

We have seen peace prevail in most places for a half century. We have avoided another world war.

But we have not solved older, deeply-rooted problems that continue to diminish the potential of half the world's population.

Now it is time to act on behalf of women everywhere.

If we take bold steps to better the lives of women, we will be taking bold steps to better the lives of children and families too. Families rely on mothers and wives for emotional support and care; families rely on women for labor in the home; and increasingly, families rely on women for income needed to raise healthy children and care for other relatives.

As long as discrimination and inequities remain so commonplace around the world—as long as girls and women are valued less, fed less, fed last, overworked, underpaid, not schooled and subjected to violence in and out of their homes—the potential of the human family to create a peaceful, prosperous world will not be realized.

Let this conference be our—and the world's—call to action.

And let us heed the call so that we can create a world in which every woman is treated with respect and dignity, every boy and girl is loved and cared for equally, and every family has the hope of a strong and stable future.

Thank you very much.

God's blessings on you, your work and all who will benefit from it.●

#### IT'S NOT FOR WHITE MEN TO DECIDE

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, we have heard a lot of talk about affirmative action, much of it designed to attract votes rather than to contribute any light or rational discussion.

Recently, I was on a radio discussion program with our former college, Pete Wilson, now the Governor of California. His position is one that I am sure is supported by a majority of Republicans and may be temporarily politically wise. But I do not believe it serves the Nation well.

In an appearance on the David Brinkley program, he quoted Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. It was of interest to me then to pick up the Los Angeles Times and read Arthur Schlesinger's response.

Like most things Arthur Schlesinger writes, it is loaded with good sense, and I ask that his response be printed in the RECORD.

The response follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 3, 1995]

IT'S NOT FOR WHITE MEN TO DECIDE

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

On Sunday, July 23, while I was befogged in Dark Harbor, Me., Gov. Pete Wilson of California seemed even more befogged on "This Week With David Brinkley." On this program, he cited me and my small book "The Disuniting of America" in support of his crusade against affirmative action. "[Schlesinger] uses a phrase," Wilson said, "that various policies are, in fact, tribalizing America, and, in fact, that is unhappily the case, and we need to end it."

Wilson is quite correct in noting my concern about the campaign by "multicultural" ideologues to promote and perpetuate separate ethnic and racial communities. But he is quite wrong in suggesting that I am, for

that reason, opposed to affirmative action. On the contrary, affirmative action has been, in my view, a valuable and potent means of moving the republic away from ethnic and racial separatism and toward a more integrated and unified society.

Before affirmative action, the labor market and the educational system were encrusted with barriers, antipathies and conditioned reflexes that systematically excluded women and non-white minorities. Affirmative action has played an indispensable role in breaking these terribly well-entrenched patterns in employment, college admission and other arenas of recruitment and upward mobility. The goal of affirmative action is precisely to destroy racial and gender barriers; and it is the free intermingling of peoples that provides that basis for a common culture and an embracing national identity.

Unquestionably, some reforms are in order. Rigid application of "diversity" standards often leads to bad results, especially in government employment. Programs carried out in the name of affirmative action, especially preferences for what purport to be minority business enterprises, have been sorely abused. Still, affirmative action in the main has served as an agency for the uniting, not the disuniting, of America.

I regard affirmative action as a transitional program. I do not expect it to become a permanent feature of the labor market. When should the transition end? It should end when our white male ruling class no longer automatically discriminates against women and against nonwhite minorities. And the decision as to when the point is reached surely belongs to those whose needs affirmative action is intended to meet.

Already some beneficiaries are growing increasingly uneasy. Affirmative action seems to cast doubt on their own credentials, competence and worth. They have become partners in the firm or professors in the university, others might think, not on their merits but because of racial or gender preference.

Affirmative action can thus become a means of undermining self-esteem and dignity. It can imply that, without affirmative action, women and minorities could not survive and compete in the world of affairs. It may carry with it a flavor of condescension and patronage. And it inevitably and understandably arouses the resentment of those who feel that affirmative action discriminates against them.

When enough beneficiaries regard affirmative action with embarrassment and discomfort, the time will have come to roll up the policy. And the more white male America practices policies of inclusion rather than exclusion, the sooner that time will come.

But until women and nonwhite minorities see affirmative action as more a handicap than a help, the case for its continuation in some form seems strong. And surely the decision about continuation is not one to be made for hapless minorities by politically ambitious white governors. Such overweening presumption by powerful white men is the true road to the disuniting of America.●

#### IN HONOR OF KITE SOCIETY OF WISCONSIN WEEK

● Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to announce that this year the 17th annual Frank Mots Memorial Kite Festival will be held on September 16 in Milwaukee, WI. Kite flying is one of the most beautiful and relaxing hobbies around. Many of us can still remember when we were children, building our first kite and watch-

ing with excitement as it became airborne. Today children of all ages can experience this thrill again during the Kite Society of Wisconsin Week, which will take place the week of September 11-17.

Frank Mots was a kite flying enthusiast, and it was in his memory that the Kite Society of Milwaukee was created in 1976. The festival that bears his name was founded in 1978 and has drawn people from around the country every year. I invite everyone to celebrate this event on September 16 and take some time out to enjoy the simple pleasures of kite flying. The Frank Mots Memorial Kite Festival has something for everyone, and I am proud of the kite society's accomplishments.●

#### BIG MAC TO GO; HOLD THE LIES

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, one of the most thoughtful observers in the Nation today is Felix Rohatyn, an investment banker, who has had considerable leadership experience at both the local, State, and Federal levels.

He was chairman of New York's Municipal Assistance Corp., from 1975 to 1993 and helped put the pieces together when New York City was in such desperate straits.

He had an article recently in the Washington Post that comments specifically about the District of Columbia and New York City, but it is really much more than that. He is really talking about what our priorities are as a Nation and what we must do to revitalize urban American and revitalize the Nation.

To the timid souls in the House and Senate and the administration who are afraid to face our problems and come up with realistic answers to those problems, because realistic answers are not going to be immediately popular, I would note his comment:

Many of our actions were deemed to be political suicide when first considered, but it is worth noting that Governor Carey's approval rating was the highest ever in December 1975 when we had carried out the most painful parts of the restructuring.

The American public yearns for genuine leadership, not public relations talk. Instead to much too great a degree, we are providing the public relations talk but not genuine leadership.

I ask that the Felix Rohatyn article be printed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to read it.

The article follows:

BIG MAC TO GO; HOLD THE LIES; NEW YORK'S RECIPE FOR RECOVERY—AND WHAT D.C. CAN TAKE FROM IT

(By Felix Rohatyn)

Watching the evolution of the District of Columbia's fiscal crisis inevitably brings to many of us here in New York City memories of our own brush with bankruptcy in the 1970s. There are too many differences between our situation 20 years ago and the District's today to draw direct parallels. Still, there are lessons in our successes—and in our failures—that may provide some useful insights to those trying to direct the District's future.

The first of those lessons is that recovery was not rapid and—for reasons both of our own making and beyond our control—it was not permanent. It took New York City almost six years from the time we lost access to the financial markets in 1975 until we regained it in 1981, having balanced three consecutive budgets in the meantime. Now, 14 years later, New York City is again in the throes of a serious budgetary crisis which shows no signs of early resolution.

To the extent that we succeeded, much is owed to a few factors: putting able and responsive people into top city management positions; enlisting the cooperative efforts of all parties—state and city officials, labor, business—who contributed to the problem in the first place; getting financial controls into place; building public support for the tough actions needed; securing help from higher levels of government. To the extent we failed, it was because we relied too much on stopgap measures and postponed structural reforms needed to secure the city's future. There are caveats for the District in all this.

Many of the forces that drove New York City towards bankruptcy in the '70s are not unlike those that now cast a shadow over the District's, and, indeed, the entire country's future: excessive borrowings, escalating budget deficits, excessive public spending and shrinking private employment, compounded by weak political leadership. Just as the District's problems had been building for many years, under the nose of the mayor, city council and their federal overseers on Capitol Hill, New York's crisis was obscured for many years by imaginative bookkeeping and by lenders who looked the other way.

By May 1975, when the banks refused to provide additional loans to the city, short-term debt had climbed from practically nothing six years earlier to almost \$6 billion. (In each of those years the city's budget was reported to miraculously, "in balance.") The city work force had ballooned to 300,000 people while private employment (and tax revenues) plummeted during the recession of the early 1970s. When newly elected Gov. Hugh Carey, formerly a liberal Democratic congressman from Brooklyn, appointed four private citizens (including me) to recommend a course of action, we were 18 days away from a default and a bankruptcy filing.

During the next six months, we put in place practically every new structure and agreement that served as the ultimate cornerstone to our recovery. Some survive to this day. These were the main components:

Getting control. In this and many other instances, strong bipartisan leadership at the state level was crucial, support that the District must look to the federal level to supply. Under great pressure from the governor, practically the entire top management of the city was replaced, including the first deputy mayor, budget director, and deputy mayors for finance and operations. All but one of the new appointees came from the private sector. They, together with the executive director of the Emergency Financial Control Board (EFCB), constituted as capable a management team as the city ever had.

The EFCB, analogous to D.C.'s new financial control board, consisted of the governor, mayor, city and state comptrollers and three private citizens appointed by the governor. It had the power to set the level of city revenues and to reject any budget submitted by the mayor not in compliance with the long-term plan. All major city contracts, including labor contracts, were subject to its approval. Once these control structures were in place after the usual political struggles, we had total cooperation from city officials—including Mayor Abraham Beame, despite the high cost to his political career.

The EFCB's veto power and the shared commitment of top city management meant that it was possible to translate the requirements of the approved budget plan into actual savings. It is always easy to demand or promise cuts on paper; it is much harder to pocket them. This is especially true if, as some in the District are urging, reliance is placed on the voluntary response of city workers to accept buyouts or on privatization to cut costs and payrolls.

Getting the facts. We knew the numbers we were working with were meaningless and that we needed a factual basis for any long-term plan. It took many months, but ultimately the city, with the help of outside experts, put in place a system of financial controls and accounting second to none.

Just as the true dimensions of the District's fiscal gap were revealed only over a period of months, New York City's 1975 deficit turned out to be almost triple the initial estimate—close to \$1.5 billion on a total budget of about \$13 billion (including about \$600 million of expenses buried in the capital budget).

Negotiating a social contract between business and labor. Key to our success was enlisting the help of those who had created the problem. The city's labor and business leaderships (including the banks), as well as the state and city themselves, provided a relatively small number of people who could make commitments on behalf of their constituents and deliver them.

Having a common goal was important; carrying it out was agonizingly difficult. The "social contract" provided labor support for deferring all wage increases, at no interest cost, and a minimum 6 percent attrition rate. Ultimately 60,000 workers, 20 percent of the work force, went off the payroll through layoffs or attrition. Pension benefits were rolled back, while union pension funds purchased \$2.5 billion of city bonds (which proved a good investment for retirees).

Just as the District is beginning to do, we looked hard at city functions to see which were essential and which we could live without. Tuition was imposed, for the first time, at City University. Transit fares were doubled. Services were sharply cut, with the worst impact borne by the school system. Rigid cost controls were imposed. Taxes were temporarily increased.

The banks, in turn, supported creation of the Municipal Assistance Corp., a state agency directed by a board of nine private citizens and authorized to issue up to \$10 billion of long-term bonds, backed by a portion of the city sales tax. MAC financed the phase-out of the city deficit by 1980, as well as a dramatic increase in the city's infrastructure investment by 1985.

All of these actions resulted from difficult and often acrimonious negotiations. For example, after the initial wave of 20,000 layoff notices, striking sanitation workers disrupted the city and greeted arriving passengers at Kennedy Airport with signs saying: "Welcome to Stink City." This scared the mayor into rehiring a number of workers—which, in turn, caused financing for MAC's first private market bond offering to collapse. Still, we were able to stop the bleeding.

Getting outside help. For all the pain, the city's redemption depended importantly on help from the state which assumed certain of the city's costs for courts, correction and higher education. At a critical time, the state also purchased \$250 million of MAC bonds and provided MAC with its "moral authority" to maintain our credit.

Federal help, while psychologically critical, was far more limited (Remember the famous New York Daily News headline "Ford to City: Drop Dead.") Still, the Ford admin-

istration provided a limited amount (\$1.5 billion) of seasonal loans which was replaced by the Carter administration by long-term loan guarantees which were totally paid off in the early 1980s.

Building public support. Being open with the public and consistently explaining actions and goals helped the city's emergency management build and sustain a positive public spirit (an effort made easier by the natural pride and civic spirit of New Yorkers). The fact that New York has a number of powerful newspapers also helped to create the public support our political leaders needed to carry out extremely painful actions every day—the details of which were almost impossible to explain on television. Many of our actions were deemed to be political suicide when first considered, but it is worth noting that Gov. Carey's approval rating was the highest ever in December 1975 when we had carried out the most painful parts of the restructuring.

Important as these stern measures were, the city could not have moved its budget into balance after four years without the help of the national economic recovery and the revitalization of the city's own private sector. And a sharply accelerating public investment program helped generate the strong local economy. Budget cuts alone will not create recovery.

But it is also true that temporary budget cuts won't solve much of anything. And here is where we made our greatest mistake: Postponing fundamental reform. We believed that we had basically changed the city because we had balanced the budget and regained our credit. We were wrong.

The economic recovery of the 1980s seduced the city back into some of its prior spending habits. Prosperity is the enemy of reform. The work force swelled to pre-crisis levels; cost increases were not offset by productivity increases; full pension benefits were restored. No serious thought was given to the gradual elimination of certain services or to the possible privatization of functions like the municipal hospital system or to restructuring the school system. No real improvement was made either in the quality or efficiency of service delivery. Similarly, temporary measures were always taken to deal with long-term reductions in the city's revenue base. By the time Mayor Rudolph Giuliani came on the scene in 1993, a major structural deficit was again built into the city's budget.

The problems our mayor—like the District's—faces are greater than those of the 1970s, in both the private and public sectors. Much higher levels of crime, drugs and AIDS; rising caseloads for welfare and Medicaid funds; inadequate public schools; high taxes and poor quality-of-life and unsustainable labor costs—all these are driving taxpayers and businesses out.

Ultimately, however, success in New York, as in every city, will depend on the private sector. But for a city to retain its advantages as a cultural, communications and financial center, it must provide a level of public service far superior to what most provide today. It must have an educated work force and first-class public schools; safe and clean streets; attractive and affordable public transportation; a business-friendly tax environment; a thriving entertainment district; airports and railroad stations friendly to the traveler; partnership between universities and high-technology companies; and adequate housing for employees. These are all things that only cooperation between the private and public sector can provide.

In this regard, the District may have some advantages New York City did not enjoy.

The biggest one, so far, seems to be the willingness of the Republican leadership in Congress to encourage fundamental change to improve the District's long-term prospects. Tax benefits, school vouchers, extensive privatization, increased infrastructure investment and more should be tried not only in Washington, D.C., but in every metropolitan area. A bipartisan interest in developing a real urban agenda in America is way overdue. Without such an agenda, no city plan anywhere in this country is realistic in the long run.

Some of the problems we face in New York as well as those of the District were self-inflicted and due to irresponsible policies. Many others, however, are not of our doing. Only national policies can deal with national problems such as poverty, health care, crime, education and immigration. The idea that sending welfare and Medicaid back to the states will be viable is total fantasy—simply an excuse for massive cutbacks with unfathomable results.

America is the only advanced Western democracy that does not consider its cities as both its cultural and economic crown jewels. In Europe, cities existed long before countries came into being. The notion that Paris, Rome, London, Berlin or Amsterdam could face the kind of economic pressures and physical neglect that is faced by America's major cities is unthinkable. Without a change in the appreciation of what cities mean to the U.S. economy, we will ultimately be doomed to fail here in New York, and the District of Columbia will be a permanent ward of the federal government. If the cities fail, ultimately we will be doomed to fail as a society and as a nation.●

#### TRIBUTE TO MIKE CURRAN

● Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I rise today to salute a valued and trusted public servant, Mr. Mike Curran, who is retiring this month following 30 distinguished years as an employee of the U.S. Forest Service. Since 1986, Mike has been the forest supervisor for the Ouachita National Forest in Arkansas, and that is where I came to know him and to admire his abilities.

Mike has been an outstanding leader of people and manager of assets throughout his career in public forestry, and his exceptional ability to forge through new concepts to meet changing public demands certainly caught my eye. His creative style and national flair for addressing competing interest groups and issues has been key to his success.

In 1990 I became involved in one of the most divisive forest issues ever to face the national forests in Arkansas. Public demand to eliminate the practice of clear-cutting had reached a peak. Mike was instrumental in bringing the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service to Arkansas to meet with me to determine whether or not a new way of looking at forest management could be developed that would allow us to eliminate this disagreeable practice and continue to produce quality timber in quantity.

This event led to the implementation to the new perspectives concept of sustainable forestry and placed the Ouachita National Forest, under Mike's leadership, in the lead position

in a national movement toward the ecosystem management philosophy. Mike weathered much criticism from many corners as this system began to be developed. At times I know he felt he was under siege personally. Today the Ouachita National Forest has never been healthier, and its future is bright.

Mike has made a significant contribution to our Nation, and all of our forests have followed his lead. Thank you, Mike. We wish you Godspeed in your future endeavors.●

#### AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, ON THE MERIT SYSTEM

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the University of California has been the focus of above-average attention on the issue of affirmative action because of the presence of two national political figures, Governor Pete Wilson and the Reverend Jesse Jackson.

I wish we lived in a time in which affirmative action was not necessary but that is not the case. We have improved as a society—even though many people may not recognize that—since the days of my youth, but we still have a long way to go.

Of particular interest to me was a New York Times op-ed piece by Professor Orlando Patterson about the California situation.

I ask that the op-ed piece be printed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to read his remarks, if they did not read them in the New York Times.

The material follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 7, 1995]

#### AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, ON THE MERIT SYSTEM

(By Orlando Patterson)

CAMBRIDGE, MA.—For years Americans have complained about government programs for the disadvantaged that do not work. Now, however, we are on the verge of dismantling affirmative action, the one policy that, for all its imperfections has made a major difference in the lives of women and minority groups and has helped us achieve the constitutional commitment to the ideal of equality and fairness.

In utilitarian terms, it is hard to find a program that has brought so much gain to so many at so little cost. It has been the single most important factor in the rise of a significant, it still economically fragile, black middle class.

So it is hard to understand why it has become the most contentious issue in the nation. One would have thought that a policy that so many politicians denounced would have adversely touched the lives of at least a substantial proportion of those opposing it.

The facts show just the opposite. A National Opinion Research Center survey in 1990, still applicable today, found that while more than 70 percent of white Americans asserted that whites were being hurt by affirmative action for blacks, only 7 percent claimed to have experienced any form of reverse discrimination. Only 16 percent knew of someone close who had. Fewer than one in four could even claim that it was something they had witnessed or heard about at their workplace.

#### STANDARDS ROSE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA IN THE LAST 12 YEARS

So what was the source feeding all the outrage? The vast majority of those interviewed

claimed to have heard about the problem either through the press or from other second-hand sources, like their political leaders.

Of course, such data would not matter were affirmative action something inherently evil. But this could hardly be the case, because for more than 15 years leaders of both parties, including Senator Bob Dole and Gov. Pete Wilson of California, both Republican Presidential candidates, supported this initiative. Indeed, they lauded it, as both morally defensible and the only effective means of remedying the intolerable exclusion of disadvantaged minorities and women from opportunities to train and apply for the better-paying working- and middle-class jobs.

What happened? How did so manifestly worthy and effective a program lose the support, including that of some people who stood the most to gain from it?

Blaming the media or the cynicism of our leaders will not do, the transparent opportunism of Mr. Dole and Mr. Wilson notwithstanding. Several factors account for the collapse of support for affirmative action.

The first is that the largely erroneous arguments of neo-conservative and other right-wing critics somehow carried the day. Merit, we were repeatedly warned, was being undermined, resulting in both individual inequities and, worse, severe threats to our economy and the demands of a high-tech society.

Nonsense, both. Only a minuscule number of whites, we now know, are affected by affirmative action, and of this small fraction, a still smaller percentage are able to claim genuine grievances.

The claim that our economic efficiency is being threatened is simply laughable. Oddly enough, the problem right now is not a shortage of highly trained manpower but an oversupply, demonstrated by a saturated market for scientists and engineers. An alarming number of them are becoming lawyers (the overdependence on which being perhaps our biggest waste of manpower resources).

White men still control more than 99.9 percent of all the important top positions in private and public institutions, as well as the vast majority of middle-level and high-paying jobs. They will continue to do so unit well into the next millennium.

There is also the argument that affirmative action has done nothing for the underclass and poor but favors people already in the middle class. Although rhetorically it is extremely effective, it is deliberately misleading. This point figured prominently the recent broadsides against the University of California's affirmative action policies from Governor Wilson and an influential university regent, Ward Connerly.

But affirmative action was never intended to help the poorest and least able. It is, by nature, a top-down strategy, meant to level the field for those who are capable of taking advantage of opportunities denied them because of their sex or race.

For the underclass and the working poor, an entirely different set of bottom-up strategies are called for, although no one seems to know what these might be.

The University of California's experience with affirmative action demonstrates beyond doubt the shallowness of the politicians' criticisms. Over the past 12 years, it has achieved its goal of incorporating students from disadvantaged minorities.

But far from experiencing a decline in standards, the university has not only fulfilled its mandate of selecting students from the top one-eighth of the state's graduating class, but has increased its eligibility requirements five times during this period. It is now a far more selective institution than before the introduction of affirmative action, with improved graduation rates for both black and non-black students.