

Here's how today's Wall Street Journal describes it:

Mrs. O'Leary quietly hired an investigative service to poke into the reporters who were poking around the DOE. From April through August, the service, Washington-based Carma International, tracked more than two dozen individual reporters and hundreds of newspapers, magazines and newscasts. It also pored over thousands of stories, giving each one a numerical ranking based on how favorable or unfavorable it was. It then calculated scores for how favorably or unfavorably the DOE fared on various issues, from nuclear waste to Mrs. O'Leary's own reputation. And it scrutinized sources quoted in those stories, coming up with its own "Top 25" list of "Unfavorable Sources."

Wanda Briggs and John Stang, reporters with the Tri-Cities Herald in Washington State, are among those the investigative service monitored.

Mr. President, the foolishness and irresponsibility of this venture boggles the mind. The first, most obvious point to raise is the fact that we are on a mission to balance the budget. For Secretary O'Leary to waste taxpayer dollars on her image is inexcusable. While we in Congress are trying to reduce the size and cost of Government so that we may achieve a balanced budget in 7 years, a member of the President's Cabinet feels free to throw money into frivolous projects.

Oh, and by the way, the Wall Street Journal quotes Secretary O'Leary's spokeswoman as saying that the investigative service "wasn't particularly useful," and that the Secretary read very little of what the service had to offer since "she found it too complicated." I think it's time the Secretary understood that we can neither afford, nor will we allow, \$43,000 mistakes.

Second, Mr. President, of all the various responsibilities of the DOE—and they are serious responsibilities indeed—using a private company to analyze Secretary O'Leary's image in the press is, to put it mildly, at the very bottom of the list.

The challenges facing DOE in Washington State alone are stupendous:

At the Hanford Nuclear Site, thousands of tons of nuclear waste lie underground, yards away from the Columbia River, posing a direct threat to the region's safety.

Cleanup at Hanford, while progressing, still demands our utmost attention and concern. The health of the people of the Hanford region, and of the people all over the country who live near nuclear sites, requires that we remain fully committed to cleaning up the nuclear waste.

That is just in my home State, Mr. President. Across the country, similar problems exist. So it is disturbing to learn that Secretary O'Leary's attention is being diverted by such trivial concerns as what the press is saying about her.

Mr. President, over the last 18 months, almost 5,000 people have lost their jobs at Hanford. They are struggling and will continue to struggle

with upheaval and uncertainty in their community. Meanwhile, the Secretary of Energy, someone who has potentially great influence over their fate, pulls a stunt like this. So much for setting an example at the top.

There are a lot of people in this town for whom \$43,500 is nothing—less than nothing. In the White House, in Congress, in the agencies, people deal on a daily basis with money in the millions and billions. But Mr. President, for the people of Hanford, that's real money.

There is a man in the Hanford area who lost his job more than 6 months ago. He has talked with my office, and prefers to remain anonymous. For 15 years he worked at Westinghouse as a technologist. He paid his taxes, he was a Boy Scout, he provided for his family. He was laid off on April 28—in the same month that Secretary O'Leary began her quest for a better image. He has two children and two grandchildren. His wife recently had to quit her job due to illness. He is still looking for work.

Coincidentally, Mr. President, this man's salary—before he was laid off—was \$44,000. Secretary O'Leary spent over \$43,000 for 4 months of useless media analysis. Food on the table, or image enhancement—Mr. President, just where do Hazel O'Leary's priorities lie?●

THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to lament the fact that House Joint Resolution 115 contains a provision to provide for the "orderly termination" of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations [ACIR]. This is most regrettable, and ought not to go unnoticed.

The ACIR was created by Congress in 1959—during the Eisenhower administration—"to monitor the operation of the American federal system and to recommend improvements." The commission is independent and bipartisan. Over 30 years ago, under Dr. Alice Rivlin, it commenced ground-breaking research on alternative measures of fiscal capacity. It measures tax effort and representative expenditures and a host of other topics that may appear arcane, but are of enormous importance when it comes to governance. Few people are even aware of the ACIR because it goes about its business quietly, professionally, and dispassionately.

Earlier this year, Mr. President, Congress passed the unfunded mandates bill—Public Law 104-4. That bill generated considerable discussion about our Federal system and the proper roles of and relationships between the various levels of government. At that time, the Commission's unique expertise on such questions was recognized, and Congress delegated much work regarding unfunded mandates to it. The Commission estimated it would need about \$1 million over and above its fiscal year 1995 appropriation of \$1 mil-

lion to perform the unfunded mandates work and continue equally valuable ongoing research and projects.

Earlier this year, the House Treasury-Postal appropriations bill (H.R. 2020) zeroed out funding for the Commission. The Senate bill provided \$334,000 for the Commission, but stipulated that no further Federal funds would be made available.

This seems to me a good example of an unfunded mandate. But no matter. The ACIR is prepared to continue its operations without Federal funding. I do not know how, but I leave it to them. When conferees met on the Treasury-Postal bill, however, language was inserted that would give ACIR a small appropriation to terminate its operations by April of 1996. Senate Joint Resolution 115 also provides a minimum amount of funding "necessary to accomplish orderly termination" of the Commission. Both the Commission and the Office of Management and Budget [OMB] are concerned that termination is something altogether different from simply not providing Federal funding.

I deeply regret the action of the Treasury-Postal conferees, and I deeply regret that it has carried over to the continuing resolution. Is it necessary to terminate an organization that has indicated it can survive, somehow, without Federal funds?

Mr. President, the first principle of public affairs is that you never do anything about a problem until you learn to measure it. I would add a corollary: if your purpose is not to address problems through government, you will put an end to attempts to measure them. I wonder if that is what is at work here. Surely, we are not going to balance the budget by eliminating the ACIR. What is this all about?

I remember back in December 1981, Edwin Harper, then deputy director of the OMB, issued a memorandum which stated:

As a result of recent evaluations of certain reporting requirements, it has been decided to discontinue the compilation and publication of the "Geographic Distribution of Federal Funds," effective immediately. Data should not be submitted for fiscal year 1981.

The purpose of that directive was to make it more difficult to quantify the balance of payments between the States and the Federal Government.

Beginning in 1968, the Community Services Administration began to publish annual reports, known as the Geographic Distribution of Federal Funds series, in which expenditures of various Federal programs were broken down by State, and thereafter by counties and towns. It is worth noting that the Community Services Administration was the successor to the Office of Economic Opportunity, the organization established in 1965 to carry out President Johnson's "War on Poverty." As a member of the President's task force that drew up that legislation, I had been much concerned with the question of regional balance in Federal expenditures and, in 1965, made what I believe

was the first formal statement calling attention to the loss of industrial jobs in New York. The idea of measuring these matters was an aspect of the poverty program, and it was pleasing to find that our intentions had not been lost on those who followed.

Unfortunately, the task was not done with sufficient vigor. Various Government agencies were simply asked where their money went, and the matter was left at that. Because New York is the banking center of the world, huge amounts of Federal moneys are deposited there, although they are actually in transit elsewhere. No matter: vast sums of foreign aid, payments by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and similar transfers were being recorded as Federal outlays in New York.

As you may know, Mr. President, each year that I have been in the Senate I have issued a report I call the "Fisc" which measures the balance of payments between New York and the Federal Government. You can imagine my surprise—back when the finances not only of New York City, but of the State, as well, were shaky—that the data, such as they were, suggested that New York ran a balance of payments surplus.

Well, we discovered a phantom \$14 billion in Federal outlays nominally attributed to New York. When these sums were subtracted from the total, we discovered a large and unmistakably serious deficit in New York's balance of payments. A deficit that persists to this day.

We got to the point where we had tidied up the data. It took some doing. Looking back, if a general judgment may be offered of the period, the Community Services Administration was interested and helpful. The Treasury Department, on the other hand, was aloof and impervious—equally to reason or change. In the end, we turned to the Tax Foundation, a private organization, as our source for data on tax payments, inasmuch as the Treasury Department refused to tell us then—and still will not tell us—where it gets its money.

And then the new administration came and decided to discontinue the Geographic Distribution of Federal Funds series. It was stopped in order to conceal trends and mute argument.

We protested, and we enacted Public Law 97-326, the Consolidated Federal Funds Report Act of 1982, which directed the Census Bureau to track allocable Federal expenditures. The Census Bureau does a marvelous job. Its Consolidated Federal Funds Report and Federal Expenditures by State report are available on CD-ROM now, containing 10 years' worth of data. It's marvelous.

Mr. President, the ACIR does important, if largely unheralded, work. And we stand on the brink of terminating it. This is a mistake which we will regret. I realize the provision is identical to the conferees' agreement on the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill.

But that bill is an unresolved matter. Neither the House nor the Senate has approved the conference report, and even if we were to do that, there is no guarantee the administration would sign it. There is a chance, albeit slim, to correct the mistake.

Mr. President, getting back to my first principle of public affairs, Lord Kelvin stated it best:

When you can measure what you are speaking about, and express it in numbers, you know something about it; but when you cannot measure it, when you cannot express it in numbers, your knowledge is of a meager and unsatisfactory kind: it may be the beginning of knowledge, but you have scarcely, in your thoughts, advanced to the stage of science.

Mr. President, without the ACIR, our knowledge of important matters will never be anything more than meager. The action we are about to take will harm our capacity to govern effectively.●

TRIBUTE TO AGRI-MARK-CABOT COOPERATIVE

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, today I rise to congratulate and pay tribute to the members of the Agri-Mark/Cabot Cooperative. On November 13, 1995, the hardworking Agri-Mark framers dedicate the newly renovated state-of-the art cheddar cheese production facility in Middlebury, VT.

For over 75 years Cabot Creamery has produced superior dairy products from local Vermont farms. Today, only the size of Cabot has changed. Farmers from throughout New England and New York have joined the farmers from Vermont with great pride in producing the highest quality products. Farm fresh milk will be churned into Cabot's award-winning cheeses for stores throughout the country and around the globe.

Mr. President, Cabot products are in high demand. Cabot's special detail to quality gives their products the edge over the competition. In fact, Cabot's own sharp cheddar was acclaimed the best cheddar in the country by the U.S. Cheese Makers Association in Green Bay, WI. That's right, even the competition agrees that Cabot farmers produce the best. In addition to the overwhelming satisfaction of real cheddar lovers, just this year Cabot's Vermont cheddar won first place at the American Cheese Society's annual contest.

Throughout my years in Congress, I have been proud to represent the Vermont dairy farmer. I have worked to protect farmer income, bring stability to the dairy industry, and preserve Vermont's agricultural landscape. This investment of money and sweat from the farmers of Agri-Mark/Cabot comes at a time when Congress is making sweeping changes to the Government's involvement with the dairy industry. I am confident that the farmers of Agri-Mark/Cabot will adapt to the changes of the industry, becoming

more efficient, competitive, and productive. I will continue to give the support that the farmers deserve and respect in Congress to allow them to succeed.

Mr. President, I join with the 1,800 Agri-Mark/Cabot farmers in a "Milk Toast to the Future." One hundred years from today, the farmers of Agri-Mark will open a time capsule. In it they will find the past that helped build the future. The dedicated members of this farmer owned cooperative believe that their hard work in the first 75 years is the key to the success in the next 100 years. We must all work together and recognize the value of the family farm to our State and our country. Vermont's farms will survive and remain the backbone of Vermont's heritage.●

AN 80TH BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE TO SARGENT SHRIVER

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute today to Sargent Shriver, my dear friend for whom I have the utmost respect and admiration, on the occasion of his 80th birthday.

It is rare, in this day and age, to be able to say that a person has truly made the world a better place in which to live. But that is a fitting description of Sargent Shriver. A man of stellar character, faithful devotion, and tireless energy, Sargent Shriver has led a life of philanthropy, compassion, and public service.

Born on this day in 1915, Sargent Shriver earned both his undergraduate and law degrees from Yale University. In 1953, he married Eunice Kennedy—and I say to my good friend Eunice today, she could not have married a better man. Shriver has, at different points in his life, played the roles of Navy serviceman, *Newsweek* journalist, Merchandise Mart general manager, Chicago Board of Education commissioner, public servant, vice presidential candidate, and Ambassador to France.

But the roles in which Sargent Shriver truly shined are those for which he is best known. In 1961, Sargent Shriver became the chief organizer and first director of the Peace Corps, establishing an organization that would come to the aid of foreign communities needing medical, educational, and technical assistance, while giving millions of Americans the opportunity to share knowledge and culture with those around the world. It was not easy—the critics were numerous and vocal—but he pressed on and the Peace Corps became one of the hallmarks of the Kennedy Administration. Mr. President, Sargent Shriver deserves the gratitude of every American for his work in this capacity. I must add my personal thanks to him, for my own service in the Peace Corps profoundly affected my life.

But Sargent Shriver's commitment to those most in need did not end there. Leading President Johnson's War on Poverty, Shriver ushered in