan-Campagne's outstanding contributions to the business community and her dedication to her colleagues and family.

Gail Duncan-Campagne, who became president of Jerome Duncan Ford in 1991, has been part of the local business community for many years. She joined the dealership staff in 1974 and has held various positions, including director of finance and insurance, customer

service director, and director of parts and service. Gail is well known for her efforts in maximizing efficiency and building relationships with her clients and employees.

Ms. Duncan-Campagne graduated from Oakland University in Rochester, MI, with a masters degree in guidance counseling. She continued her education at the National Auto Dealers Association Dealer Candidate Academy, finishing her studies in 1983.

As a community leader, Gail Duncan-Campagne has been a part of several local organizations. She served on the board of directors and as president of the Sterling Heights Chamber of Commerce and is a member of the Greater Utica Optimist Club and Comprehensive Youth Services. She has also been honored in the past for her work with local youth.

Apart from her professional career, Gail is a dedicated wife and mother. She and her husband Paul have two daughters, Kristin and Whitney.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join with colleagues, family, and friends in honoring Ms. Duncan-Campagne as she becomes the Sterling Heights Chamber of Commerce Citizen of the Year. I wish her many more years of continued success.

TRIBUTE TO THE SOUTH BRONX MENTAL HEALTH COUNCIL, INC.

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the South Bronx Mental Health Council, Inc., and praise the innumerable contributions it has made to the South Bronx community. One of the preeminent agencies in the South Bronx which delivering services to a seriously disabled psychiatric population, the South Bronx Mental Health Council, Inc., has elected today, January 24, 1992, Patient Recognition Day. It has chosen this day to honor those patients of the council who have made efforts toward recovery and to thank those staff members who have helped make it possible.

In addition, this day will bring to the attention of the press and public the fact that person with mental illness can achieve and improve their life situation, notwithstanding difficult and challenging handicaps. In this instance, the handicaps resulting from their mental illness are compounded by the discrimination associated with being a minority group member in our society and having had to cope with the social ills of one of the poorest communities in our Nation, the South Bronx.

Throughout the past decade, the South Bronx Mental Health Council, Inc.,—the council has labored tirelessly to provide the abovementioned individuals with the care their specific circumstances require. A community-based organization located in the South Bronx since 1981, the council has the responsibility of delivering comprehensive mental health services for a population of approximately 148,000 South Bronx residents. The council is the primary mental health provider for the Mott Haven and Hunts Point catchment areas, which are among the highest in New York City in incidence of poverty, unemployment, deteriorated housing, and need for all human services.

The council's philosophy is to provide quality mental health direct treatment services that are readily accessible to, and can be utilized by, the population it services. It also provides indirect mental health services to community agencies, organizations, and services—such as schools, senior citizens centers and preschool nurseries—located in its catchment area. The council attempts to be one component of an overall human service delivery network.

The staff of the council is composed of 176 employees working in its various component parts: emergency services, inpatient services, and generic outpatient services. These services are carried out at the Lincoln Medical and Mental Health Center, the Bronx Lebanon Hospital Center, and the Bronx Psychiatric Center. The overall goal of these services is to reduce the acute symptoms of mental illness and to prevent further loss of intrapersonal and interpersonal functioning. Bilingual, bicultural professionals provide the services within an interdisciplinary team approach. The orientation of the treatment interventions takes into consideration the patient's ethnicity and culture as well as social, economic, constitutional, and medical conditions which impact and/or exacerbate the patient's mental health and overall functioning in society.

The council strives to achieve its goals through the various outpatient programs it provides to serve the community. The adult psychiatric outpatient clinic provides direct outpatient treatment services as well as consultation to agencies. The children and adolescents' services provides a wide range of therapeutic services through individual, group, and family therapy as well as crisis intervention and play therapy to children and adolescents as well as to their families. In addition, the staff works closely with the schools in the community providing therapeutic services and consultation as needed.

The school site mental health projects is a satellite clinic of the children and adolescents' services unit. This unit provides 25 hours a week of clinical services in certain targeted schools in the Bronx. The services are provided to children and adolescent students who need preventive services in order to be maintained in regular classes. The continuing treatment program is a clinic day program providing comprehensive mental health and supportive services on a long-term basis to chronic mentally ill adults. It serves patients aged 18 and over who have a history of chronic mental illness and have functional deficits which interfere with their ability to maintain stable and independent community living.

In addition to these programs, the council provides specialized outpatient services. These include the community support systems program, which functions in the same fashion as the continuing treatment program, and chemical abuse services. The various component programs of chemical abuse services are designed to provide specialized services for patients who have a primary psychiatric diagnosis and are involved with the use or abuse of alcohol or street substances.

The council also provides a community residences program which was initially developed in 1982 as a response to the demonstrated need for specialized and appropriate housing sensitive to the needs of the chronic mentally ill adult. The goals of this program are to assist residents to achieve maximum attainment of functional skills of daily living necessary to enable independent functioning and reintegration into the community. There are two components to the community residences program, a generic component and a specialized component. The generic program is comprised of four residential apartment programs which provide a homelike atmosphere, room and board, education and training in the least restrictive environment within three levels of care. The specialized program, on the other hand, focuses on the long-term residential needs of low-functioning patients that are mentally ill chemical abusers. For 2 years they are closely supervised in a program which has been formulated to move them to increased social competence in four stages.

The South Bronx Mental Health Council, Inc., provides an extremely varied and complete range of services for those members of the South Bronx community that are disabled through a major psychiatric illness. As a result, many of these individuals have had the opportunity to improve their lives and achieve their goals. Mr. Speaker, please join me today in commending the South Bronx Mental Health Council, Inc., for its absolute dedication to individuals suffering from psychiatric illnesses and, applauding its efforts to improve the situation of a previously neglected portion of our South Bronx community.

NATIONAL PARKS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, December 25, 1991, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE FUTURE OF OUR NATIONAL PARKS

On the 75th anniversary of the National Park Service (NPS), Americans can boast of a National Park System second to none. The System covers more than 76 million acres and includes 357 parks, monuments, historic sites, and recreation sites. The NPS can be proud of its success in fulfilling its mission of managing and protecting the nation's parks.

Nonetheless, our Park System faces unprecedented challenges today. It is threatened by wildlife poaching, understaffing, road deterioration, encroaching development and air pollution. Once the park rangers served only as a wilderness educator and guide and taught visitors about the natural wonders. Today they are also investigating accidents, calming domestic disputes, and fighting crime. We have to address these threats if the parks are to be as good or better 75 years from now as they are today.

History: The U.S. established the world's first national park in 1872 when the Congress

set aside 2 million acres to create Yellowstone National Park. The Congress placed this natural treasure under the exclusive control of the Secretary of the Interior with instructions to provide for the preservation of its unique resources. The founding of Yellowstone National Park began a worldwide national park movement. Today there are more than 1,200 national parks or equivalent reserves in more than 100 countries.

The Congress authorized additional national parks and monuments after the founding of Yellowstone, but no single federal entity provided unified management of the various federal lands. In 1916 the Congress established the National Park Service within the Department of the Interior to administer and preserve the National Park System. The NPS was charged with the conservation of "the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife" of the park system, and with providing for the public enjoyment of the parks.

The NPS is one of four major Federal land management agencies. The Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Land Management are also located within the Department of Interior. The Forest Service, a branch of the Department of Agriculture, also manages certain federal lands. Unlike the others, the NPS generally manages its parks to protect the resources in their natural or historical conditions; logging and other commercial development are not permitted in the Park System unless specifically authorized by law. The other land management systems allow for some degree of commercial resource utilization.

Indiana has three parks in the National Park System. The George Rogers Clark National Historic Park in Vincennes commemorates the capture of Fort Sackville from the British by Lt. Col. George Rogers Clark on February 25, 1779. The Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore in Porter County boasts dunes that rise 180 feet about Lake Michigan's southern shore. The Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in Lincoln City celebrates President Lincoln's boyhood home.

Challenges: The NPS will face many new challenges in the years ahead. Some will arise out of the inherent conflict in its mission: preserving the many natural and cultural resources in the National Park System, while providing for the public enjoyment of the parks.

One such challenge is increased visitor demand. In 1950, there were 33 million visits; in 1986 that figure jumped to 365 million. At the current rate of population growth, recreation visits to the parks will likely reach 1.5 billion by 2050. These added visitors will require expanded facilities and services, including more campsites, roads, upkeep, and rangers. The NPS anticipates that the number of automobiles, RVs and buses entering our parks will grow as well, placing additional pressures on the resources of the parks. These vehicles may further contribute to the air quality problems and other environmental hazards already threatening our national parks.

A second challenge involves future management of the Park System. The NPS and others debate how the service can manage public lands for human recreation while leaving those lands as pristine as possible. The fires that swept over Yellowstone National Park in 1988 focused attention on current NPS management policies. The NPS chose to let natural forces control the fires that consumed 900,000 acres of Yellowstone. The NPS defended its policy on the grounds that it should limit its interference with the Parks' natural ecosystem.

A third challenge concerns economic development within the Park System. There are about 560 concessions in 126 National Parks, including snack bars, luxury hotels and marinas. Critics say concessionaires have too much power and have cluttered the parks with unnecessary souvenir stands and restaurants, and some have called for limiting their access to the parks. Operators respond that they are meeting the demands of the public.

Development and resource exploration outside of park boundaries pose a fourth challenge. These activities can create environmental problems inside parks by reducing air quality, threatening water supplies, and degrading wildlife habitats. The Everglades in south Florida, for example, is considered the most endangered park in the System. Development, drainage, water diversion projects, and pollution have contributed to a 90% loss of its wading bird population over the last 50 years and threaten the long-term viability of the park.

Response: In recent years, however, both the Congress and the NPS have demonstrated a commitment to preservation and conservation in natural resource management policy. Last year, Congress authorized a program to help save the Everglades. The House recently passed a bill to give Old Faithful geyser, Yellowstone National Park's most famous landmark, added protection from proposed commercial geothermal development around the park. The National Park Service Director recently pledged his commitment to the conservation and preservation of the resources.

The National Park Service has done a good job protecting Yellowstone, Yosemite and the other parks, and introducing millions of visitors to their wonders. These parks are threatened from within by waves of visitors and economic development, and threatened from without by the advancing tide of pollution and encroachment. But they remain natural treasures, and if they are not preserved, the nation will be diminished.

DR. PAUL GEORGE, MIAMI HISTORIAN, EXPLORES MIAMI'S EAST LITTLE HAVANA NEIGHBORHOOD

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Miami historian, Dr. Paul George who was recently featured in the Miami Herald. The article "Welcome to Dr. George's Neighborhood" by Marilyn Garateix tells how the Miami historian wrote a 70-page pocket guidebook describing Miami's East Little Havana neighborhood:

One day this summer Miami historian Paul George, armed with a Dictaphone, hit the streets of East Little Havana. The result was a 70-page pocket guidebook of the neighborhood.

"This area is very close to my heart," said George, who gives tours of East Little Havana and other neighborhoods.

"The Dr. Paul George Walking Tour of East Little Havana," published earlier this month by the Historical Association of Southern Florida, traces the evolution of East Little Havana and describes the area's colorful and historic homes, businesses, churches and schools.

The book was published with a $5,000 state grant and sells for $9.99 in the gift shop at the Historical Museum of Southern Florida. It is the first in a series George plans.

East Little Havana, according to George's book, was first called Riverside. In 1905 a person paid 10 cents to cross Flagler Street Bridge from Riverside to downtown Miami. A horse carriage paid 25 cents.

In the 1930's Riverside was predominantly Jewish. That changed rapidly in the 1960s when Cubans arrived, said George, who has a Ph.D. in history.

The walking tour covers an area between Southwest Eighth Street on the south, Southwest 12th Avenue on the west and the winding Miami River on the north and east.

The first stop is Malaga Restaurant, 740 SW Eighth St. Owner Armando Fernandez thinks the book will boost business and teach people more about Little Havana.

"It's magnificent because it recognizes all of Calle Ocho," Fernandez said.

I am happy to pay tribute to Dr. George and the Historical Association of South Florida for publishing "The Dr. Paul George Walking Tour of East Little Havana" by reprinting this article. This guidebook, the first of a series on Miami's neighborhoods, will contribute much to our understanding of the history and culture of south Florida.

GUS YATRON, A GREAT GENTLEMAN, RETIRES

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was unhappy to learn that my good friend and colleague, GUS YATRON, will be retiring next year after 24 years of service in Congress.

For all of that time he has been on the Foreign Affairs Committee, serving as chairman of the Human Rights Subcommittee for the last 10 years. I've found GUS to be a real gentleman: fairminded, affable, and a man of his word.

GUS came to Congress with an interesting background. He was both an ice cream manufacturer, which may account for his sweet disposition, and a professional boxer, which served him well in his tenacious struggle for human rights around the world.

Over the years, GUS YATRON has been an advocate of a bipartisan foreign policy. He has especially devoted a lot of time and energy to the search for a just and lasting peace on the island of Cyprus.

GUS has been a conscientious and effective legislator, a hard-working representative of the people of southeastern Pennsylvania, and a good friend. I will miss him.

CONGRESSIONAL FILES ON JFK ASSASSINATION SHOULD BE RELEASED

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert for the RECORD a letter appearing in the January 4, 1992, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch that makes a strong case for the release of all Government documents relating to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. I am in strong agreement with the author of the letter, Kenneth F. Warren, a professor of political science at St. Louis University.

THE TRUTH BEHIND "JFK"

"JFK" is probably Oliver Stone's greatest movie. The movie has attracted a lot of unsubstantiated, defensive, emotional criticism from establishment types who assert that the movie is basically "cartoon history" (George Will), an assault on former President John Kennedy's memory (former President Gerald Ford) or "sensationalist claptrap" (Edwin Yoder). But the real reason it caused such a reaction is that Stone's "JFK" is certainly a lot more believable than the Warren Commission Report ever was.

A few insights from political science may help. First, the government is not in the truth business. William Safire and Hodding Carter, both former president's press secretaries, made this clear at a conference a few years ago at Washington University. Government misinformation and disinformation campaigns are commonly conducted to serve the purposes of government.

Obviously, the government does not feel it is in its interest to disclose the truth about the Kennedy assassination. Clearly, if the CIA were involved, a truthful report to the American people would have to disclose that our own government was responsible for murdering its president. What government would admit to such a nefarious act?

Second, commission reports are notorious for being inaccurate, incomplete and deceptive because they have been employed so often to serve blatant political objectives. In discussing the role of the Warren Commission, political scientist George Berkeley contends that this is a textbook example of a commission that was used to try to get the public to accept only "a particular set of facts."

Third, governments throughout history have been responsible for killing their own leaders. It happened in ancient Rome, and it has occurred many times in the 20th century. There are always some in government who believe that their leader must be stopped. We hope that we in America are above such foul play. I hope so.

But the only way to find out is to allow the files to be opened. Instead, the files that hold the secrets to JFK's assassination have been ordered closed for at least 50 years. Stone is saying: Don't believe me, but believe what is in those files that the government won't let anyone see.

Unquestionably, Stone does not substantiate every detail of the assassination. He also speculates, sometimes wildly but sometimes plausibly, on the reason for the assassination.

But Stone's "JFK" has been viciously attacked not because it's pure fiction, but specifically because his reasonably well-documented film is so powerful and quite persuasive on the very basic point that the government has tried to cover up for nearly two decades—that Lee Harvey Oswald, if he acted at all, did not act alone.

CONGRESSMAN KILDEE HONORS FLUSHING LIONS CLUB

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Flushing Lions Club of Flushing, MI, which will be celebrating its 50th anniversary at a dinner on January 25, 1992. The Flushing chapter of this distinguished civic organization was chartered in January 1942, and has provided dedicated service to its community and to the entire State of Michigan since that time. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the continuing accomplishments of the Flushing Lions Club.

The members of the Flushing Lions Club describe their organization as "50 years young," an apt description of the vitality of this particular chapter. Although the members are taking this opportunity to look back upon their 50 years of service, I know that they will wake up tomorrow looking forward to opportunities for another 50 years of service.

The projects and charitable causes the Flushing Lions have worked to support range from education and scholarships to historical preservation to recreational projects to drug awareness programs. But by far the primary recipient of Flushing Lions Club donations has been the Leader Dog School for the Blind in Rochester, MI. The Lions estimate that over the years their annual donations to this leading school, which not only trains leader dogs but also trains blind people how to use leader dogs, have exceeded $100,000, currently averaging $4,000 annually.

In the area of academics, the Flushing Lions have granted over 100 4-year scholarships for needy and talented high school students totaling more than $50,000; $3,000 in scholarships are donated annually. But the Lions' dedication to education does not end there; the club has provided funds for the Flushing High School Athletic Boosters, marching band trips, school musicals, and educational trips to Washington, DC. The Lions started the drug awareness program at Flushing Junior High School by funding its first 2 years. The club has also sponsored alcohol-free parties for students on prom nights, homecomings, and graduation nights as efforts to reduce underage drinking and driving.

In the area of historical preservation, Flushing Lions Club members have not only contributed necessary funds but also hundreds of hours of volunteer time for construction projects. In association with the Flushing Historical Society, Flushing Lions donated funds and worked voluntarily to restore the Flushing depot. Additional time and money was donated to the construction of two pavilions along the river walkway, a pavilion in the city park and a new stage and band shell in the concert area at Riverview Park. Incidentally, the Lions were an original contributor to the construction of this back in the early 1950's. The Lions regularly work on and contribute funds to beautification and recreation projects in their fair city. Additional Flushing Lions Club activities include the donation of eyeglasses to poor citizens in need of them, totaling approximately 250 pairs and $17,000 over the years, as part of this organization's particular interest in service to the blind. Each year, the club donates Christmas baskets to Flushing's poorer citizens.

Let us not think that the list of Flushing Lions Club charitable contributions ends here. It is evident that members of this club over the years have contributed time and effort to a variety of causes and needs too numerous to mention and of which no record is kept. It is part of the creed of Lions Club members and a testament to the Lions Club motto of "We Serve" to see that no civic need is ignored.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great honor and distinct pleasure for me to have the opportunity to recognize before my colleagues the contributions of the Flushing Lions Club to the greater good of their community and their State. This high-minded civic organization has provided 50 years of dedicated service and stands as a reminder of what we as private citizens can accomplish if we work together. This anniversary, which coincidentally falls on the 75th anniversary of Lions Club International, will serve to strengthen the resolve of its members to continue to provide charitable contributions for community needs in the coming years. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the Flushing Lions Club on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

RETIREMENT OF BRIG. GEN. FRANK K. MARTIN

HON. DAVID O'B MARTIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, today I want to salute a dedicated career officer, Brig. Gen. Frank K. Martin of the Air Force. General Martin is retiring after 29 years of service to our country, with 5 of those years in the position as Chief of Security Police for the more than 40,000 security force members in the Air Force. He has served with distinction as an officer in both the security police and the Minuteman missile combat crew career fields.

General Martin, a native of Ogdensburg, NY, was commissioned through the Reserve Officer Training Corps program at Cornell University in 1962. He is also a graduate of Troy State University in Alabama, a graduate of the Air Command and Staff College, a 1980 graduate of the National War College, as well as the National Defense University for Higher Defense Studies, in 1987.

General Martin has served in numerous leadership positions as a missile combat crew member, including being selected as a member of his squadron's senior standardization crew while assigned to Malmstrom Air Force Base, in 1966. While assigned to Vandenberg Air Force Base in California, General Martin served as the critical major command crew evaluator within the 3901st Strategic Missile Evaluation Squadron.

He returned to the security police field in 1974 as the Commander and Chief, Security Police for the 388th Security Police Squadron at Korat Royal Thai Air Base, Thailand. After serving as the executive officer to the Air Force Chief of Security Police in Washington, General Martin was assigned to the Tactical Air Command Headquarters at Langley Air Force Base, as the Chief of Security Police. In 1985, he was selected as the Deputy Chief of Staff for Security Police at Headquarters, U.S. Air Forces Europe. Following his selection for brigadier general, he became Commander of the Air Force Office of Security Police, and Assistant Inspector General for Security. In April, 1991, General Martin returned to the Air Force Air Staff in Washington as the Chief of Security Police for the Air Force.

His military awards and decorations include the Legion of Merit, with two oak leaf clusters, Meritorious Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters, Air Force Commendation Medal with two oak leaf clusters, Combat Readiness Medal, National Defense Service Medal with service staff, and Humanitarian Service Medal.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join me in saluting General Martin for his contributions to the security of this great Nation. It is with great pride that I congratulate him upon his retirement.

TRIBUTE TO MARTIN G. ABEGG

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a greatly respected man, Martin G. Abegg, the former president of my alma mater Bradley University in my hometown of Peoria, IL. Jerry devoted his time and energy to make Bradley the institution of academic excellence that it is today. After 20 years of hard work, Jerry is retiring.

Jerry was not your typical university president. A typical university president remains in office less than 5 years. Jerry took office in 1970 and we wouldn't let him go. He wanted to retire earlier but we just couldn't find someone as able to fill his shoes. At this point in the RECORD, I'd like to insert the following editorial which appeared in the Peoria Journal Star on January 21, 1992.

[From the Journal Star, Jan. 21, 1992]

THE MAN AND THE UNIVERSITY

At groundbreaking ceremonies for an enlarged Baker Hall, a grinning Martin G. Abegg grabbed a hard hat, hopped into the cab of the Caterpillar D6, lowered the blade and shoveled a load of dirt.

He may have surprised onlookers with what looked like a spontaneous gesture, but the truth is he'd been out practicing. Like most engineers, the president of Bradley University doesn't like to be caught offguard.

In the topsy-turvy world of higher education, where personalities rise and fall with each new school year, where fads catch themselves by the tail in the hurry of coming and going, where attention spans are measured often in days and rarely in years, Jerry Abegg has enjoyed a remarkably steady tenure at Bradley's controls. The typical university president has been in office less than five years. Abegg has been the number one man at Bradley since November of 1970.

For the most part, his years have been extraordinarily good ones for the university; 17 new or renovated buildings, an endowment grown nearly six-fold (and still too small), enrollment at a 23-year high, tougher admission standards (average ACT scores for entering freshmen have increased from 21 to 24), 13 consecutive balanced budgets. Abegg leaves a university which is better than the one he came to, and in these days of fiscal agony and educational unrest, that's something to take pride in.

Many reasons have been offered for his success, but in our minds they come down pretty much to one thing: an extraordinarily good meld of the man and the institution.

Asked to talk about Abegg, those who know him well say his values are old-fashioned and middle-American. He's honest, plain-spoken and to the point. He's neither showy nor arrogant. He identifies at least as much with the Bradley basketball fan as with the university scholar. He's not eccentric, he's not colorful, and the best anecdote a poker pal can tell about him is the occasion 40 years ago that he bought a cheap brand of beer—Bullfrog—and all the card players got sick.

He's Everyman as university president, and at Bradley that has worked. Let the other schools woo the researchers and court the scholars to decorate the university resume, if not the classroom. Let the other universities construct the presidential castles and the classrooms with the velvet swivel chairs. But let Bradley be Bradley: a place where small-town kids can get a big-time education from professors who care about teaching, and big-city youngsters can absorb some small-time values.

It may be easier this morning for Abegg to think of himself as not-the-university-president than it is for the rest of us. He tried to retire earlier but was persuaded to stay on longer, because no one who could follow his act credibly had been found. That says a lot.

AIDS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, January 8, 1992, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AIDS

The recent announcement by basketball star Magic Johnson that he is infected with the virus which causes Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) has renewed interest in this devastating disease among Hoosiers and Americans. Here are some frequently asked questions about AIDS:

What is AIDS? AIDS is the fatal disease that attacks the immune system, destroying the body's ability to defend itself against infections and cancers. The disease is caused by a virus called human immunodeficiency virus (HIV). There is no known cure, and AIDS is fatal to most victims within two years of diagnosis.

What is the Extent of the Problem? AIDS is one of America's most troubling health care problems. Since 1981, there have been more than 195,000 reported cases of AIDS in the United States and more than 126,000 deaths. These figures are predicted to rise as high as 480,000 cases and 340,000 deaths by 1993. In comparison, roughly 500,000 Americans will die from cancer this year alone, and 760,000 from all forms of heart disease. AIDS is found in almost every country in the world. Some 8–10 million people worldwide, including more than one million Americans, are infected with HIV. Some 1300 Hoosiers have AIDS, and almost 800 Hoosiers have died from AIDS.

How is it Spread? AIDS spreads several ways: intimate sexual contact, shared hypodermic needles, blood transfers from mothers to unborn child, and the introduction of contaminated blood into the bloodstream (although blood testing has all but eliminated this problem). Homosexual men account for roughly 60% of U.S. AIDS cases, but the numbers are rising among intervenous drug users, minorities, and infants. The fastest growing category is men and women who are infected through heterosexual sex. Medical experts stress that there is no evidence that HIV can be transmitted through casual contact.

Can AIDS be Prevented? According to the Surgeon General, the most certain way to control the AIDS epidemic is for individuals to maintain faithful monogamous sexual relationships and to avoid injecting illicit drugs. With no cure for AIDS, educating those at risk of infection is currently the only way to halt the spread of the disease. The Surgeon General has stated that condoms will help prevent the spread of the virus during intimate sexual contact. To reduce the risks among intravenous drug users, some public health officials advocate the distribution of clean needles as part of drug abuse treatment programs.

What is the Government Doing? The federal government is funding research, assuring access to health care for AIDS patients, and supporting public education programs. In 1991 the federal government spent more than $1.9 billion on AIDS research and prevention, up from just $200,000 in 1981. AIDS has received funding comparable to that of other major diseases. Federal spending for cancer research and prevention in 1991 was $2 billion, and for heart disease was $660 million.

Most state and local governments are also fighting the AIDS epidemic. Indiana spent more than $660,000 in 1991 for education, testing, counseling, and patient care related to AIDS.

How are Aids Health Costs Financed? AIDS cases are straining America's health care system. Estimates of the cost of caring for a typical HIV-infected patient from infection to death range from $55,000 to $80,000. Private and public costs will reach $5.8 billion this year and will almost double by 1994.

Private health insurance covers 40% to 60% of the cost for caring for persons with AIDS. Medicaid, the federal-state health program for low-income persons, covers an additional 20% to 30%, and Medicare provides 1% to 3% of costs. The remaining costs are out-of-pocket expenses paid by individuals or families. Medicaid eligibility is based on strict income and asset requirements. For Medicare eligibility, individuals under age 65 must have received Social Security disability benefits for 24 months. Thus, few AIDS patients qualify for Medicare because their average life-expectancy is shorter than the two-year waiting period.

Should There be Mandatory Testing? All donated blood is now screened for HIV and

testing is mandatory for military personnel and federal prisoners. There is broad agreement that individuals at high risk of contracting HIV should seek testing.

Most experts resist plans for sweeping, mandatory testing, such as testing all applicants for marriage licenses or all health care workers. They are concerned that, because of the stigma of the disease, mandatory testing will drive away high-risk individuals who most need counseling or medical treatment. In addition, HIV blood testing is expensive. A typical HIV screening test costs $50 to $100, and testing would mean spending an enormous amount of money to uncover a small number of infected people.

Federal, state, and local governments have developed workplace standards to protect workers and patients against the spread of blood-borne diseases such as AIDS and hepatitis. These safety standards encourage health care workers to test voluntarily for HIV, and are supported by almost all national health care organizations.

Are AIDS Victims Treated Fairly? Americans with AIDS or HIV have suffered various forms of discrimination, including the loss of job, home, and insurance. The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicap (including HIV infection and AIDS) in most private sector employment, in public service, in public transportation, and in restaurants, theaters, and office buildings.

What Progress has been Made? Progress has been made in fighting AIDS, and a great deal has been learned about the disease since its discovery eight years ago. Scientists know how to prevent it, know the high risk groups, and know what can and cannot be done and what should be done in research and treatment.

Still, many things remain to be learned: why the virus may remain dormant for years before it suddenly begins its destructive course; why the AIDS epidemic marches erratically, explosive in some regions and moving slowly in others; and why the antibodies the body produces against HIV do not stop the invader as antibodies do against other microbes.

The AIDS crisis will get worse before it gets better. As the heterosexual population is exposed, the number of AIDS cases will continue to rise. Most experts believe an effective AIDS vaccine will not be available for many years.

JAMES ROSE PATTERSON HONORED FOR 50 YEARS OF SERVICE TO HIS COUNTRY

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to recognize Mr. James Rose Patterson, who was recently featured in the Miami Herald for his 50 years of service with the Federal Government. The article "Air Controller Honored for 50 Years of U.S. Service" by Ana Acle tells how he served his country for more than a half century:

It was the day after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor when James Rose Patterson submitted his employment application with the U.S. War Department.

He was 17.

Monday, Patterson was recognized for 50 years of service with the federal government including his work with Federal Aviation Administration at the Miami Air Route Traffic Control Center.

"I'm really moved by this recognition," Patterson said. "It has exceeded my wildest expectations."

He went to work to help the war effort, he recalled.

"It was very upsetting times to think that these people attacked us," he said. "We knew we were going to be in a very long war. Everyone was excited."

His application was accepted, and he went to Fort McPherson in Atlanta to work as a junior communications operator. Two years later, he worked with the Federal Communications Commission in the radio intelligence division. Wanting to work with aviation, he went to the FAA in 1944.

A love for airplanes brought Patterson and his wife, India, together. Patterson met India when she was working in the communications station in Miami. They married in 1947 and now live in Kendall.

Patterson said his greatest accomplishment has been rearing his four children. His son, Sgt. James Ray Patterson, is stationed in Germany, where he works as a Patriot missile technician and a controller with the U.S. Air Force.

His daughters are Karen Bakes, of Homestead, and Lise Patterson and Marcia Galigani, both of Gainesville.

Garland P. Castleberry, regional administrator of FAA's southern region, congratulated Patterson at the ceremony: "Patterson has exhibited qualities of patriotism, integrity and dedication throughout his entire career of 50 years, and we, the FAA, congratulate him on this accomplishment."

I am pleased to pay tribute to Mr. Patterson and the Federal Aviation Administration, which he served through most of his career, by reprinting his article. Since the day after Pearl Harbor when he signed up to help our Nation's war effort, he has demonstrated his patriotism by his dedicated service to our country.

DRUG-RELATED TERRORISM PREVAILS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert for the RECORD a recent article in the Washington Post by Douglas Farah that tells of the tragedies residents of the drug infested Medellin, Colombia, community must suffer on a regular basis. I would like my colleagues to be ever mindful of the fact that drug problems are not endemic to the United States, and while we are being bombarded constantly by the rash of crimes in our communities, we must not ever lose sight of the fact that drug related terrorism is a worldwide problem.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 9, 1991]

AWASH IN A TIDE OF VIOLENCE

(By Douglas Farah)

MEDELLIN, COLOMBIA.—Teenage Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts in blood-stained uniforms met the taxis that pulled in, with horns blaring, to the small lot in front of the emergency entrance of the hospital to unload the wounded and dying.

It was a Saturday night at the San Vicente de Paul hospital, known in Medellin as La Policlinica, where on weekends the emergency room averages about 150 gunshot victims a night. Because the hospital has no money to pay for orderlies, troops of Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts volunteer to work 12-hour shifts to unload the wounded. Ambulances are scarce, so most patients have to pay for a taxi. The bleak concrete building has no waiting room, so relatives, barred by an iron gate, wait outdoors.

"The first time I did this, I cried and everything," said Girl Scout Sandra Patricia Pulgarin, 16 as she removed her rubber gloves and wiped fresh blood from her uniform after taking one more patient to the emergency ward. "Now I just do it."

While drug-related terrorism has declined sharply in Medellin since leaders of the city's infamous cocaine cartel surrendered to the government earlier this year, human rights and medical workers say the violence has not declined. And La Policlinica, with few resources, is fighting for survival in one of the most violent cities in the world.

A hospital study released last month said that in Medellin there are 320 homicides a year per 100,000 inhabitants—about 6,000. In the United States, the national figure is 12 homicides per 100,000 people, and Washington, with 483 homicides last year, has about 80 per 100,000.

Most of those who arrive at the hospital here are men between 15 and 30 years old from comunas, the poor neighborhoods that ring the city. Gang fights, skirmishes with the police, drunken brawls and fights over drugs and women all contribute to the flow of patients.

By 1 a.m. on the recent Saturday night, patients waiting to be treated had filled the stretchers, so new arrivals were carried on whatever the volunteers could find.

Following the arrival of "another package," as the bodies are called, Pulgarin disappeared behind the iron gate that keeps visitors from entering the emergency room and emerged a moment later, carrying 2-year-old Catarina, whose mother had been shot in the chest by her father.

The child had refused to let go of her mother's hand in the taxi, and Pulgarin pried her loose and hugged the trembling girl in the parking lot, eventually coaxing her to drink a cola and eat some chips. Relatives arrived about an hour later to take her away.

The dimly lit parking lot was splattered with dried blood. Relatives and friends waiting for word on the fate of loved ones sat on the ground or whatever surface they could find.

Vendors sold coffee, snacks and cigarettes, while late-night hangers-on, morticians hustling business and morgue workers lounged against the wall. Occasionally, the murmurs were interrupted by the sharp cries of those being informed of a death or by chatter of patients being discharged.

A long hearse-like vehicle was backed up to the morgue doors, and three bodies were loaded. Four more were inside awaiting identification.

Asked if the night was unusually gruesome, a morgue worker replied: "No, this is Saturday. Seven, 10, 15, 20 dead is normal here."

After discharging their passengers, taxi drivers are often unable to collect the fares, and they stay for a while, cleaning the blood off the back seats. The single policeman on duty asks each driver who arrives with a gunshot victim for the location and circumstances of how the body was found. Most give the shortest possible answer to avoid involvement, then head back into the night.

A young intern working the 36-hour weekend shift said that Saturday, when more than two dozen wounded arrived between 10 p.m. and 1 a.m., was actually relatively quiet but that he was one of only a handful of doctors the hospital could afford to have on duty.

"We have no resources to do this work," the doctor said as he slumped in a chair in a small cafe, smoking and drinking a cola during one of the few breaks he would grab. "I can only operate on maybe three or four people a night, the same as the other physicians. The rest have to wait, and, I am sorry to say, many die while waiting."

Orlando Londono Ospina, director general of the hospital, asked last month that the city build a new "war hospital" to deal with the overwhelming flood of emergency victims so that La Policlinica could concentrate on important non-emergency treatments.

"The congestion is such that with only 40 beds in the emergency ward, only the most extreme cases are placed there," Londono said at a press conference. "Regular patients get a mattress in the hall, and those with wounds that are not too serious get treated as they lie on the floor on a blanket."

The intern put out his cigarette and prepared to go back to work. "We lack everything here that you can imagine," he said. "We all do the best we can, but as you can see, sometimes that is not enough."

NATIONAL EYE DONOR MONTH

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of Congress have helped make possible the enormous humanitarian and economic benefits of eye, organ, and tissue transplantation: lives saved, bodies repaired, sight restored, and thousands of men, women, and children returned to the workplace, classroom, and community life. Our support of eye donation, in particular, has had a dramatic impact.

Thanks to increased public awareness of the benefits of eye donation, a record number of humanitarian-minded citizens are choosing to pledge their eyes to be used after death for sight restoring surgery and eye research. In 1990 more than 86,000 donor eyes were procured by eye banks across the United States and Canada. Of this number, the Eye Bank Association of America [EBAA] reports that over 40,000 were used in other sight enhancing surgical procedures, and in important research projects to speed the day when thousands of persons with other types of blindness also might have their sight restored.

Since 1961, when the EBAA was founded, more than 390,000 corneal transplants have been performed with a 90-percent success rate, making this surgery the most frequently performed of all transplant procedures. Persons who have received the precious gift of sight through this surgery have come from all walks of life and all parts of the country, and include a 9-day-old infant and a 103-year-old great-great-grandfather.

The EBAA is coordinating activities across the United States and Canada through its 97 member eye banks to increase eye donation, expedite research, and maintain high medical standards for obtaining, medically screening, and delivering corneas for transplant.

Despite this remarkable effort, men, women, and children still wait in darkness because of a shortage of eye donations. Eye banking experts are convinced that one of the most effective means for increasing donations is to increase public knowledge of the donation process. They point out that many citizens do not realize that all eyes are acceptable for donation, regardless of the donor's age or quality of vision.

Therefore, it is fitting that we in Congress inform the public of the need for eye donations and encourage more Americans to become organ and tissue donors, as we have done every year since 1983. We do so by designating March 1992, as "National Eye Donor Month" and calling on all citizens to support this humanitarian cause.

IN HONOR OF ROCKO M. FASANELLA, M.D.

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, few doctors have made such important contributions to the medical profession, both locally and globally, as Dr. Rocko M. Fasanella. As a world-renowned surgeon in ophthalmology, a medical scholar, a dedicated teacher, and a leader among his colleagues, Dr. Fasanella has helped countless patients and been a source of great pride to the community of the third Congressional District of Connecticut. The Italian American Historical Society of Greater New Haven recently honored Dr. Fasanella with a Distinguished Service Award, and I join them in paying tribute to Dr. Fasanella and his lifetime of achievement. New Haven's Italian Americans are a close-knit community and all of us feel a special pride and admiration for the accomplishments of this outstanding individual.

Rocko Fasanella grew up in Trenton, NJ, where his parents had settled after immigrating from San Fele, a village not far from Naples, Italy. He received both his B.A. from Yale College and his M.D. from Yale University School of Medicine, beginning his outstanding career in the greater New Haven community. He completed postgraduate work at the University of Pennsylvania, and received an honorary doctorate of human letters from Sacred Heart University. He has frequently been honored by American and European medical societies for his contributions to medicine.

After serving as a medical officer in World War II in the European Theater, Dr. Fasanella returned to the Yale Medical School as its first, and youngest, chief of ophthalmology. As a professor of medicine, he trained students who now head the staffs of medical centers in Peru, Los Angeles, Baltimore, Hawaii, and Texas.

Both the United States and the international community have benefited from Dr. Fasanella's expertise and accomplishments. Medical students in this country and abroad use the four ophthalmology texts Dr. Fasanella has edited, which have been translated into several languages. He has also made important contributions to the New England Journal of Medicine and the Journal of Ophthalmology.

Dr. Fasanella has traveled all over the world as a guest lecturer, to share his expertise on many crucial ophthalmological procedures. These include the Fasanella-Servat surgical procedure; a fixation suture for crossed eyes; modifications of nasal lacrimal surgery; use of cryoextractor in cataract surgery; introduction of innovar, the Finnish anesthesia; research in Blepharospasm, and many other critical advances in the field of ophthalmology.

In addition, Dr. Fasanella has distinguished himself among his colleagues by devising new ways to share American medical knowledge with the developing world. With this purpose in mind, he founded the Caribbean Ophthalmology Society, whose objective is the spread of knowledge from the world of medicine to Central and South American communities. Here in the United States, Dr. Fasanella is a charter fellow of the American Society of Ophthalmology Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery.

Rocko Fasanella is a source of pride and inspiration to all of us in the Italian American community and Connecticut's Third District as a whole. It is with great pleasure that I congratulate him on his achievement and wish him continued success in the future.

PINELLAS COUNTY SCHOOLS VOLUNTEER PROGRAM NAMED NATIONAL POINT OF LIGHT BY PRESIDENT BUSH

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to report to my colleagues that President Bush this month has recognized the thousands of volunteers of all ages who have contributed to the success of the Pinellas County Schools Volunteer Program as his 668th Daily Point of Light for the Nation.

This is an outstanding model program in which volunteers provide tutoring, mentoring, motivational support, one-on-one counseling, and classroom assistance to enrich the education of 93,000 Pinellas County school students.

It is just one more example of how Pinellas County leads the Nation in innovative programs to improve the education of our children and the quality of life for our residents. The 17,000 students, parents, senior citizens, corporate employees, and other participants who have made this program such a success symbolize the spirit of volunteerism which has transcended our Nation's history.

The volunteer program began in 1981 and last year alone provided 865,000 volunteer hours to the schools, one-third of which were one-on-one instructional sessions with students.

In saluting the volunteers of Pinellas County Schools Volunteer Program, President Bush

said they exemplify his belief that, "From now on in America, any definition of a successful life must include serving others."

Volunteers serve in 130 Pinellas elementary, middle, and high schools, meeting at least once a week during school hours with selected students. They provide support, encouragement, and self-esteem to students through tutoring and mentoring activities including art, computer, and music programs. Youth motivators are also matched with students needing extra attention and friendship to provide advice and support during weekly meetings.

The program has been an outstanding success as demonstrated by a 1989 survey of 200 middle and high school students who were matched with tutors found that 89 percent of the students improved at least one letter grade over the previous year, that classroom attendance improved for at least 75 percent, and that 92 percent exhibited greater self-confidence during interviews with teachers and guidance counselors.

Mr. Speaker, the volunteers in this program who have provided support and motivation to thousands of Pinellas County students are symbolic of our Nation's history of providing assistance to neighbors in need. Through their work and generosity, they have helped better the qualify of education for our students which provides the foundation upon which our community and our Nation will grow and prosper.

SHORT-TIME UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which encourages States to establish and implement short-time compensation [STC] programs. The 14 States that have used this alternative to help employers and employees when a company is facing a downturn in business have found it a helpful way of continuing business and retaining skilled workers.

The possibility of using STC, its other names are short-term compensation and work-sharing, has been around since 1978. Where the program has been used, it has a good proven track record. It seems not to have been adopted by more States or used by more companies in States that have adopted the program because it is not well known. My hope in introducing this bill during the present recession is to call attention to this alternative that is less painful than employee layoffs or plant shutdowns.

The bill reiterates that there is nothing in Federal law that precludes the adoption and implementation of a STC program as part of the unemployment compensation law of any State. It also states that STC shall be treated for Federal statutory purposes as an unemployment compensation payable for partial unemployment. This means that if a manufacturing company has a 20-percent drop in sales it may reduce all workers' hours by 20 percent rather than reduce its work force. The employees will verify their hours at the plant and the unemployment insurance office will do the rest. The employees will receive 80 percent of their usual wages from their employer and 20 percent of their unemployment benefits.

In order to assist States in developing and implementing STC programs, the bill requires the Secretary of Labor to develop model legislative language by January 1, 1993 and to update it periodically. In addition, the Secretary shall provide technical assistance and guidance in developing, enacting, and implementing such programs. Last, by January 1, 1995, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of this legislation and periodically update this evaluation.

Knowing that we have a way to go to get out of this recession and that STC programs offer employers a viable option to losing valuable employees, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

HONORING CUBAN PATRIOT, HERO AND POET JOSE MARTI

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my distinguished colleagues to join me today in honoring Jose Marti—Cuban patriot, hero, and poet.

Jose Marti's writings and spirit have served as an inspiration for Cubans who successfully fought for independence from Spain at the turn of the century, and for those today who seek to bring freedom and democracy to their homeland.

I am especially aware of the importance of Jose Marti to the people of my congressional district of Hudson County, as we have the second largest concentration of Cuban-Americans in the United States, outside of Miami.

These Cuban-Americans often talk of the great works of their self-sacrificing patriot, Jose Marti. On Thursday, the people of Union City gathered to honor Marti and to raise the Cuban flag above city hall. This Sunday, the people of west New York will also gather to honor Marti.

These Cuban-Americans faithfully honor Marti each year because the values he held dear—freedom, liberty, and democracy—are those embodied in the spirit of the people of both Cuba and America.

As this great body deliberates on how to best help the people of Cuba, it would be wise for us to consider the vision of Jose Marti, who saw the desperate need for Cuban self-determination, free from the ravages of a military dictatorship.

Jose Marti, born January 28, 1853, was able to transform his vision for a free Cuba into stirring writings and poems. He was a frequent contributor to newspapers in North, South, and Latin America. His thoughts and words prompted a longing for freedom in the hearts of oppressed peoples not only in Cuba, but throughout the world.

Jose Marti followed his words with concrete actions and led groups opposed to Spanish rule of Cuba into the war for independence. He made the ultimate sacrifice for his homeland on May 19, 1895. Only earlier in the year, Marti had called for hostilities against the Spanish to resume.

Never one to let others fight the battle for freedom, Marti engaged Spanish troops in a skirmish at Dos Rios in the Oriente Province. It was here that he gave his life.

Even after his death, Jose Marti's spirit and hope for a free Cuba lived on in his compatriots.

That same spirit can be seen again today within opposition groups in Cuba and the Cuban-American community in Miami and in my congressional district of Hudson County.

I am sure that were Jose Marti alive today, his would be the loudest voice in denouncing the regime of Fidel Castro. For while Marti wanted a Cuban leader to govern the Cuban people, he never wanted a despot to lead them to ruin.

Marti proved this point during the early 1880's, when he withdrew from the Cuban independence movement because he felt it was straying toward an effort to install a military dictatorship in his beloved Cuba.

Marti resolved his differences with the movement a few years later, but his actions stressed the need for power in a Cuban-run government to lie with the people.

As we all know, this is certainly not the case in modern day Cuba, where one can be imprisoned for speaking out against the regime in power and human rights abuses take place every day.

I believe that Jose Marti, if he were alive today, would be appalled at what has happened to the Cuban people.

And so Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my distinguished colleagues to join me today in honoring Jose Marti. But I also ask that like Jose Marti, you transform these thoughts into action, and do everything in our power to help the Cuban people fulfill Jose Marti's dream of a free Cuba. Vive Cuba libre.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, every year for as long as I can remember, my colleagues in the House have joined me on this day to express support and hope to the Ukrainian people in celebration of Ukrainian Independence Day.

This year, however, is a most special celebration as we join the people of the Ukraine and Ukrainians throughout our Nation and celebrate their perseverance, courage, and strength which finally has brought them their freedom and independence. After years of living under the domination of numerous regimes including the Soviet commissars, with only the briefest interludes of nationhood, Ukraine is again an independent nation.

Ukraine's newfound independence is a result of the will of its people and an extraordinary session of the democratically elected Ukrainian Parliament following the ill-fated coup attempt in the Soviet Union. During this

session, the Parliament proclaimed the independence of Ukraine and the creation of an independent democratic Ukrainian State. On December 1, 1991, the freedom-loving citizens of Ukraine overwhelmingly confirmed the independence declaration in a Republic-wide referendum, and for the first time in their history voted for a President from a field with real choices.

Mr. Speaker, 74 years ago today the Ukrainian Central Rada issued the Fourth Universal proclaiming a free and independent Ukrainian National Republic. The Fourth Universal embraced the principles of freedom, democracy and self-determination. The Ukrainian National Republic it created guaranteed basic freedoms of speech, press, religion, and assembly, as well recognizing the rights of minorities.

Today, the newly independent Ukraine remains committed to these same causes. The democratically elected government has created a multiparty election system in which all are free to participate, and the Ukrainian Parliament has approved legislation which guarantees equal rights to all ethnic groups in Ukraine, including provisions for the use of more than one language in areas with significant minorities. In addition, Ukrainian President Kravchuk has declared Ukraine's intention to follow the highest international standard on human rights.

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 212, which calls upon our Nation to fully support and recognize Ukraine's independence, I was very pleased when on Christmas night, President Bush granted that nation full United States diplomatic recognition. President Kravchuk acknowledged U.S. recognition on January 2d, and our two nations since have begun establishing diplomatic relations and building new ties.

On this special day I would reiterate the important role the Congress and the American people have played in supporting the people of Ukraine during their long, valiant, peaceful, and democratic transformation to independence and in their efforts to cast off the yoke of communism. Clearly we benefit by having a stable, democratic and prosperous friend in that region of the world. Moreover, by supporting Ukraine's independence, we remain true to our values and our traditional support for freedom and self determination.

Mr. Speaker, during this celebration of freedom and independence, let us also remember the millions of Ukrainians who fell victim to years of Soviet oppression and know that their sacrifice was not in vain. For as hard as the dictators of the Soviet Union tried to extinguish the burning flame of freedom in the people of Ukraine, we knew all along that their efforts would fail and that freedom would reign. The lesson from this latest chapter of history is that once again freedom has won out over tyranny and oppression and the Ukrainian people have regained the most basic of human rights.

JAMES KNUPPE WORTHY RECIPIENT OF MARTIN LUTHER KING COMMUNITY AWARD

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1992, the NAACP and the city of Hayward will present Mr. H. James Knuppe with the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Community Award. Mr. Knuppe is being so honored for being a unifying force in a diverse community.

As a pioneer in the ministorage industry, Jim's first AAAAA Rent-A-Space facility was opened in 1970, in Alameda County. It is now one of the largest individually owned and operated self-storage chains in the country, with a total of 10 well-constructed, attractive, award-winning site, 9 in California and another in Hawaii. Jim also began and participates in a number of regional and national self-storage associations.

Jim is licensed as a general contractor in both California and Hawaii. He holds the title of a certified professional builder and is also a 14-year life director of the National Association of Homebuilders.

Since the inception of his business, Jim has been unpretentiously encouraging a policy of nondiscriminatory hiring. His efficient, tightly knit organization is successfully run on a day-to-day basis by himself, his son Michael, and a talented multiracial staff.

A dedicated Christian businessman, Jim is also a deacon at Palma Ceia Baptist Church, and a member of the Gideon. He has built two churches in Hayward.

Jim and his wife Bobby have been married for 38 years and have 3 children and 7 grandchildren. In addition to his enthusiasm for model trains, Jim has established 11 aviation world records while pursuing the hobby of flying.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute the achievement of H. James Knuppe for promoting harmonious community relations while building a successful business.

HONORING A LIFE OF DEDICATION TO INTERNATIONAL SERVICE, DUMOND PECK HILL

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine and former chief counsel to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Dumond Peck Hill, died recently and I would like to honor the memory of this man who dedicated much of his life to international service.

Although Peck Hill left a position in Government many years ago, he continued to participate both professionally and on a volunteer basis in people-to-people programs linking countries and their leaders.

One organization to which he was particularly close was the Partners of the Americas. Partners recently voted to have its Volunteer of the Year Award—the highest recognition given annually to Latin, Caribbean, and U.S. citizens who excel in volunteer efforts—carry Dumond Peck Hill's name forever.

Partners, which was very important to Peck Hill, is the private sector successor to the Alliance For Progress, founded by the Kentucky administration to link U.S. leaders and institutions with their counterparts in 31 Latin and Caribbean countries.

Last year, I was pleased to host this organization when it celebrated its 25th anniversary in the hearing room of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Peck Hill served as the Partners legal counsel for 20 of those 25 years and it was a credit to him that the organization can point to a fine record of growth and management in its many programs.

Will we miss Peck Hill, but we know that his many contributions to international service will live on in the work he did for organizations such as Partners of the Americas.

I feel honored to have known and worked with him.

A NEW RECORD FROM A GREAT AMERICAN STATESMAN

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, our colleague JAMIE WHITTEN surpassed the 18,324 day record of service in the House of Representatives set by Carl Vinson.

It was Andy Warhol, the New York artist, who said that in the future everyone would be famous for 15 minutes.

If true, our distinguished colleague, JAMIE WHITTEN, has already had roughly 1.75 million times his quota of fame.

JAMIE came to Washington not to seek fame, but to serve his constituents and his country. He has been doing just that, faithfully and effectively since 1941.

It's hard to imagine all of the history that JAMIE has witnessed since he first came to Congress. More to the point, it's hard to imagine all the history that JAMIE has made since then. He has served this country in many powerful positions in Congress, and he has served with distinction.

He's been a forceful and authoritative presence in Congress and an excellent role model for the many Members who have learned the legislative process under his guidance.

JAMIE is a wonderful friend, a great American statesman, and a credit to the State of Mississippi.

TONY BURNS RECEIVES GREATER MIAMI CHAMBER OF COMMERCE'S "SAND IN MY SHOES" AWARD

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Mr. Tony Burns, the

chairman of Ryder System, who was recently featured in the Miami Herald for receiving the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce's 11th annual "Sand in My Shoes" award. The article "Ryder Chief To Be Honored for 17 Years of Civic Work" by Elizabeth Grudinski tells how his dedicated work for many civic and community organizations earned him the chamber's highest recognition for an individual community volunteer:

Tony Burns, chairman of Ryder System, has axle grease on his hands and sand in his shoes.

Burns—whose father operated a Nevada truck stop and who has made a career in transportation—will receive the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce's 11th annual "Sand in My Shoes" award Friday.

The award is the chamber's highest recognition of an individual community volunteer, given to the person who "best demonstrates an unequaled love and commitment to South Florida as a place to live and work."

During the last 17 years, Burns' public service has touched dozens of organizations. His work has ranged from arranging a fundraiser for the Boy Scouts to serving as chairman of the United Way of Greater Miami. Testimony of Burns' commitment comes from all levels, from movers and shakers to students and security guards.

"The guy does the right thing, and he does it from the heart," said Harve Mogul, executive director of United Way of Greater Miami.

"He is always a friend," said 16-year-old Kent Leckie, a member of Burns' church, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. "He's always there when you need to talk to him."

"He's super," said Lenny Mowatt, 71, who staffs the visitors desk at Ryder headquarters. "He treats everyone the same way. He's well-liked by the employees."

Burns downplays his role in the community. "It's not because of me personally, but because of what Ryder does in the community."

Recent business difficulties have caused Burns to cut back on national volunteer activities, while continuing his local involvement. Burns said he is spending more time on Ryder business than he did in the 1980s.

Burns has traveled a long and unlikely road to the "Sand in My Shoes" award. Born in 1942, he grew up in Mesquite, Nev., a town of 500 people 60 miles outside of Las Vegas. His family, converts to the Mormon faith, had migrated from England and settled in Mesquite in the middle of the last century.

Burns intended to work at his father's truck stop after high school, but a baseball coach arranged for a scholarship at Dixie College in Utah. After a year, Burns transferred to Brigham Young University in Salt Lake City, where he received a degree in business management. He earned a master's degree in business from University of California at Berkeley. While at Berkeley, Burns and his wife, Joyce, leased and ran a Texaco gas station to support themselves.

Burns' first job out of college was visiting Mobil gas stations and peddling gas, tires and other automotive products. He was Mobil's financial analysis manager in New York, when Jim Ryder and Bill Cullom, then of the Ryder System, lured Burns to Miami to become director of corporate planning and treasurer.

"We liked him from the first moment we saw him," said Cullom, now president of the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce.

Burns rose quickly at Ryder, becoming president and chief operating officer in 1979, chief executive officer in 1983, and chairman of the board in 1985.

Burns' tenure as Ryder president turned rocky in the late 1980s. "The last two have been challenging," Burns said, referring to Ryder's recent restructuring and downsizing of the work force from 46,000 to 40,000.

The Sand in My Shoes Award will be only one more entry on Burns' already crowded resume. It joins the honorary doctorate of public service from FIU, the Boneh Yisroel Builder of Israel award from the Greater Miami Jewish Federation, the Good Scout Award from the Boy Scouts of America, the trusteeship of the University of Miami, the membership on the board of directors of the United Way of Greater Miami and the former chairmanship of the National Urban League, among others.

A few activities are particularly important to Burns—education and other child-related programs and the trauma center at Jackson Memorial Hospital, partially paid for with a $2.5 million contribution from Ryder.

"As a philanthropic policy, the trauma center makes sense to Ryder. It will help all people, regardless of background and income. When you need it, it will be there," said Burns.

Burns and his wife, who have been married for 29 years, have three children.

Burns is the 12th recipient of the Sand in My Shoes Award; there were dual recipients last year. Past recipients include bankers Luis Botifoll and the late Harry Hood Bassett, former Knight-Ridder chairman Alvah Chapman and developer Charles Babcock.

The name of the award is taken from writer Damon Runyon, who used Miami sand in his shoes as the reason for turning down a job in Hollywood.

I am happy to pay tribute to Mr. Burns and the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce by reprinting this article. He has lived up to the spirit and letter of this important recognition, which is given to the person who best demonstrates an unequaled love and commitment to south Florida as a place to live and work.

RESOLUTION ON UNCED

GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution on U.S. participation in the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development—UNCED—or otherwise referred to as the Earth Summit.

The purpose of this resolution is to convey to the world community and the administration the importance Congress attaches to this unprecedented and critical conference. It is essential for the Congress to play its rightful role to ensure the Earth Summit is successful.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, which has jurisdiction over the global environment, I have conducted several hearings on UNCED. The resolution is a result of these hearings.

UNCED will review 20 years of U.N. efforts to improve the environment and will attempt to establish an international agenda for action for the rest of the decade and into the 21st century—called Agenda 21. It will be held in Brazil in June 1992. It comes 20 years after the first U.N. conference on the environment—the Stockholm Conference—which subsequently established the United Nations Environment Program [UNEP]. All U.N. members are expected to attend UNCED, to discuss means of halting or reversing deleterious global trends, which can only be addressed through multilateral efforts. It is anticipated that the conference will be attended by hundreds of nongovernmental organizations.

Some of the major issues which UNCED is expected to address include climate change, oceans and coastal area pollution, hazardous wastes, dangerous chemicals, freshwater pollution, biological diversity, desertification, soil erosion, and deforestation. It is anticipated that two conventions, one on climate and another on biological diversity, which are currently being negotiated, will be ready for signature at UNCED.

The other, and equally important aspect of UNCED, will be to deal with the developing needs of poorer countries. Since environment and development are inextricably linked, UNCED will endeavor to reduce poverty by promoting sustainable economic growth and encouraging sound environmental management in the developing world. Helping developing countries become more energy efficient with an emphasis on renewable energy resources will be a key issue.

In addition, the conference will seek to develop a better legal framework and institutional structure for effective global action, decision-making, and compliance will respect to the global environment. Financial resource issues will also be discussed.

A series of Preparatory Committee [Prep Com] meetings were held to attempt to negotiate proposals for action at UNCED. The final Prep Com is scheduled for New York in March. A great deal of substantive work must be done there for a successful UNCED.

The issues at Prep Coms have been divided into three working groups: Working Group I deals with climate change and atmosphere, and land resources including biological diversity, forests, and biotechnology; Working Group II handles oceans and seas, freshwater resources, wastes, and toxic materials; Working Group III addresses legal and institutional matters.

Each country is supposed to prepare a national report providing basic information on the existing situation in the country in terms of interactions between the development process and the environment. The reports should highlight national economic and sectoral development plans, environment and natural resource problems, and actions to solve them, including policies and programs.

The resolution urges the President to attend the conference and give it the highest priority. The measure also urges the administration to support the signing of the conventions on climate and biological diversity, the development of a strong legal framework with appropriate institutional mechanisms, the establishment of global goals to slow deforestation, the consideration of appropriate financial arrangements to facilitate sustainable growth through sound environmental management, and the enhance-

ment of energy efficiency initiatives with an increased priority on renewable energy resources for developing countries.

The resolution reads as follows:

H. CON. RES. —

Whereas global environmental and development issues such as climate change, depletion of the ozone layer, the disposal of hazardous chemicals, deforestation, the loss of biological diversity, marine pollution, threats of the world's supply of freshwater, and global population growth, are high priority concerns of the United States, affecting the security and well-being of present and future generations;

Whereas reducing poverty and promoting sustainable economic growth and sound environmental management in the developing world are also high priority concerns of the United States;

Whereas these urgent global environmental and developmental challenges will require increased international cooperation between developing countries and developed countries, as well as strengthened international institutions;

Whereas the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, to be held in Brazil in June 1992, represents the best opportunity in many years to reach agreements on such international cooperation; and

Whereas the role of the United States in the negotiations on the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development is crucial to its success: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States should place the highest priority on participation in the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development is successful;

(2) The United States should actively support the signing of international agreements that effectively reduce the threats of climate change and the loss of biological diversity and that establish a strong framework for cooperation between developing and developed countries on a wide range of environmental and developmental issues, and whose success would be reflected in the personal participation of the President;

(3) the President should make every effort to attend the Conference;

(4) the United States should seek the development of a stronger legal framework to protect the global environment, with appropriate institutional mechanisms in the United Nations system including mechanisms for settling environmental disputes and to promote compliance with existing environmental accords and any new agreements signed at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Brazil;

(5) the United States should support the effort to address the legitimate needs of developing countries for increased financial resources, new and appropriate technologies, and reduced debt burdens to facilitate sustainable growth through natural resource conservation and environmentally sound agricultural, industrial, and energy production;

(6) the United States should support initiatives to help developing countries become more energy efficient, with increased priority on renewable energy resources and more efficient transportation systems; and

(7) the United States should support global goals of slowing deforestation of primary native forests, increasing worldwide forest cover, and preserving a specified amount of mature forests.

TRIBUTE TO STEVE OWEN

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that we rise today and pay tribute to an extraordinary individual, outstanding member of the community and good friend, Mr. Steve Owen. Steve will be honored by the San Fernando Valley Board of Realtors for his devoted service as president.

During his tenure as president, Steve has played a key role in strengthening and expanding the San Fernando Valley Board of Realtors. His visionary leadership and commitment to improving the quality of life in our community has helped make the board a highly respected organization throughout the State of California.

Under Steve's leadership, the San Fernando Valley Board of Realtors has maintained its position as one of the largest and most prestigious in the Nation. Steve has improved and expanded member services without raising dues or fees. As a result of his hard work and excellent performance, he enjoys respect and support throughout the San Fernando Valley. He is a member of the San Fernando Valley board's executive committee and has chaired and served on the governmental affairs, long range planning and multiple listings committees.

It is very important to Steve that the San Fernando Valley Board of Realtors help the community it serves. Under his guidance, the first housing needs committee was established to examine and increase opportunities for low income citizens to obtain affordable housing. As a result of this unique effort the board was chosen as one of four pilot program sites by the National Association of Realtors and the National Council of Mayors for a major affordable housing project. Under Steve's direction, the San Fernando Valley of Realtors Foundation made its first grant to the L.A. Family Housing Corp.

Steve is serving his sixth year as director of the California Association of Realtors and has served on the association's legislative and scholarship trustees committee.

Besides being a successful realtor, Steve is past president of both the Mission Hills Chamber of Commerce and the Police Athletic League Foothill Division. He is director of Project Heavy, director of the San Fernando Valley Business Professions Associations and member of the Los Angeles County Tax Assessor's Commission.

It is our distinct pleasure to ask our colleagues to join us in saluting Mr. Steve Owen, an invaluable member of the community.

PRIVACY AND TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, January 1, 1992, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PRIVACY AND TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION

I have become increasingly aware of the enormous growth in technologies that intrude into our private lives. There are surveillance cameras in banks, supermarkets, and department stores. Computers gather information about our financial affairs, buying habits,and travel patterns. The government collects huge amounts of information in massive data banks operated by the Internal Revenue Service, the Social Security Administration, Census Bureau, and other agencies.

These technologies present new challenges to privacy rights. Our system of government has long recognized our general right as citizens "to be let alone". The Supreme Court has attached the concept of privacy protection to the fourth amendment of the Bill of Rights, which prohibits unreasonable searches and seizures. Federal and state laws have been enacted to protect a person's privacy from both government and business intrusions. However, the explosion of technology and computers is making it increasingly difficult to shield our private lives from such encroachments.

Privacy and the Workplace: Companies today are delving further into employees' personal lives. Several major telecommunication companies have begun monitoring not only employee telephone conversations with customers, but also their private workplace telephone conversations. While this type of monitoring may be helpful in improving employee performance with customers, it may infringe on workers' privacy rights and is being challenged in the courts. Further examples of possible privacy infringements include monitoring the keying rate of keyboard operators at data processing companies, video-surveillance cameras that scan an increasing number of workplaces, and employers trying to institute mandatory polygraph (lie detector) tests for workers. Federal law prevents employers from requiring polygraph testing of employees as a condition of employment.

Computers and Data Collection: Powerful computer systems have the potential to link data bases, including tax files, credit ratings, criminal records, bank records, telephone calls, medical records, and even the records of drugs purchased at local pharmacies. For example, every month, the big three credit bureaus purchase computer records from banks and retailers that provide detailed financial information on virtually every adult American. They possess over 400 million files on 160 million Americans. These credit agencies sell this information to smaller agencies who many times sell it to people and businesses that have no legitimate reason to see it.

My sense is that most Americans want information about them used only for the purpose for which it was collected. I am concerned that individuals have limited control over this information and how it is being used by businesses. Data merchants can put together mailing lists of enormous complex-

ity that can identify an individual's address, age, income, credit history and personal habits. New technologies will further assist their efforts. For example, supermarkets will soon accept credit cards for payment. This will enhance the ability of data merchants to link consumers' names with products they buy, and sell those names to merchandisers for targeted mailings and advertisements.

The Congress has taken some steps to bolster existing laws on privacy protection. The Fair Credit Reporting Act of 1970 was intended to bar credit agencies from sharing their information with anyone other than authorized customers. The Act also gives consumers the right to review their credit records. However, the 1970 law has major loopholes that limit its effectiveness. In response to published accounts of Judge Robert Bork's video movie rental records during his confirmation hearings, a law was enacted in 1988 to prevent retailers from disclosing this information without the customer's consent or a court order. A second law, also enacted in 1988, regulates computer matching of federal data for verifying eligibility for federal programs.

Telecommunications and Privacy: The explosion of technology in the telecommunication field poses additional challenges to privacy rights. Many Americans now use cellular and cordless phones. These products are, in effect, little radio stations and it is possible to tap most personal calls. However, there are only limited safeguards against such intrusions. While it is legal to listen to someone's cordless phone conversation, it is illegal to listen to a cellular call.

Caller I.D. is another such technology. This service, provided by many local phone companies, displays the telephone number of every incoming call on a small screen. While this service may eliminate obscene calls and fraud in over-the-phone purchases, it can be abused as a marketing tool. Businesses can use the displayed phone numbers to obtain other information about individual customers from other consumer data bases.

State and federal government have made efforts to protect consumers from such abuses. Several states have enacted laws to prohibit the service unless phone companies offer customers the ability to block their number from being displayed at all times. The Congress and President Bush approved legislation this year that prohibits the use of automated dialing machines that can call every number in a telephone exchange and then play a pre-recorded sales pitch. A bill is also pending that would regulate the Caller I.D. service by allowing callers to choose whether their number can be displayed.

Privacy in the Future: The Congress and the President must devise a better framework for safeguarding privacy rights in an era of rapid technological innovation. Current law is inconsistent and ineffective. For example, while video records are protected today, health insurance claims remain largely unprotected. I don't think most of us understand how much is known about us and how the information is collected and used.

My guess is that many Americans want the benefits and convenience of new technologies which have been helpful in, for example, curtailing workplace crime. At the same time, Americans are growing increasingly concerned about threats to personal privacy. For many years we have been concerned about big brother—the police state—watching our every move. Now we have to worry about little brother as well—employers, neighbors, merchants and marketers, all of whom have the ability to look into our lives. Most of us would agree that privacy is important to maintaining a free society, and that excessive intrusion into our private lives could threaten our basic freedoms of speech, religion and political expression as well as the freedom of families to make their own decisions.

SUK HE KIM CLOTHING BUSINESS RESTORED AFTER BURGLARY

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORDIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, Ms. Suk He Kim's clothing store was robbed from top to bottom 3 years ago. Because she did not have insurance, she was forced to close the doors of her business. Whereas many merchants have given up, Ms. Kim's determination and that of her family turned this setback into success. The Miami Herald ran an article by staff writer Ricardo J. Bascuas telling Ms. Kim's story. That article follows:

Don't let the meek voice fool you; Suk He Kim isn't easily daunted. almost three years after most of her inventory of handmade clothing was stolen, Kim is back in business.

Her new store, Suk He's Place, opened Saturday at 9869 Eureka Dr. It has taken her all this time to crochet 290 samples of her work and raise the money to reopen the store.

"This time I have insurance and this time I have an alarm system," Kim said. "But everything is in God's hands. I'm not going to worry about that."

The 550-square foot shop is filled with sweaters, dresses, skirts and christening gowns, along with flowers and balloons from well-wishers. Proudly displayed in the window is a wedding gown Kim made to replace one stolen before she could send it to the bride-to-be.

"I finished the wedding gown just for me. I had to do it all over again," the South Korean native said.

Kim's original designs are made to fit each customer. Prices for adult sizes range from $180 to $320.

When her store was burglarized on Valentine's Day 1989, Kim, who had no insurance, was forced to close down. She then began photographing weddings and parties.

Cindy Najul, who owns Cindy's, a gift shop, arranged for Kim to take pictures of a wedding for which she was doing the floral arrangements.

Cindy's 20285 Old Culter Rd., was next door to Kim's old store.

"She told me she took pictures and I said, 'Hey, you want to make some money?' And then she went more into photography down the road," Najul said. Kim said that to make ends meet she relied mostly on help from her daughter, who left college and went to work.

"She's been working full time for over a year now. Without her, I never could have made it," said Kim, 38.

Elizabeth Lyon, 20, works as a drive-in teller at Florida International Bank, 17945 Franjo Rd.

"This is her entire lifelong dream. When her store was broken into before she was really devastated, and as long as I can help my mom do what she wants to do and she's happy, then I'll be happy," Lyon said.

She is planning to go back to school now that her mother is back in business. "I want to let my mom's store get off the ground first. I know she'll do well, but we've got to give her some time to get her clientele back up," she said.

Kim has two other daughters and a son ranging in ages from 11 to 21. Her youngest helped prepare the new store for the grand opening.

"My little daughter came in here every day, painted, put tables together and put price tags on," said Kim, "She said, 'Mom, you're going to make it and I'm so proud of you.'"

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to congratulate Ms. Kim and her family for reopening "Suk He's Place." While I am very sorry about the hardship caused by the robbery of 3 years ago, I am glad to see that the burglars could not steal the Kim family's perseverance. I wish Ms. Suk He Kim much success with her new business.

IN HONOR OF RABBI IRA BOOK AND DR. GERALD HENIG

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1992, the San Leandro Congregation of Temple Beth Sholom will be honoring Rabbi Ira Book and Dr. Gerald S. Henig for their 13—Bar-Mitzvah—years of service to the temple as Rabbi and educational director.

Rabbi Ira Book came to San Leandro as the elected spiritual leader of Temple Beth Sholom in 1978. His positive influence since then has been felt throughout the entire East Bay community.

Under his guidance, the religious, social, and educational program development of Temple Beth Sholom has been expanded and improved. This synagogue shares pride with Rabbi Book over having created and fostered the growth of the Sabbath morning "minyan" and study group. Rabbi Book's enthusiasm and talents have helped many members learn to read Hebrew, study the Torah, and contribute to the building of the local Jewish community.

While lead by Rabbi Book, the Temple Beth Sholom became officially affiliated with the United Synagogue of America. In addition, the youth groups of the congregation became chapters of USY [United Synagogue High School Youth] and Kadimah—literally, "forward." The kitchen of the synagogue was remodeled as a kosher kitchen with the help of the Beth Sholom Sisterhood, and the Endowment Society was formed under Rabbi Book.

The academic program of Temple Beth Sholom grew to become a separate organization called Bay Area Midrasha, formerly known as Bet Midrash. Now the synagogue's high school students study together with their peers from three adjacent congregations on a weekly basis.

Rabbi Book contributed to the creation of a full-time day care and preschool center in 1986, the centennial anniversary of Temple Beth Sholom. He has also chaired the community Walk for Hunger. Rabbi Book has given the Bar/Bat Mitzvah children, Confirmands, and the whole congregation of

Temple Beth Sholom a greater awareness of the mitzvah—commandment—of repairing the condition of the world, "tikkun olam."

After graduating from Columbia University, Rabbi Book completed an M.A. degree at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America and was ordained by the Rabbinic Academy of America. He later received another M.A. degree from the University of San Francisco. He has coedited a volume on American Jewry, "To Dwell Together in Freedom," and a prayerbook, "Ivdu B'Simcha: Serve the Lord With Gladness." Rabbi Book has taught at San Francisco University, the San Francisco College of Jewish Studies, and Chabot College. He has also served as the Jewish prison chaplain at the Federal Correctional Institution in Pleasanton, CA.

Rabbi Ira Book and his wife Sharon have four children, two of whom, Adam and Robyn, were raised at Temple Beth Sholom. Both attended the synagogue's preschool; Adam was confirmed with the Class of 1989, and Robyn is currently a student in the Bay Area Midrasha.

Dr. Gerald S. Henig has played several important roles in the educational program of Temple Beth Sholom over the last 18 years. He has served in the religious instruction and growth of an entire generation of Beth Sholom students as teacher, principal, and education director.

Dr. Henig's guidance has been central to instilling in the students a sense of social awareness, responsibility, and commitment, as well as a sense of social justice. His organizational skills as administrator have provided the student body with the drive and ability to successfully raise funds for such charitable causes as the Ethiopian Relief Fund, Book Bank U.S.A., Boys Town Jerusalem, Home for Jewish Parents, Jewish Family Services, Holocaust Resource Center, Alameda County Adult Literacy Project, Bay Area Council on Soviet Jewry, Agency for Jewish Education, and the Davis Street Project.

Having taught at the Alameda Midrasha, the Bay Area Midrasha, and the Temple School, Dr. Henig has had an impact throughout the bay area. Admired and loved for his warmth, understanding, good humor, and skill, he has been a source of inspiration and enlightenment for his students.

Dr. Henig has also achieved excellence in other academic circles, having received the Outstanding Professor of History Award at the California State University, Hayward, and having been a four-time recipient of the Phi Kappa Delta Best Lecturer Award.

Dr. Henig earned his B.A. degree at Brooklyn College, his M.A. at the University of Wisconsin and his Ph.D. at the City University of New York. His book, "Henry Winter Davis: Antebellum and Civil War Congressman From Maryland," was recognized by Prize-Pulitzer winning historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., as a "splendid piece of scholarship." Dr. Henig has written numerous articles on 19th century American political and social history, and he has also been the coeditor of a volume on American Jewry.

The Henig family has been a part of Temple Beth Sholom for nearly two decades. In 1972, Rabbi John J. Zucker married Gerald and his wife Lori. Later, Rabbi Book presided over the bat mitzvahs of their two daughters, Jennifer and Rebecca, as well as the brit milah of their son, Adam. The oldest child, Jennifer, was a student from preschool to confirmation at the synagogue. Rebecca is currently attending the Bay Area Midrasha, and Adam, the youngest, as a sixth grader, will soon be preparing for his bar mitzvah—continuing the traditional and close relationship the Henig family has had with Temple Beth Sholom.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Rabbi Ira Book and Dr. Gerald S. Henig for their service to Temple Beth Sholom in San Leandro. I wish all the best for them, their families, and the whole congregation.

IN HONOR OF RED VERDERAME

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, Salvatore J. [Red] Verderame has meant many things to many people throughout his long and highly successful career. First and foremost, he has approached each professional endeavor with the same deep, personal loyalty and commitment that he devotes to his many friends. Red Verderame has achieved legendary status in Connecticut's Third Congressional District for his outstanding achievements over his 50-year career in sports, education, and foreign service. As this uniquely talented and committed individual marks his fifth decade of public service, it is a pleasure for me to recognize the achievements and contributions he has made to our community.

From his early years as a high school and college basketball star, Red has dazzled teammates, friends, and fans with his ability to lead his team on to victory. Upon graduation, he decided to devote his talents to public service, and we in the New Haven community are extremely thankful that he did. After years of distinguished service to our country in both the Marines and the Foreign Service, Red brought his skills and his determination home to New Haven and put them to use where they were desperately needed—in our public high schools. As both an administrator and a coach, he has devoted his heart and soul to leading the yough of New Haven.

As principal and vice principal of Hillhouse High School during the past 20 years, Red has been tireless in his devotion to giving our young people the best education possible. Serving as an administrator of a New Haven high school is no easy task, given all the challenges our inner-city schools are facing, but it is one which Red has handled with the same strong leadership, tough fighting spirit, and winning record that he brought to his career in sports.

Red's dynamic leadership and commitment to young people have enabled him to consistently bring out the best in the athletes he has coached in New Haven and all over the world. As a basketball coach, Red has lead high school and college teams to win championships year after year. He set a State record by coaching Wilbur L. Cross High School to a winning streak of 46 consecutive victories. He never fails to inspire young people to push their skills to the limit. In these difficult times, our young people need this kind of teacher and role model more than ever, and they have been lucky to find one in Red Verderame.

In addition to all his other responsibilities and activities, Red has found the time to write three books about coaching basketball as well as numerous articles in professional publications. He has always been generous in sharing his insight and advice with those whom it might help.

Internationally, Red has coached teams throughout the Middle East and Africa, including Egypt's 1984 Olympic team. In New Haven and worldwide, he has shown a unique ability to bridge cultural differences and bring together a team working toward a common goal. Most recently, Red founded the International Ambassadors Program. This program, which provides outstanding area youngsters a unique opportunity to participate in an international exchange program that fosters multicultural awareness and respect, is a fitting continuation of Red's lifelong work with youth all over the world.

We can all learn a great deal from Red's life and his work. It is with great pleasure that I congratulate him on his lifelong achievements and wish him continued success in the future.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO EXTEND PROVISIONS OF SECTION 936

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today the chairman of the Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee and I are introducing legislation to extend the provisions of section 936(d)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code to the Andean countries: Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru.

Under section 936, certain U.S. corporations that derive a significant portion of their income from Puerto Rican business activities are effectively exempt from U.S. income tax on the portion of their income derived from sources within Puerto Rico. Section 936 companies can effectively retain earnings tax-free as long as the funds remain in Puerto Rico.

As a result of this program, large deposits of section 936 funds, referred to as "qualified possession source investment income" or QPSII funds, have accumulated in Puerto Rican banks. In 1986, Congress agreed to permit Puerto Rico to make or authorize loans of QPSII funds to qualifying projects in any Caribbean Basin Initiative [CBI] country that has entered into a tax information exchange agreement [TIEA] with the United States. According to a study conducted by Price Waterhouse, 20,000 new private-sector jobs have been created in qualified CBI countries as a result of nearly $650 million in 936 investments approved by Puerto Rico.

Our bill will extend the QPSII treatment to investments made by 936 corporations in the Andean countries. The benefit, however, is only available to those Andean countries that

enter into Tax Information Exchange Agreements [TIEA's] with the United States.

As you know, the Congress recently passed the Andean Trade Preference Act [ATPA] which grants duty-free treatment to imports from the Andean region in an effort to provide legitimate alternatives to coca production. However, without the necessary capital investment to create new jobs, unilateral tariff reductions cannot by themselves eliminate the drug problem. The possibility of new productive investment is the core of the strategy of developing alternative income generating activities which will result in the creation of desperately needed jobs. Without new investment, tariff reductions become much less effective. Consequently, 936 funds would become a catalyst for new investment.

In addition, by requiring each of the countries to sign a TIEA in order to become eligible for 936 funds, we will gain a useful law enforcement tool against tax evasion and money laundering, an important factor in the war against narcotics trafficking. And best of all, the Joint Committee on Taxation has estimated that this bill will have a negligible impact on revenues.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will join us in supporting this very worthy legislation.

A TRIBUTE TO A DEDICATED CHIEF OF STAFF IN HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS, BOYD CRAWFORD

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to honor the memory of Boyd Crawford, who served the House Committee on Foreign Affairs as its staff leader for 31 years.

Mr. Crawford, 85, retired as chief of staff in 1970, having served in that capacity through the terms of seven committee chairmen, including five Democrats and two Republicans. He died at a hospital near his home in Annandale, VA, on January 6, 1992.

I would like to express appreciation, not only for Mr. Crawford's long years of service to the House of Representatives but also for his diligent and faithful staff leadership on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. Crawford was an able administrator, but beyond that, he had a knack for getting along with committee members regardless of their party affiliation. Evidence the fact that successive committee chairmen retained his services as chief of staff and considered themselves on close and friendly terms with him over the course of 31 years.

A native Washingtonian, Mr. Crawford as a youth operated a cloakroom and checking service for tourists at the Capitol. He then studied typing and shorthand. He began his congressional staff career in 1932, as a secretary to Representative Clarence J. McLeod.

In 1936, Mr. Crawford was appointed secretary to the Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission under its leader, Representative Sol Bloom. When Congressman Bloom became chairman of Foreign Affairs in 1939, he named Mr. Crawford to head the committee staff.

During his career on the staff of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Crawford became known to many world leaders, U.S. Presidents, and particularly their Secretaries of State. He attended the 1945 founding conference of the United Nations in San Francisco.

Over a lifetime, Mr. Crawford pursued several disciplines and avocations, including the study of French. He was considered a proficient portrait painter.

Survivors include his wife, Gertrude; a brother, Stanley, of Houston, TX; a sister, Muriel I. Crawford, of Lighthouse Point, FL; two grandsons, and a great-granddaughter. A son, Christopher, died in 1988.

Mr. Crawford's life exemplifies the very best in staff service to Congress and the people of the United States and we honor his memory here today.

LET'S RECOGNIZE THE INDEPENDENCE OF CROATIA AND SLOVENIA

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the Government of this great Nation to recognize the independence of Slovenia and Croatia.

During the long night of Communist domination of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, the United States carried the torch of freedom and gave inspiration to the millions who were forced to live under totalitarian governments. In recent years, the winds of change have brought democracy to the freedom-loving people of that region who suffered for so long under the former evil empire. The rising tide of democracy also put an end to the central control that Moscow had exercised.

The former Yugoslav federation, an artificial multinational state, is now experiencing painful changes. The Croatian and Slovenian people, wanting to exercise democratic self-determination, voted overwhelmingly for secession, a right the first sentence of the Yugoslav Constitution clearly spells out. Not unlike the citizens of the many nations in the Commonwealth of Independent States, they, too, want independence. The cause of these new democracies is just, and they deserve the support of the world community. Led by Germany, the European Community recently recognized the independence of those republics, as did 27 other countries. The United States, however, has yet to take this long overdue action.

Yugoslavia was held together by force under a totalitarian system, and Slobodan Milosevic, a Communist nationalist, continues to try to impose centralized rule on the Croatian and Slovenian people. The ongoing conflict is the result of his efforts.

During the past months, the war in Croatia has claimed 10,000 lives and left over 600,000 people homeless. Damage to Croatia's infrastructure and economy could exceed $20 billion. While the current cease-fire appears to be effective, much remains to be done to ensure a lasting peace.

It is time for the United States, the leader of the free world, to stand up for democracy by recognizing the independence of Croatia and Slovenia. This action will strengthen, not hinder, the cause of peace and put America squarely behind the forces of freedom in that troubled region.

I commend the following insightful article by Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick to my colleagues in the Congress.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 13, 1992]

GERMANY'S INDEPENDENT COURSE

(By Jeane Kirkpatrick)

Germany's recent unilateral move to recognize Croatia surprised and disappointed many of Bonn's closest friends. High-level French officials have raised questions about whether leaders of the German government are "good Europeans" after all. The British have accused the Germans of "arm-twisting" in Brussels. And American officials have spoken of a "new German assertiveness" that may be "difficult to stomach."

Allied officials seem genuinely surprised that, after all these years as half of the Franco-German heart of the European Community and as the United States' strongest NATO ally on the continent, Germany would actually pursue an independent policy.

Hadn't the German government led the drive for common EC foreign and military policies? Why, then, was Germany sacrificing EC unity to a unilateral policy of early recognition? Hadn't Germany joined in plans to constitute a Franco-German "core" of a Western European Union? Why then had Germany proceeded in this important matter independent of its French partners? Hadn't Germany opposed a general right for EC members to opt out of community policies, only to be the first to opt out of an EC process?

It was, as the German newsweekly Der Spiegel put it, "the first time since 1949 that Bonn took a unilateral action in foreign policy." Why now?

Clearly, there are several reasons that Chancellor Helmut Kohl and Foreign Minister Hans Dietrich Genscher told their EC colleagues Germany would not feel bound by community views on Yugoslavia.

The first is, of course, the fact that German reunification is now complete. Once reunification was achieved, German officials lost their overwhelming need to calm other governments' anxieties about resurgent German power.

The second reason is geopolitical. Proximity, historical ties and a habit of vacationing in Yugoslavia gave Germans a special concern about Croatia and Slovenia and have kept the issues of civil war and violence near the top of the German agenda. For similar reasons, Italy and Austria have also adopted policies like those of Germany's. All three have a special need for stable democratic governments in what was Yugoslavia.

The third reason for Germany's breaking ranks is surely the demonstrated inability of the EC or the United Nations to stop the determined aggression of Serbian Communists against Croatia and Slovenia.

Germany's action in recognizing Croatia was hardly precipitous. The war began last June, when Yugoslav armies acted to block Croatian independence. The EC has been seeking a settlement ever since. The United Nations and the United States have also worked on it to no avail.

The central Yugoslav army (overwhelmingly Serbian) has wreaked terrible violence on the Croatian people. Thousands have died.

Many more thousands have become refugees in their own land. A succession of ceasefires has been negotiated and violated—most of them by Serbian "irregulars" who are being rapidly integrated into the "central" armies.

But the determined effort to destroy Croatia has not been an ethnic squabble toward which the world should remain aloof and neutral. It has not been simply a conflict between warring nationalities. It is a good thing that the German government distinguished between the more powerful, undemocratic Serbs determined to maintain control by violence and the Croats seeking to exercise democratic self-determination.

And it is too bad that the United States and other EC countries have not been as clear about the nature of this conflict. It is especially embarrassing that the U.S. government has not supported the right to democratic self-determination in Croatia and Slovenia but has behaved instead as if the Communist rulers of Serbia have some sort of moral claim to govern forever what the Communist government of Yugoslavia had governed in the past.

The fact is that Yugoslavia no longer exists. It has self-destructed, much like the Soviet Union, and for much the same reason: because it was pieced together and held together by force rather than by affection and consent. The governments of the United States and the European Community should recognize the component democratic republics of what was Yugoslavia and should cease acting as if the principle of Realpolitik compels us to support the side with superior forces.

No one should be surprised if Germany, which is once again the strongest nation in continental Europe, again pursues an independent policy. We can only hope that future policies will be as constructive and discriminating as the one toward Croatia.

MICCOSUKEE TRIBE OF INDIANS PART OF SOUTH FLORIDA'S CULTURE

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 24, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians, who are located just west of Miami within the vast Everglades area. The Miccosukees are little known outside of south Florida, yet their history dates back prior to the 1600's. Stephen Tiger, a member of the tribe, and their public relations manager, has written an essay on the history of the Miccosukees and and I wanted to relate some of that history for my colleagues.

Originally, the Miccosukees were part of the Creek Nation and, as a result of many wars and hardships brought on by non-Indian settlers that staked claim to Florida, they settled in the area now known as Dade County in the mid-1800's. They stayed virtually isolated in the Everglades and did not accept any offers of assistance by either Federal or State governments. When their land was declared a national park, they were asked to relocate and the elders decided to take a stand so they could remain in the Everglades. After long and difficult negotiations with Federal authorities, on January 11, 1962, the Secretary of the Interior finally officially recognized the Miccosukee Tribe and approved their constitution, giving them much autonomy. Stephen Tiger's father, William Buffalo Tiger, led the negotiating team on behalf of the tribe. Since then, the tribe has grown and prospered, opening a school, a community gymnasium, a restaurant, an outpatient clinic, and administration building. Stephen operates the Miccosukee Indian Village and Airboat Tours.

The Miccosukees are not only very independent, they are a naturally artistic people. Since 1975, they have sponsored an annual arts and crafts festival which attracts thousands of people. At the festival, they display their patchwork, dolls, beadwork, and baskets, as well as offering excellent Miccosukee food.

The Miccosukees are an integral part of the culture of south Florida and they continue to thrive under the leadership of their current council, consisting of their tribal chairman, Billy Cypress; assistant chairman, Jasper Nelson; secretary, Max Billie; and lawmaker, Henry Bert.