

Born in Richmond Hill, NY, on December 10, 1913, Morton Gould has been composing and performing as conductor of the major symphony orchestras in the United States and throughout the world for most of the 20th century. His first published composition appeared in 1920 when he was just 6 years old.

By the time he was 21, Morton was conducting and arranging a weekly series of orchestra radio programs for the WOR Mutual Network on which many of his orchestral settings were introduced.

A gifted composer, his work is characterized by its distinctively American flavor; it incorporates folk, blues, jazz, gospel, and western elements with the classic symphonic form. Among his more popular symphonic works are "Latin-American Symphonette," "Jekyll and Hyde Variations," "Spirituals for Orchestra," "American Salute," "Tap Dance Concerto," and "Derivations for Clarinet and Band," written for the late Benny Goodman.

In addition to the National Symphony Orchestra, his music has been commissioned by other major symphony orchestras, the Library of Congress, the Chamber Music Society of Lincoln Center, the American Ballet Theatre, and the New York City Ballet.

Morton's talents are not limited to the symphonic mode. His Broadway credits include the musicals "Arms and the Girl" and "Billion Dollar Baby" while his film scores include "Windjammer," "Delightfully Dangerous" and "Cinerama Holiday." His scores composed for television include "Holocaust," "F. Scott Fitzgerald in Hollywood" and CBS's "World War I" documentary series.

His list of credits is virtually endless. At age 81 he lives in Great Neck, NY, where he still is actively composing works which have been commissioned by major orchestras.

It is a pleasure to salute Morton Gould and bring the latest honor bestowed on this true American icon to the attention of our colleagues.

**A TRIBUTE TO BETTY
McLAUGHLIN, PRESIDENT, DISTRICT 29 VETERANS OF FOREIGN
WARS LADIES AUXILIARY**

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1995

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join today in offering a tribute to Betty McLaughlin, district 29 president for the Veterans of Foreign Wars Ladies Auxiliary. Betty McLaughlin will be honored on May 12, 1995, by the members of district 29 of the VFW Ladies Auxiliary.

It is fitting that the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives should have this opportunity to reflect on the patriotic civic commitment of a woman like Betty McLaughlin. Since joining the ladies auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars in 1970, Betty McLaughlin has given countless hours of her time in support of VFW activities that celebrate American values of family, community, and country.

Betty McLaughlin originally joined the VFW Ladies Auxiliary on the eligibility of her husband, Bob McLaughlin, who served with the 1st Cavalry Division, 7th Cavalry Regiment of

the U.S. Army during World War II. They married in 1952 and currently reside in West View, PA. She and her husband have four children, Robert Jr., Linda, Robin, and Sean. They are also the proud grandparents of six grandchildren.

Betty McLaughlin has served in a number of leadership posts over the years since first joining the VFW's Ladies Auxiliary. She was elected president of the West View Auxiliary in 1973 when her husband Bob served as commander. They were the first husband and wife team to serve together as president and commander at the West View Post. During her first term as president of the West View Post, Betty McLaughlin was honored for her success at recruiting new members. She has been chairman of several committees, including Americanism and Loyalty Day Safety, Community Activities, and Cancer. She is currently serving as committee chairman for Cancer, and Americanism and Loyalty Day as well as trustee.

Betty McLaughlin's first appointment on the Allegheny County Council level was as a color bearer. After serving on many committees at the county council level, she was elected to the office of president of the Allegheny Council Ladies Auxiliary in June 1982. Betty McLaughlin was appointed department of Pennsylvania chief of staff by department president-elect Jean Gasior in 1990 and has held several State chairmanships, such as 1991 chairman of the Pennsylvania Western Area Chairman for National Home, the 1992 department of Pennsylvania chairman for Political Action Committee, and the 1993 Department of Pennsylvania western area chairman for Americanism and Loyalty Day.

While deeply involved with the VFW Ladies Auxiliary, Betty McLaughlin has also been active in her community and has given her time and energy to programs sponsored by local groups, churches, and schools. She has served as den mother, Brownie, and Girl Scout Mother. She is currently serving as advisor to the West View Junior Girls Unit. She has also served the last 6 years on the election board in her local community.

Mr. Speaker, in 1994, Betty McLaughlin attained the office of district 29 president of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Ladies Auxiliary. She has brought to this position the same dedication and spirit that she has demonstrated in so many positions since joining the VFW Ladies Auxiliary in 1970. I am proud to represent Betty McLaughlin as a constituent of the 14th Congressional District of Pennsylvania and I want to wish her and her family the very best. It is a distinct pleasure to join with the comrades and sisters of the West View Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 2754 and its auxiliary and junior girls in saluting Betty McLaughlin.

**AMERICA AS EXPORT
SUPERPOWER**

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1995

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, the aftermath of the cold war presents America with a wide range of opportunities as well as challenges to its pre-eminent position in world commerce.

To many, the source of our success provides comfort in the fact of these challenges. And, indeed, the skills and technology which created the military might by which we won the cold war afford us one means for shaping our future response.

But skills and technology alone are not enough. We must do more. We must carefully assess the international environment and understand more fully the nature of our competition abroad. Thus, while the United States is poised to build upon its superiority in world commerce, there are some questions which are part of our public debate which remain to be answered. Among them are the evolving relationship between government and business, industry's relative strengths and weaknesses, and how we can open markets currently closed to U.S. investment and products.

The answers to these questions are not easy ones. But a recent speech by my friend Michael Armstrong concisely presents some possibilities worthy of further discussion. Mike is the chairman and CEO of Hughes Electronics, a company highly successful because of its clear understanding of the international environment. I commend to my colleagues his remarks on making America an export superpower.

**AMERICA AS EXPORT SUPERPOWER: REASSESSING
GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN ECONOMIC
GROWTH**

(By C. Michael Armstrong)

It is a tremendous honor to follow the long line of distinguished speakers to this podium. Since its founding in the wake of World War I, the Council on Foreign Relations has been at the very center of the public debate on America's place in the world—a forum for ideas, and a fulcrum for change.

I want to underscore right at the onset, that while I am privileged to serve as Chairman of the President's Export Council—and while my visits to Washington have been more frequent—I can still say, at this point, that the views I express today are my own.

TRANSITIONS: 1945–1995

I think all of us were moved by the celebrations—the commemoration—of V-E Day. That journey back to May 1945 to the beginning of a post-war era that was prelude to the long Cold War no one could yet foresee—has undeniable parallels to our present. Today, we are once again making a difficult crossing—ending one era and entering the next: A new world, with new rules for the way nations cooperate—for the way nations compete.

As the historians in the audience today know better than I, the outlines of our era are only now becoming clear. Just as American GIs shook hands with Ivan at Torgau on the Elbe in 1945—only to find an implacable Soviet Union blockading Berlin in 1948—periods of transition unfold in unpredictable ways.

The distance from 1995 back to the fall of the Berlin Wall or the implosion of the Soviet Union may seem significant—but in the handful of years since those events, we are only now beginning to seize the opportunities—to shape a future—beyond the Cold War's long shadow.

Already we see more clearly that with the passing of the Cold War, the coming competition will be less military than economic: Dominion will be defined by the development of new technologies and economic performance. I am convinced: If the measure of our Cold War strength was military—America's destiny in the remainder of the century is as an Export Superpower.

As the first generation after the Cold War—we have an opportunity that is also an obligation. History will judge what happens on our watch.

If we are to sustain our role of global leadership and expand our country's economic well-being, it will only happen if America is the Export Superpower of the world.

And there are signs we are on track:

We've just passed Japan and Germany to regain the top spot as the world's largest exporter—12.8% of all global trade, compared to 10.5% for Germany and 9.9% for Japan.

U.S. exports, according to the latest Department of Commerce estimates, are projected at double-digit growth—up from a still-impressive 5 to 7% as recently as one year ago.

Broad, bi-partisan leadership has passed NAFTA and now GATT, opening the way to expanded trade opportunities that will boost GDP and job creation.

So with all this good news—what's the problem? Why are some of us more concerned than confident?

Because the positive signs I've just mentioned coexist with a more worrisome record: A record that points to a far different future—to a competitive implosion so fundamental it could amount to gradual economic disarmament.

We've got to ask:

Does a decade-long trade deficit of \$1.1 trillion dollars define an export superpower?

Does a 10-year, \$2.1 trillion dollar federal budget deficit—a budget that hasn't been balanced since 1969—define an economic superpower?

Does an education "deficit" that produces students that rank consistently in last place among industrialized nations portend a leader of the societies of this world?

We've had a good run at economic success for 50 years, but I happen to believe that we succeeded so well economically after World War II also because of some fundamentals:

First, we won the war without internal economic destruction. As a result, we quickly re-tooled our war economy and dominated global commerce.

Second, we firmly established the world's foremost public education system including a GI bill that opened the door of opportunity to millions throughout our society.

And third, we let the market system sort through our problems which gave an adaptive America room to restructure to compete.

But is the market system alone enough to deliver America's economic destiny? Just what should the government's role be to enable our businesses to compete globally; to enable our people to enjoy a standard of living second to none; to enable our nation to preserve where history has witnessed the demise of others.

TECHNOLOGY V. BUREAUCRACY

To answer this, we must recognize two new realities that are currently transforming our world: First, with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the Soviet Union, we are witnessing the fall of economic, social and cultural borders as well. There is an unmistakable, irreversible trend toward open markets—to the reality and the bounty of a global village.

Second, the phenomenon that defines our age—the speed of technology in bringing new products, new capabilities, new markets, new lifestyles and new economics. In contrast to the past, where either government or mega-corporations defined markets, today the contest pits the speed of technology versus the speed of bureaucracy—or, more precisely, the lack of it, as the information age makes a mockery of borders and barriers of all kinds.

It is in this context that we should ask, "How much Government do we need?"

I believe the answer is simply, just enough.

Just enough: No more—and no less government than we need to sustain a globally competitive society.

Enough government means getting the night government where we need it—and getting rid of it where we don't.

While the premise of "just enough" is hard to dispute, the devil is in the details. Thus, I would propose we answer two questions with each policy and factor-in our quest for exports:

What government must do.

What governments should not do.

COMPETITIVENESS, EXPORTS AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

As we explore this question of government's role in America's export competitiveness, I want to be clear that our country's economic responsibility makes demands of the private sector as well as public policy.

While business cannot overcome a government that shackles it with a bureaucratic ball and chain, nothing government can do—no policy/no practice/no politics—will spark our economic engine if American business is not competitive.

There is sometimes a certain "no-fault" mentality that's crept into American management. The antidote is accountability.

The ancient Romans had a tradition: Whenever one of their engineers constructed an arch—as the capstone was hoisted into place, the engineer assumed accountability for his work in the most profound way possible:

He stood under the arch.

If his construction was shoddy—he would be the first to know.

With out market systems, American management must, at the end, stand under the arch.

And we've had our share of fallen arches. Historically, the companies that did not respond to the international challenge are the companies that did not reap the rewards. Look back at the list of companies at the top of the first-ever Fortune 500, compiled back in 1955: Of the Top 50— $\frac{1}{3}$ have dropped off the list/another $\frac{1}{3}$ have merged—only $\frac{1}{3}$ are still going strong. Whatever their industry, the companies that have kept their place all share one common trait. They took their American business international—conquering new markets to create new growth.

Now look ahead—to the export opportunities we enjoy: Over the next two decades, 12 countries with a combined population of 2.7 billion—more than ten times the population of the United States—are expected to account for 40 percent of all export opportunities. For countries as well as individual companies, there's a world out there hungry for the goods and services we provide.

The question is whether American industry is up to the challenge. Many of you know the studies by the Council on Competitiveness of U.S. industry's strengths and weaknesses in 94 critical, cutting-edge technologies. The most recent review showed some positive movement—but also distressing evidence of the distance we've got to go to make our positions more competitive.

While the U.S. has improved its position in 22 categories—a closer look reveals the sobering part of the story. In 11 of those 22 areas we move from the last category—"losing badly or lost"—to "weak." In the other 11, we moved from "weak" to "competitive." In not one case—not one—did we move from competitive to strong.

Now, getting off the critical list is welcome news for anyone—but finding out the patient has a pulse isn't the same as watching him hop out of bed and run a marathon.

WHAT GOVERNMENT CAN DO

My promise is thus quite straightforward, if we are to be an export superpower, it takes both a competitive commercial base and a

competitive government system. For the most part, over time, our market system should define and produce a competitive commercial base. But it is up to all of us to define the role of government in our pursuit of exports.

To begin, I'd suggest what government must do.

First, while we may need a balanced budget to discipline our politicians, what we need for export growth is a balanced economy.

We need a reasonable balance between our country's investment accounts and its "care and feeding" accounts. Undisciplined deficits and a disabled dollar are critical challenges government must address.

We need competitive and well educated graduates coming out of our schools if we are going to have competitive products to export. It is not enough to delegate such a national policy to thousands of individual communities to solve alone. A national consensus should be followed by a thoughtful results-based education strategy.

We need a political balance in our system of government that is both principled and practical—that is responsive, committed and gets things done. If we elect people to spend their time serving society, we are out of balance if they spend half their time running for re-election. Whether it takes the form of campaign reform or term limits—a better balance must be struck.

Second, government must act to open markets for our exports and our investment.

The passage of NAFTA and GATT will serve trade expansion well—and the passage of these landmark agreements was surely a signal from both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue that America's destiny is tied to trade.

However, we need to build on those successes, and open the markets of the second largest commercial nation in the world. We should all support the difficult negotiations now underway with Japan. It will never be easy; it will take understanding and trust on both sides; but it must be done now. Hopefully, if sanctions are required, they will limit Japan and not just layoff Americans.

We need to sustain our support for Mexico, our third largest export market. It is not politics; it is not Federal Aid; it is not a give-away to banking interests; it is simply in our economic self-interest.

We need to ensure market access to U.S. consumer goods—taking aim at restrictive standards designed to keep foreign goods out and protect domestic producers.

We need effective, strategic negotiating authority in government to respond, act and conclude. Fast-track negotiating authority is not an option—it is a necessity—if we really want to open markets.

And while we drive to open markets, we should concurrently demand that respect for intellectual property rights must be a condition of access to our market.

Third, in addition to opening markets, all of our government must act as an export advocate. While we now have a sensible and thoughtful National Export Strategy, we need support and follow-through in the marketplace. It is terrific to see Commerce, Defense, Transportation, Energy and Ambassadors around the world, not only stating their support, but engaging to help make things happen. But we need more advocacy; more agency coordination and consolidation; more leadership in the markets, not just at the podium.

However, I've heard proposals to reorganize the U.S. Foreign and Commercial Services—newly named the Commercial Service—a network of offices across the country and in our embassies whose clientele is American companies trying to break export barriers and win business. This is an area where our

present policy makes sense—change would be a mistake. It ain't broke—so don't fix it.

Fourth, at times, government must act as an export financier. This is not a disguised form of foreign aid. This is a market necessity for large and small American businesses to compete abroad and create jobs at home.

There are many instances where businesses and banks with their balance sheets should fear to tread. Where the risk, the venture, or the competition dictates that the appropriate role of government is as guarantor.

There is a critical roll for established institutions like the Export-Import Bank. Ex-Im can help broker blockbuster deals—like the recent \$500 million package for Indonesia's first-ever private-sector power project. Without Ex-Im's political risk coverage, projects like this one would not go forward—and the loss wouldn't just be Indonesia's because, in this case, the project will provide 7000 new American jobs.

And the benefits of export financing and export advocacy should flow so that small businesses can become powerhouses in the export game. There is no reason the small firms in the industrial park down the street can't export to markets around the globe. It ought to be possible in America to be an export entrepreneur.

Fifth, we must recognize that long-term export expansion and technology leadership are synonymous. To assure direction and application, we should enact a permanent R&D tax credit. However, I would add that irrespective of an R&D tax credit, businesses should be investing in R&D to satisfy their futures and stay ahead of their competitors. But tax policy in this country has often helped to shape our republic and assure our future. A permanent R&D tax policy today could help to do just that.

And sixth, we need U.S. export policy that addresses a globally competitive marketplace, not policies rooted in the Cold War, fashioned to contain communism rather than expand peace and prosperity. We should have an Export Administration Act that minimizes licensing requirements; that implements, where needed, a licensing process that is fast, fair and responsive; that places commodity jurisdiction within the government where it belongs—based on today's technology and markets; and a Munitions List that is rational to the realities of technology as well as the needs of national security.

Anything less constitutes a weakness of American competitiveness—anything less consigns our industry to a kind of bureaucratic Berlin Wall blocking American exports.

I disagree with the school of thought that suggests a strong export strategy equals a weak foreign policy. In fact, the truth is just the opposite: Strong exports mean more leverage—more options, more choice in our foreign policy.

In our current foreign policy, we seem to think technology can be quarantined by bureaucracy. The fact is: Technology travels. One nation's export ban is another nation's economic boon: An invitation to win trade opportunities while competitor companies are kept in the penalty box.

On this last point, an outdated Munitions List too often teaches the right lesson to the wrong people.

Last month, it was a businessman stopped at Customs for carrying a telephone on a foreign trip. The phone was equipped with a security scrambler—a technology on the Munitions List.

And that made the telephone a dangerous weapon—right along with ballistic missiles and nuclear warheads. Meanwhile, any for-

eign national can walk into an American computer store, buy the same encryption software that makes the phone secure—and take it out of the country. And even that is a waste of a plane ticket—because anyone on the internet can e-mail the program, anywhere in the world. You can even print the computer code on a mailing label and send it abroad—for the price of a postage stamp.

In fact, there's only one way you can't carry or sell that software abroad—and that's if you're an American citizen.

While the government is busy managing exports based on yesterday's threats and technology, the 1995 Cadillac now has more computing power under its hood than the original guidance system that landed the Apollo space capsule on the moon.

The examples are legion:

In the 1970s the average interval between taking a computer from the drawing board to the market was 7 years.

Today, in some cases, a new generation comes along every 12-18 months.

70% of American computer products have a shelf-life of less than 18 months.

Some of the fastest growing foreign markets—some expanding as much as 7 to 10% per year—are among the 50 to 60 countries designated as "sensitive" on the Munitions List.

That's one-third of all the countries in the world—fenced from U.S. high-tech goods and services.

We've got to recognize the inherent tension between the speed of technology and the speed of bureaucracy: Government policies that slow non-threatening technology will cost this country its competitive position in the marketplace.

I am encouraged that secretaries Christopher and Brown have pledged their support to work with each other, and the Congress, for the passage of an effective Export Administration Act this year.

Each of the issues I've identified argue for what is just enough government.

While 19 agencies may be too many to achieve a coherent trade policy . . .

While the finance function government performs may be fine-tuned . . .

While government's role in advocating U.S. exports may be activist in a number of ways . . .

We cannot lose sight of the positive role government must play in promoting our economy's export engine. To do anything less would be to abandon our destiny as an Export Superpower—and put ourselves on the path to economic disarmaments.

If these are the areas where we need the right kind of government to support export expansion, there are also areas where we need government to change or get out of the way.

The most difficult policy that needs to be addressed is also one of the most economically damaging policies of our government. I'm speaking of the use of unilateral economic sanctions. Generally speaking, history has judged unilateral economic sanctions as an unsuccessful policy to change errant behavior. Only if unilateral sanctions are a means of leadership to bring about multilateral sanctions, are the chances of success able to justify the cost at home.

That's not the case when we take a go-it-alone approach to sanctions. I would cite two examples.

In August of 1993, the State Department invoked unilateral economic sanctions against China for violations of the MTCR. This was due to alleged shipments in 1992 by China of M-11 missile parts to Pakistan. The State Department chose to extend interpretation of the Munitions List to embedded tech-

nology. Based on this interpretation, it then forbade the export or launch of commercial communications satellites.

As a result:

Australia and Hong Kong could not launch their Hughes satellites—satellites that would primarily be carrying home TV, much of it American programming.

The Chinese canceled their orders with Hughes for 2 satellites, mainly to be used for tying their banking system together. This was a \$400 million order worth hundreds of American jobs.

Then, after Chancellor Kohl visited China and pointed out the differences between American and German policy, China canceled a joint agreement to build 10 satellites—and transferred this multi-billion dollar agreement to Deutsch Aerospace. Thousands more jobs were lost.

The sanctions did little to hurt China—but they certainly registered in California, creating a new wave of unemployment potential among people already dealing with difficult times.

Now, there are times when government gets it right. When the issue was piracy of intellectual property rights involving American-made movies and other software, the U.S. threatened the Chinese government—and it paid off, with quick and conspicuous results. We taught the right lesson to the right people.

The tragedy is that if there was some process, some required involvement with affected industry, its possible sanctions could be implemented without sustaining such large self-inflicted wounds.

Presently the U.S. has just invoked broad unilateral sanctions against Iran. There is no question in my mind—and no lessons we can look to—that suggests sanctions will change the behavior of Iran—unless they are multilateral. The purpose of sanctions cannot simply be to feel politically justified. The purpose, of course, must be to change errant behavior.

In imposing unilateral sanctions, this step by the United States should be our calling card for them to join us. If this is not the charge to the State Department, then the outcome will merely be a shift in the flow of commerce, a few thousand fewer jobs in America, and more important, no change in Iran's behavior.

To learn from the lessons over time of unilateral economic sanctions, I strongly urge the Administration to put in place a process to involve industries affected and a policy that recognizes that multilateral sanctions, and "reverse" sanctions on the offending country are the only effective means to achieve our security objectives.

Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen, the end of a century is like a hinge in history: A time to look to at the past—and always a time to complete the unfinished work of the future. The steps we take in the final five years of this century could well spell our destiny in the next.

Failure to understand the public and private economic imperatives of export expansion, will put us on a slow but sure spiral into economic disarmament: Will earn us a page in history offering a painful lesson in decline—a lesson made more bleak because our prospects were so bright.

Success—traveling the path that leads to our destiny as an Export Superpower—will bring a standard of living and a level of security the likes of which earlier generations could never have dreamed possible.

To realize that future: We must all pay attention . . .

And America must act.

Thank you.