

In sum—we do not want an underperforming, undersaving, under-investing American economy any more than you do—if only because a weakened American economy will trigger off strong protectionist tendencies in the United States.

THE U.S. AS AN INFLUENCE ON EAST ASIAN  
DEMOCRATIZATION

Ladies and gentlemen:

Over the past half-century, a spacious sense of its self-interest has impelled the United States to help shape East Asian development—in fact, to make East Asian development happen.

And this enlightened self-interest derives from the very idea that is America. Its Founding Fathers saw their country as a venture greater than just another national enterprise. They saw their country as bringing a message of revolutionary enlightenment to all humankind.

That revolutionary message has not lost its relevance—particularly for East Asian people who—as they become richer and more secure—are demanding respect from their rulers—and a say in how they are governed.

Authoritarian regimes may seek their legitimacy by sponsoring capitalist growth. But economic development cannot—forever—substitute for democracy. And it is to the idea of America that East Asia looks—in its groping for freedom. Look at how the Chinese student-militants of 1989 dared to raise a 30-foot plaster model of the Statue of Liberty on Tiananmen Square.

During the cold war, America was sometimes accused of a cynical willingness to sacrifice democracy abroad to preserve democracy at home. Now, at last, America can reconcile power and morality in its foreign relations.

Despite a decline in its relative wealth, capacity and influence, the United States today is the world's only superpower. And it is at the cutting edge of a revolution in both military technology and doctrine which promises to preserve its military preeminence in the world for at least another generation.

Because of its hegemonic power, America “can afford the luxury of attending to principle.”

America can be to the world what its founders meant it to be—the ultimate refuge of all those “yearning to breathe free.”

WORTHWHILE CAUSES FOR AMERICAN IDEALISM

And—although the ideological challenge from messianic communism has collapsed—there is no lack of worthwhile causes for American idealism.

We are as far away from a stable—and moral—international order as we were at the end of World War II. Far too many regions of the world are still subject to regimes of varying barbarism; while other national societies are disintegrating in anarchy.

If only America can gather its resolve, it can also lead the global community to begin dealing with the tremendous income disparities among nations—and alleviating the mass-poverty of regions like South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa.

Then there is the care and protection of the global environment—a task so susceptible to the free-rider axiom that it needs exceptional leadership to organize effectively and equitably.

In these vital missions of reawakening America to its historical role—and of propagating in the Asia-Pacific the ideals and values America stands for—this center of intellect and scholarship will continue to play an ever-increasing role.

Throughout its time on Earth, humankind has been striving for the ideal society. Unless we of the Asia-Pacific and America embark on a win-win Direction, that ideal may forever remain beyond our grasp.

But, if America remains true to its original sense of revolutionary enlightenment, perhaps it can lead the world to approximate that ideal: To banish pain and fear and hunger—to bring a measure of peace and prosperity to every region—to enable every nation to discover the extraordinary possibilities of ordinary people.

Thank you and good day!

PROTECTING PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as my colleagues are aware, I have introduced legislation to reform the way property owners are treated by the Government. My legislation would encourage, support, and promote the private ownership of property by clarifying existing laws and creating a more uniform and efficient process by which these rights are protected. In short, it seeks to protect the rights of citizens as envisioned by the Framers of the Constitution.

Recently, however, critics have misinterpreted some of the bill's provisions. For example, some have stated that this bill would cost the taxpayers billions of dollars to implement or that it would force the Government to pay polluters to clean up their act. These fears are not warranted.

I was encouraged by an editorial in Salt Lake City's Deseret News headlined “Enough with half-truths about property rights bill.” This editorial dispels the myths and misconceptions about property rights legislation. I commend it to my colleagues. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Salt Lake City Deseret News,  
Nov. 20, 1995]

ENOUGH WITH HALF-TRUTHS ABOUT PROPERTY  
RIGHTS BILL

Politicians and activists must think they are terribly clever when they toss around inaccuracies and inflated half-truths in order to win public sentiment.

Take, for instance, the attacks on Sen. Orrin Hatch's omnibus Property Rights Act, which is set to break out of the Judiciary Committee before Thanksgiving. In recent days, critics, including President Clinton, have ranted about the Utah's senator's attempts, through the bill, to force the government to “pay polluters” to clean up their operations. They have carried on about the bill's enormous costs to government (some have placed the figure in the tens of billions of dollars).

These are arguments certain to strike fear in the heart of every sober-minded American concerned with the environment and taxes—just in time for Halloween. Trouble is, they are as hollow as jack-o'-lanterns.

Critics are conveniently overlooking this sentence in the bill: “The government is not required to pay compensation in cases when the property is a nuisance.” Whoops.

Polluters, by anyone's definition, are nuisances. If the government can prove the item in question—say, a belching smoke stack or a toxic waste dump—is a nuisance, it won't have to pay compensation. No one will be paying polluters, after all.

Critics also are overlooking, or perhaps ignoring, a study recently released by the Congressional Budget Office showing the bill

would cost only up to \$40 million annually, and then only for the first few years. After that, costs would drop because agencies would avoid actions that could lead to protests by property owners. Whoops, again.

The bill is a reasonable attempt to clarify and solve a conundrum as old as the republic. While the Fifth Amendment prevents the taking of private property for public use without compensation, government must retain the right to pass regulations for the greater good of society.

Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes set the current standard for this balancing act in a 1922 Supreme Court ruling when he said, “. . . if regulation goes too far, it will be recognized as a taking.”

Hatch's bill merely attempts to define “too far,” and it would make the burden of protesting such takings less onerous for the average citizen.

Horror stories abound of small-property owners who find they can't build on their land because of wetlands or endangered species regulations. Critics have tried to diminish the impact of these stories, but they can't explain away the witnesses who have testified of them at congressional hearings. Environmental laws are indeed important and necessary, but so are property rights.

So far, 18 states have passed similar compensation laws. The House recently passed a bill that in some ways goes farther than Hatch's version. It would compensate anyone whose property was diminished in value by 20 percent, while the Hatch version requires owners to prove a 33 percent loss.

No doubt, Congress eventually will pass a compromise version of the two bills. When it does, the planet will not spin off its axis.

The Hatch bill is not above reproach. For example, it would prohibit agencies from entering private property without the consent of the owner—a prohibition that could keep the government from ever gathering facts about a nuisance.

Critics of the Property Rights Act should read it sometime, rather than amusing themselves with strange fictions.

HE PUT OUR RIGHT TO LIVE OVER  
OUR RIGHT TO KNOW

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, in early October John Scali died, the obituaries stated, of heart failure—which is interesting because John Scali was a gentleman known by his friends as being “good-hearted.” I had known John for many years in many ways and I never heard him boast, even once.

John Scali had a quiet greatness that carried him to a distinguished career as an honorable and objective journalist for ABC television, later as an adviser to President Nixon, and then as successor to George Bush as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

I first met John Scali during his and my television days; he with ABC-TV in Washington and I with WRAL-TV in Raleigh. When I was elected to the Senate in 1972 John was one of the first to call. When I arrived in the Senate in January 1973 as a new boy on the block, I saw John Scali more often. He stopped by many times, seldom for an interview but mostly as a friend.

There were a few lines in a few obituaries about John that deserved more attention than they got concerning John Scali's remarkable involvement

in pulling back the Soviet Union and the United States from what may have been the brink of war in 1962.

Mr. President, John Scali kept this episode a secret, and at this point, I shall bring to the Senate's attention a column by my longtime friend, Max Freedman, himself an erudite gentleman whose very credible thoughts appear regularly in the *Jewish Journal* published in New York City. At this point, Mr. President, let Max take over.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Max Freedman column of November 24 be printed in the *RECORD* at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the *Jewish Herald*, Nov. 24, 1995]

HE PUT OUR RIGHT TO LIVE OVER OUR RIGHT TO KNOW

(By C.H. Freedman)

The greatest tribute to John A Scali in his recent obituary was that most readers had not been that familiar with him.

Such relative non-celebrity status was what made the former ABC correspondent one of the noblest Americans ever.

Scali could have been a "superstar" journalist had he so chosen. Next to him, such names as Cronkite, Donaldson, Woodward and Bernstein would now be comparative bush leaguers had he embraced the same "journalistic ethic" many of them do.

Scali had what was arguably the greatest scoop of all time during the Cuban missile crisis in October 1962—and forwent it for the sake of America and civilization.

I recall the time all too vividly. With city-obliterating Soviet missiles pointed at us and ours at them, and our next day's very existence predicated on national egos and on two posturing leaders' flashpoints, most of us were shaking in our pre-L.L. Bean boots.

In the midst of this national trauma, the Washington-based Scali unexpectedly received a call from one Aleksandr Fomin, counselor of the Soviet Embassy. Fomin, whom Scali knew to be the head of Soviet intelligence in this country, invited him to lunch.

"I'd already had lunch," recalled Scali, "but his voice was so urgent and insistent that I decided to go immediately."

At the Occidental Restaurant, almost in the shadow of the White House, Fomin made an astonishing proposal.

"After the waiter had taken our order," Scali recounted, Fomin "came right to the point and said, 'War seems about to break out; something must be done.'"

Scali recalled answering, "Well, you should have thought of that before you introduced the missiles" in Cuba.

"There might be a way out" of the impending conflict, said Fomin. Suppose that "we would promise to remove our missiles under United Nations inspection and promise never to introduce such offensive missiles into Cuba again? Would President Kennedy be willing to promise publicly not to invade Cuba?"

Scali judiciously replied that he didn't know, but was "willing to try and find out."

To Scali's eternal credit, he forsook his journalism "ethic"—which, to many, demands such story be propagated forthwith—and instead assumed the role of patriot. In the days that followed, he became an unnoticed, unheralded courier shuttling between the White House and the Soviets until the crisis was peacefully resolved.

Not until 1964, when the lines in the sand were long since washed away, did Scali go public with the story.

He received no great tributes then—or at any time since—for the noble career sacrifice he had made two years earlier.

Imagine, especially if you're a devotee of what-if fiction, what the scenario might have been if, say, Fomin had gotten a steady busy signal on Scali's line and in his urgency called one of the dozens of other such correspondents in Washington.

Not necessarily someone like Lyle Denniston of the *Baltimore Sun*—who once told an interviewer that if he'd been old enough for World War II he would have reported the atom-bomb secret or the time and place of the upcoming D-Day invasion; indeed, he boasted, he would have even stolen such war-forfeiting information. "They would have made good stories," he explained. No, Fomin needn't have reached a Lyle Denniston to risk turning us into radioactive cinders; a much more moderate practitioner of the craft would have done just fine—say, one of the thousands of Denniston's colleagues who would never publicly proclaim what he did, but who condone, if not heartily approve of, his stance.

Such reporter would have solemnly agreed to Fomin's request, finished lunch, smiled reassuringly as he or she waved poh-kah (friendly, informal Russian "goodbye") to Fomin, then established a world's record dash—not to the White House, but to his or her newsroom.

There, a pious morality play would be staged by reporter and editors: national security versus that pompously invoked "public's right to know!"

And don't you dare even think that we idealistic journalists, in making such solemn decision, would consider such crass things as instant personal fame, skyrocketing circulation and the like.

But, blessedly, Fomin did not get that busy signal. And thus did not turn to someone who would have broken the story that, given the lost "face-saving" element, could well have led to this city and others becoming Hiroshima II.

It's sad enough to note here that John Scali was never given a fraction of the tribute he would have received had he sold out his soul and America by breaking that story. But besides being denied his moral due, he was treated shabbily in a more direct way.

Based on Scali's expertise in international matters, in 1971 President Nixon appointed him special consultant for foreign affairs and communications; two years later, Nixon named him to replace George Bush as our representative to the United Nations.

But when Gerald Ford assumed the presidency, he unceremoniously dumped this man who had performed so admirably at the post.

To be charitable toward Ford, such action demonstrated that playing football without a helmet does indeed diminish one's reasoning ability.

To be less charitable, it provided further insight into the character of a president who owed his career and prominence to conservatives—and showed his gratitude by choosing as his vice president, the original "Rockefeller-liberal Republican," Nelson.

Had Scali, 33 years ago, embraced the "ethic" of many journalists, there's an excellent chance Ford wouldn't even have been around to take over the Oval Office in 1974; indeed, there might not have even been an Oval Office. Or much of a citizenry left to care about one.

That concept is probably beyond the capacity of Gerald Ford. But maybe some less-dense influential Americans might show belated appreciation to a newsman, John A. Scali, to whom this scared-silly-in-'62 American, for one, feels eternally grateful.

#### THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the skyrocketing Federal debt is now slightly in excess of \$13 billion shy of \$5 trillion.

As of the close of business Friday, November 24, the Federal debt—down to the penny—stood at exactly \$4,989,260,237,257.80 or \$18,939.32 on a per capita basis for every man, woman, and child.

#### PRESENTATION OF THE CROIX DE GUERRE WITH SILVER STAR TO GOV. HUGH L. CAREY

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, of the many commemorative ceremonies held on Veterans Day, November 11, one event had particular significance for the Honorable Hugh L. Carey, the former Governor of the State of New York, and for his family and many friends.

More than 50 years ago, Hugh Carey, then a young officer with the "Timberwolves" of the 104th Infantry Division, United States Army, led a patrol near the Elbe River in Germany. The patrol encountered an encampment of German soldiers who, unaware that Germany had surrendered several days earlier, were holding a large number of French prisoners. A fight broke out, and the Germans were overtaken by the American patrol. This capture by the American soldiers led to the discovery of some 35,000 French prisoners, who were then freed by the Allies.

For his extraordinary valor in this mission, Hugh Carey was awarded the Croix de Guerre with Silver Star, one of France's most esteemed military decorations. Yet, owing to the unpredictabilities of war, he was unable to attend the presentation ceremony for the Croix de Guerre.

Time passed, and Hugh L. Carey continued his service to his country. He was ultimately discharged from active duty with the rank of colonel, and went on to serve as a Member of the House of Representatives and as Governor of New York, raising 14 children with his late wife Helen along the way.

Last Saturday, in a special ceremony at Dacor Bacon House here in Washington, Governor Carey finally got that medal. He was presented the Croix de Guerre with Silver Star by Brig. Gen. Gerard de Bastier on behalf of the Republic of France. The decoration was given in recognition of Governor Carey's "outstanding services during the operations of the liberation of France."

Earlier that day, Governor Carey joined President Clinton at the dedication of the site for the World War II Memorial at The Rainbow Pool on The Mall. As vice chairman of the American Battle Monuments Commission, Governor Carey pursued the establishment of this memorial with his usual vigor and unbounded enthusiasm. His commitment to the project has been such that at one point he even telephoned this Senator about it from his