

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.

Nothing could be more hypocritical and contradictory than the spectacle of a Republican governor demanding that his state's university system rely solely on the crude instrument of test scores to select 70 percent of its incoming students.

Republicans never tire of saying that what made America great are the virtues of honesty, courage, initiative and imagination, integrity, loyalty and fair play, all best demonstrated by a person's track record and especially his or her perseverance in the face of adversity. Why then are conservatives vilifying universities for taking these values seriously in selecting the next generation of leaders?

Race, we are told, should have nothing to do with the assessment of these virtues. Race, however, refers to several aspects of a person. It refers to physical appearance, and this, every African-American would agree with Senator Dole and Governor Wilson, should be a matter of no importance.

But for African-Americans, race also means surviving an environment in which racism is still pervasive. It has to be taken into account in assessing the content of any black person's character, and to assert that this amounts to a divisive glorification of race is as disingenuous and as absurd as claiming that we are divisively glorifying poverty and broken families when we take account of these factors in assessing a white student's character.

There is a third important meaning of race, and it is here that we enter tricky ground.

Blackness also connotes something positive: the subcultural heritage of African-Americans that in spite of centuries of discrimination has vastly enriched American civilization out of all proportion to the numbers, and treatment, of the group creating it. The University of California, like other great institutions of learning, rightly has seen the exposure of all its students to this important minority culture as part of its educational mission.

A POLICY THAT WORKS ONLY IN AN ECUMENICAL AMERICA

This is a noble goal, but it is fraught with dangers. What brought me around to support affirmative action after some strong initial reservations was not only its effectiveness as a strategy for reducing inequality, but also its possibilities for cross-pollinating our multi-ethnic communities. In the process, it could promote that precious, overarching national culture—the envy of the world—which I call ecumenical America.

But the promotion of diversity has done nothing of the sort, as Governor Wilson and Mr. Connerly were able to argue with devastating impact. To the contrary, both on an off our campuses affirmative action seems to have been distorted by its beneficiaries into the goal of balkanizing America both intellectually and culturally. One has only to walk for a few minutes on any large campus to witness the pervasiveness of ethnic separatism, marked by periodic outbursts of other chauvinisms and hostilities.

No group of people now seem more committed to segregation than black students and young professionals.

Their motto seems to be: separate, yes, but make sure there is equality, by affirmative action or any other means. To a lesser extent, the tendency of the new black middle class to segregate itself residentially and to scoff at the norms and values of the ecumenical mainstream is the off-campus version of this lamentable betrayal and abandonment of the once cherished goal of integration.

Ethnic separatism has also had deleterious academic consequences. In an experiment

conducted at the University of Michigan by two psychologists, Claude Steele and Richard Nisbett, a group of disadvantaged minority students who were encouraged to be part of the campus mainstream, and made to understand that the highest standards were expected of them, consistently performed above the average for white students and the student body as a whole. Members of a control group who took the familiar route of ethnic solidarity and consciousness-raising performed well below the average.

At its best, affirmative action compensates for one of the greatest disabilities of minority members: their lack of access to vital networks and other social capital which white men simply take for granted, whether it is the construction worker who mobilizes his neighborhood ties to get on a high-paying work crew, or the upper-middle class manager who draws on his grammar school and Ivy League contacts to land the vice presidency of some budding company.

Once in, however, too many minority workers and women felt entitled to automatic promotion and were too quick to use the accusation of racism or sexism when it was denied. Too many supervisors practice a patronizing racism or sexism. The cynical promotion of unqualified people, even if it happens only occasionally, damages the legitimacy of affirmative action since it takes only one such mistake to sour an entire organization.

Also damaging were clearly illegal practices like using blacks and women as entrepreneurial fronts to gain access to preferential contracts.

These are all correctable errors. Universities and businesses should return to the principle of integration, to the notion that diversity is not something to be celebrated and promoted in its own right, but an opportunity for mutual understanding and the furtherance of an ecumenical national culture.

The President should remain firm in his principled resolve to defend a corrected version of affirmative action. And if we give it a time limit of 10 years, it might still be possible to save this troubled but effective and badly needed policy. ●

HONORING RICHARD A. GRASSO, COOLEY'S ANEMIA FOUNDATION'S HUMANITARIAN OF THE YEAR

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Richard A. Grasso, chairman and chief executive officer of the New York Stock Exchange on his selection as the recipient of the first annual Humanitarian of the Year Award presented by the Cooley's Anemia Foundation. The Cooley's Anemia Foundation is honoring Mr. Grasso for his support, friendship, and tireless efforts on behalf of the patients and families who are impacted by this devastating blood disease.

As the father of young children himself, Mr. Grasso, I believe, has a keen understanding of the importance of supporting the efforts led by the Cooley's Anemia Foundation to find a cure for what the World Health Organization has identified as the most common inherited genetic blood disease in the world.

Mr. Grasso has had a distinguished career over the last 26 years at the New York Stock Exchange. He is the first member of the New York Stock Ex-

change staff to be elected to the position of chairman and chief executive officer in the exchange's 200-year history. He has exhibited what is best about the American spirit—he has given back to his community by working on behalf of many good causes.

Just consider the following. He is currently Chairman of the board of trustees of Junior Achievement of New York and he serves on the board of directors of the National Italian-American Foundation. Mr. Grasso is a trustee of the New York City Police Foundation, as well as a member of the board of directors of the Washington, DC-based police foundation. He also serves on the St. Vincent's Hospital Board of Trustees in New York City. He is the honorary chairman of the Friends of the Statue of Liberty National Monument-Ellis Island Foundation. He even finds time to serve his own local community, Old Brookville, NY, as police commissioner and village trustee.

His receipt of the Cooley's Anemia Foundation's Humanitarian of the Year Award adds to the many awards and honors he has already received, including the Humanitarian of the Year Award from the Tomorrow's Children's Fund, the Special Achievement Award in Business from the National Italian-American Foundation, the Ellis Island Medal of Honor from the National Ethnic Coalition of Organizations, the Good Scout Award from the Greater New York Councils for Boy Scouts of America, and the Brotherhood Award from the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Most recently, he was honored in 1994 as the Man of the Year by the Catholic Big Brothers organization. He is indeed a special person, having risen to the top ranks of his profession and still finding time to give back to these worthwhile causes.

His efforts on behalf of the Cooley's Anemia Foundation are particularly important and special to me. I know many of the families and patients who must deal with treating this disease every day of their lives. Every 2 weeks, Cooley's anemia patients require transfusions of red blood cells. Every day they must wear a special pump that painfully infuses a drug for 12 hours. But, because of research over the last several decades, treatment has been developed which prolongs the life of Cooley's anemia patients. Twenty years ago, most patients rarely lived past the age of 10; today many are living into their twenties and trying to be productive citizens. Now, promising new research is being conducted into Cooley's anemia, giving us all great hope that some day it will be curable.

That is why the efforts of people like Richard Grasso are so important. At a time when new research opportunities are before us, we must ensure that the resources of private philanthropic organizations, such as the Cooley's Anemia Foundation, are strengthened. Additionally, we must assure that the Federal commitment continues.