

that we will not tolerate ethical lapses, whatever the personal consequences to the violator. But government cannot daily prove its rectitude to the cynic convinced of government's corruption. A nation where cynicism toward government prevails cannot function effectively.

Of course, a government that merely implores voters to "trust me" will not gain that trust, nor should it. But if our eternal rounds of inquisition and calumny tear down the public trust, and make government out to be a cesspool, if our remedies make public service so unattractive and distasteful as to lose the capacity to recruit new and good people to government—we lose the whole ballgame. We have spent so much time accusing, finger-pointing and exposing, that we have forgotten why we formed a government in the first place. We make it impossible to be governed.

And yet we are proposing additional ethics reforms, based not on what they can achieve, but rather on the political perception that something must be done. In an attempt to "out-ethic" the political opposition, we only make matters worse.

For example, we already require the filing of too many forms. Every year all of our senior officials spend countless hours preparing financial disclosure forms. Candidates file extensive reports on how they raise and spend their campaign money. The reports are so complicated that most reviewers can't understand what they are reviewing, but they do serve as wonderful traps to snare the unwary official.

We have lobbying laws on the books that do precious little to expose the difference between legitimate lobbying and improper use of money and favors to gain desired results. There are proposals to add further forms—ones that will do nothing to break the link between lobbying and money. We ought to concentrate our efforts on gift banning and campaign finance reform.

We ought to evoke the principle that applies to federal judges, who cannot accept anything of value from any party who has an interest in a case before that judge. The judge either refuses the gift or recuses himself from the case. It's a simple principle. Judges understand it; lawyers and their clients understand it; everyone obeys it. In the rare cases where judges violate the rule, they go to jail. What the principle does is break the link between the giving and the ruling. You can give but you cannot buy. Applied to Congress, which recently has banned gifts such as meals and trips, the principle would end the seamy business of members asking for contributions (and getting them) from person most likely to be affected by the member's actions. Obviously, such a plan would necessitate a whole new campaign finance structure, but that is long overdue anyway.

We ought to reconsider the independent counsel statute. Some may smirk that I of all people would suggest changing it, since I voted for it while in Congress and have had to live with its consequences during this past year. But fewer and fewer people in either political party now believe that it really works. The original purpose of preventing Richard Nixon and his friend and close adviser Attorney General John Mitchell from investigating themselves in the Watergate scandal has been achieved. Since then, 17 independent counsels have been appointed. Their mandates have ranged all the way from investigating whether a White House aide sniffed cocaine in a New York nightclub to whether a cabinet official understated how much money he paid to a woman with whom he had an affair. One investigation—the five-year-old probe of Department of Housing and Urban Development officials—

has gone on for so long that the independent counsel announced that the main target had grown too old to pursue. One can question whether even the Iran-contra case or the Whitewater affair wouldn't have best been handled the normal way by Justice Department prosecutors.

We can do better. We need to amend the statute to provide for qualifications for the independent counsel that guarantee political independence. The counsel ought to be appointed on a full-time basis for a limited period of time. Extensions of the original period of appointment should be allowed only under very limited circumstances. The threshold for seeking an independent counsel should be raised further—to limit the appointment only to cases where it is clear that normal authority is insufficient. The selection process for the special court which appoints and supervises independent counsels should be changed to ensure both the reality and the perception of nonpolitical appointments.

From the outset, our founders recognized the tension between governing effectively and the elimination of all potential for abuse. George Washington wrote: "No man is a warmer advocate for proper restraints and wholesome checks in every department than I am; but I have never yet been able to discover the propriety of placing it absolutely out of the power of men to render essential services, because a possibility remains of their doing ill."

If we have all these codes of ethics and all of these disclosure laws and all of these investigating institutions and less trust with each addition to the pile, we must be doing something wrong. We need some remedies that will restore the faith. ●

TRIBUTE TO JULIE MCGREGOR

● Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, frequent staff turnover is a fact of life in the Senate. In this regard, I have always considered myself exceedingly lucky. I have had many key staff members who stayed with me far beyond the average tenure and I, and the people of Oregon, have greatly benefited from their institutional knowledge and experience. But, inevitably, the day arrives when even those diehard staffers feel it is time to move on. For Julie McGregor, that day has arrived.

And so I rise to bid farewell to a longtime and valued staff member. I find it difficult to take so many years of loyalty, dedication, and friendship and wrap it into a neat one page package. Words alone simply seem inadequate to express what Julie has meant to me, to my family, and to my office.

Julie came to my office 13 years ago as an eager, bright, and intelligent intern. She departs today a wise and competent sage. In that time, Julie's role evolved from that of student to mentor. No matter how busy, she always took the time to encourage and guide less experienced colleagues. Members of the Appropriations Committee staff as well as my personal staff have relied on Julie's counsel and valued her perspective as much as I did.

One of Julie's greatest assets is her intuitive ability to cut to the heart of the matter. She thoughtfully and fairly examines all sides of an issue, but re-

mains unerringly firm in her convictions. Even in the most emotional discussions or difficult issues, Julie is a calm voice of rationality and reason. In fact, those who don't know her well might be deceived by Julie's quiet manner or seemingly shy nature. They shouldn't be. She is extraordinarily tenacious. If you are staking a position or fighting a battle, you definitely want Julie on your side.

Julie grew up in small southern Oregon community, and those roots have served her well here. While adapting well to the rough and tumble political world in Washington, she has always kept clearly in mind the individual human beings whom we serve. She is both politically astute and compassionate, a combination of qualities that is so rare it is almost an oxymoron. Aware of the realities and limitations of the political process, Julie is unwavering in her belief that the Government can and should use its powers to improve the human condition. This is a belief that we share and one that has guided many of our legislative efforts.

While Julie, at one time or another, handled nearly every legislative issue in my office, her true calling was one that is closest to my own heart. First as a legislative assistant and later as my director of International Policy, she became an advocate for peace and a champion for humanitarian concerns. Julie's work on arms control, human rights, and nuclear proliferation issues, among others, leaves a lasting legacy in the Senate and has had an impact on us all.

Julie played a key role in one of the legislative accomplishments of which I am most proud. In 1992, we were successful in enacting legislation establishing a moratorium on nuclear testing by the United States. This nuclear test ban continues today and the United States' leadership on this issue has prompted much of the rest of the world to follow suit.

Julie has spent her entire professional career in public service, in service to the State of Oregon and to the U.S. Senate. I know that the people of Oregon, and my colleagues in the Senate, join me in expressing our gratitude for many years of exemplary work.

While we are sad to see Julie leave us, we are also excited for her as she begins a new phase in her life. This weekend she leaves Washington to join her fiancé, Michael Britti, in New Mexico. There will be many wonderful opportunities and adventures as Julie moves on with her career, and as she and Mike begin to build a life together.

Julie is, and always will be, a member of the Hatfield family. Antoinette and I send her off with our love and our best wishes for a future full of happiness and success. ●

SCHOOL FACILITIES AND THE NEW GAO REPORT SCHOOL FACILITIES: STATES' FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT VARIES

• Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I would like to announce the results of a study conducted by the General Accounting Office on States' efforts to improve the condition of our public school facilities.

Infrastructure needs are not cosmetic—they go directly to the safety, the suitability, and environment for learning that directly affects American students' performance in the classroom.

The GAO found that many States are doing little to address the deterioration of our schools—and what is being done varies widely from State to State. Only thirteen States take a comprehensive approach to their school infrastructure needs—by providing ongoing funding for school improvement projects, offering technical assistance to local officials, and maintaining up-to-date information on the condition of their facilities.

The GAO has documented that our schools are falling apart.

They are not ready for the Information Age because of inadequate infrastructure. More than 60 percent lack sufficient phone lines. Thirty-five percent don't even have enough electrical power to operate computers.

Last week, the Washington Post ran an article that described the condition of the bathrooms in some of the District's schools. The Post reported that many of the restrooms are in violently foul condition—unhealthy and unusable.

One parent said she could not believe the bathroom in her children's school was in the United States. I have that article and would like to submit it for the RECORD.

We have seen these problems in school buildings all over the country—in Chicago, Baltimore, New York, and Los Angeles—in rural communities, as well as in urban centers.

America cannot compete if our students cannot learn, and our students cannot learn if our schools are falling down.

Earlier this year, the GAO released a report—entitled School Facilities: The Condition of America's Schools—that looked at the facilities that millions of our children walk into every morning. In that report, the GAO documented that 13 million students attend schools that need to be extensively repaired or replaced.

The GAO estimates that it will cost \$112 billion to upgrade our school facilities to a good, overall condition. This cost is growing. The longer infrastructure needs are ignored or deferred, the greater the cost will be. The situation is like that facing the owner of a home. If the roof leaks, and you find the leak early, you can patch the roof. But if you wait a few years, you find you'll need to tear out the walls or rebuild the foundation. The message

couldn't be clearer—delay equals additional cost.

In the report released by the GAO today, we find out that many States are not even bothering to assess the damage or call in the building inspector.

The GAO says State support is limited and varied. In fiscal year 1994, States provided a total of \$3.5 billion in grants and loans for school facilities construction—only 3.1 percent of the total funding needed.

The sum of \$3.5 billion may sound like a lot, and indeed, if your child goes to school in Alaska, it is. The State of Alaska spent almost \$275 million—\$2,254 per pupil—in fiscal year 1994 on school construction projects. On the other end of the spectrum is my home State of Illinois. Illinois, along with 10 other States, provides no ongoing support for school facilities construction or improvement.

Today's report documents an alarming lack of knowledge about the conditions of our schools. More than half of the States have no recent information on the condition of school buildings in their States.

I mentioned a newspaper report on decaying children's bathrooms. Gerald Sigal, a major construction contractor, also read that article. He was so upset that he is forming a coalition of business leaders to fix the problem. Mr. Sigal responded to the public school bathroom crisis because he found out about it.

But most schools seldom have a major newspaper to do their reporting for them, and the only people that may know about the brown tap water and broken plumbing are the children.

Last year, Congress took a monumental step toward fixing our school facilities problem when it enacted and funded the Education Infrastructure Act. This year, however, Congress took away the money.

Mr. President, if our children do not have computers, or if they cannot see the blackboard because it has fallen off the wall, or if they cannot go to the bathroom because it stinks of sewage, or if they cannot keep warm because the heaters are broken, they cannot concentrate, and they cannot learn.

This new GAO report is essentially a report card that measures State support for education infrastructure. Very few States get a passing mark. But the schools are still falling apart. The time has come for us to step in and heal our Nation's schools.

The problem goes beyond what many local communities can handle. Many Districts cannot find more revenue because they have already been stretched to their local limits in bonding and other ways to raise money for education.

The GAO looked at whether technical assistance is available from the States to local school officials—whether local officials can count on States for help in advice and planning. Again, great disparities exist.

Florida has the equivalent of 72 people who provide guidance on planning, construction, and maintenance. New York gives workshops and publishes articles on facilities planning. But 34 States have less than 6 full time people available for this kind of assistance.

Repairing our schools is in the national interest. We must provide assistance to strapped local school districts in a way that directly benefits children. Federal support for education infrastructure allows us to help local school districts create a suitable environment for learning, without violating the tenet of local control over public education.

I urge all of my colleagues to take a close look at this new GAO study, and decide how much longer they want to leave the problem of our crumbling public school facilities to someone else.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 8, 1995]
IN D.C. SCHOOLS, IT'S TOUGH GOING—STUDENTS FIND THEMSELVES WITHOUT SOAP, TOILET PAPER OR PRIVACY

(By Sari Horwitz)

Children in public schools across the District often use dirty bathrooms that lack private stalls, soap, paper towels and even toilet paper.

The restrooms in even some of the city's most highly regarded public schools are in such poor shape that parents fear they are unhealthy for children, and educators say they are interfering with learning.

One of those schools is Horace Mann Elementary in well-to-do upper Northwest Washington, a school that has won awards from the U.S. Department of Education. Many days, second-grader Peter Joyce and his schoolmate Joe Takesuye won't use the boys' bathroom because of the filth and overpowering stench of urine. They hold it until they get home.

"The bathrooms really smell," said Peter, 7. "They are dirty. There's paper towels all over the floor, spitballs on the walls and the water from the sink is like, brown. It looks gross."

Horace Mann Principal Sheila Ford said she doesn't have the money to improve the 64-year-old building's plumbing. But she's looking for resources because the bathroom problem is spilling into her classrooms as the odors creep into her halls.

"When I need to use the lavatory and I'm away from one, my concentration is eliminated," Ford said. "It is the same for children."

Dirty, dilapidated school bathrooms are a problem in urban schools across the nation and are worsening as buildings age and resources for maintenance diminish, according to officials. Almost one-third of the nation's school buildings were built before World War II.

In a world where educational dollars are getting stretched ridiculously thin, bathrooms stand at the end of the line," said Michael Casserly, executive director of the Council of Great City Schools, which represents the nation's largest school districts. "They've really fallen off the radar screen in terms of priority."

The bathroom problem, however, does not appear to be as serious in other school systems in the Washington area as it is in the District, according to parent activists in Fairfax, Montgomery and Prince George's counties.

Open the door to the only bathroom for 140 little boys in 127-year-old Stevens Elementary in downtown Washington, and the

stench of urine is overwhelming. The dank bathroom with rusting, corroded pipes is in the basement, and the windows remain shut for security reasons.

"It kind of holds the odors in," said the school's new principal, Gloria Henderson, who has been trying unsuccessfully to have a hole cut in the wall and an exhaust fan installed.

The bathroom problem in D.C. schools is not all old age.

Parents and educators said that in many schools, clean, fully stocked and functioning bathrooms are simply not a priority in a school system saddled with other problems and budget woes. Hundreds of D.C. students still do not even have textbooks.

This fall, parents at Watkins Elementary School, on Capitol Hill, were stunned to discover there were no working sinks in the girls' or boys' bathrooms on the first, second and third floors, in some cases since last January, according to parent Samuel Brylawski.

"Here you have a school full of kids who don't wash their hands after they go to the bathroom," Brylawski said. "It took parents nine months to be informed. Fundamental sanitary practices were not a high priority."

Some repairs were made after Brylawski wrote a letter to the superintendent and the public health commission, he said.

Mary Levy, counsel to Parents United, a parents advocacy group, said the low priority for maintaining bathrooms reflects officials' lack of concern of children. "Every door should be taken off the stalls of the buildings with elected officials until they fix the doors for children," she said.

Bathroom water is the issue at Langdon Elementary School, in Northeast Washington. PTA president Vivian Whitaker said only cold water comes out of the bathroom sinks, and it's dirty brown.

"I wouldn't recommend the children wash their hands," Whitaker said.

School officials said it's hard to maintain heavily used bathrooms, especially when students dirty them or break equipment. Parents said students are less likely to violate clean, working restrooms.

At schools where bathroom repairs have been made, such as Wilson High School and J.F. Cook Elementary, it has made all the difference, they said.

Three years ago, D.C. public schools hired a consulting firm to study its buildings. The firm found serious problems in bathroom piping and toilets, including old sewage pipes rusted beyond repair, poor lighting and missing or defective toilet stalls and urinals.

In seven schools, the plumbing was called "hazardous." The plumbing system at Francis Junior High, with "extensive leaking and clogged pipes" was called "unacceptable." At Browne Junior High, the report called for "immediate replacement" of all the plumbing. As of July, 75 D.C. schools needed repairs, including new or fixed sinks, according to a school document. An additional 13 schools needed toilet partitions so students could use them with privacy.

At one on that list, Duke Ellington School of the Arts in Georgetown, student Zavi Ball, 16, described the bathrooms last week as "disgusting, horrible."

"There's never any paper towels or soap," she said. "There's no warm water to wash your hands. There's hardly ever toilet paper. There's dirty feminine products on the floor and roaches. Whenever guests come, they clean the bathrooms up. But when it's just us, they don't care. When I come to school at 8 in the morning, the bathroom is already dirty."

Facilities and Management Director William McAfee did not return phone calls. But school spokeswoman Beverly Lofton said building repair funds were very tight.

With a more than half-billion-dollar budget, the District spends \$7.673 a year for each of its students, one of the highest per-pupil operating costs in the country. But most of the capital funds for building upkeep and repairs have been used for repairing fire hazards, Lofton said.

"We don't want our kids going to schools that don't have functioning bathrooms," Lofton said. "We want them to have the best of everything, including partitions and sinks that work. But there is a lack of capital money to repair everything that breaks when it happens."

"We do recognize we have problems with bathrooms in the school systems" she said. "Bathrooms are a priority for the coming year."

Principal Rosalie Huff of Anthony Bowen Elementary School, in Southwest, tired of waiting. When the school system hadn't replaced her broken toilets and missing partitions in 12 bathrooms by the beginning of this school year, she bought five new toilets and partitions herself.

"I had a situation that was really awful," Huff said. "It didn't allow any type of basic human dignity for the girls. You were just sitting out if you had to use the toilets."

Consumer advocate Ralph Nader wants the Appleseed Foundation, a public interest law center he helped create, to work to improve the District's school bathrooms. He got fired up about dirty, dysfunctional restrooms after listening to complaints from students at Alice Deal Junior High. "They said their bathrooms were filthy," Nader said. "There was no soap, no privacy and no toilet paper. And they said they held it. But the faculty restrooms were immaculate. It's so disgraceful."

A visit to Deal last week revealed boys' and girls' bathrooms missing doors on the stalls and partitions between toilets, sinks that don't work properly and boys' restrooms filled with an overwhelming stench. A school worker said the odor came from toilets that leak and sewage that sits in rusty, corroded pipes.

At Horace Mann, PTA president Jane Joyce said she was so fed up with the bathrooms that she raised the issue at the first parents meeting in September. About 30 parents volunteered to come in on a Saturday and scrub the floors, bring in toilet paper and make repairs.

That helped for a while. A few weeks ago, parent Joan Murray ventured into one of the school bathrooms to see if it really was as bad as her two children described.

"I wouldn't use it," Murray said. "It was more than horrendous. It was disgusting. There were paper towels everywhere, no flushed toilets and no soap. The water didn't come out of the spigots. And it smelled. I couldn't believe it was in the United States." •

AMBASSADOR JOSEPH VERNER
REED'S ADDRESS TO
INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

• Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in October, Ambassador Joseph Verner Reed represented U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros Ghali at the 94th Inter-Parliamentary Conference in Bucharest, Romania.

At the Conference, Ambassador Reed delivered an exceptional speech concerning the current financial crisis at the United Nations. As a longtime friend and supporter of the United Nations, I can think of no issue more im-

portant to the U.N.'s future. Moreover, the United Nation's fiscal health has critical implications for our own country's foreign and domestic agenda.

In his address, Ambassador Reed—formerly one of the United States' most accomplished diplomats and now a high-ranking U.N. official—made a compelling argument about the necessity for resolving this crisis. I commend the speech to my colleagues and ask that excerpts be printed in the RECORD.

The excerpts of the speech follows:

Mr. President, the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations has arrived at one of the turning points in modern history.

The United Nations is the only machinery we have for collective cooperation among all Nations. It is the only global tool for promoting peace and security. It is the only worldwide institution for furthering development. It is the only universal mechanism for protecting human rights. It is the only shared framework for strengthening international law.

But today I feel compelled to share my distress with you on a subject which is unavoidable, the survival of the United Nations. For almost four years, we have tried to convince the governments of member states of the United Nations to pay their assessments on time. For four years we have warned of the financial consequences of the failure to pay assessments. We have argued, we have pleaded.

The organization has cut expenses. We have streamlined operations. We are working hard to reduce waste, duplication and overlap. Peace-keeping is expensive. The operation in the former Yugoslavia costs five million dollars per day.

In Every major statement and document of the Secretary-General, he has drawn attention to the financial crisis and proposed steps to remedy it. In meeting after meeting with foreign ministers and heads of state over these years, he has pleaded with them to address this deteriorating situation.

As of October 1995, 70 countries had not paid their regular budget assessment. Today, the United Nations is owed a total of \$3.4 billion by its member states.

I appeal to you as parliamentarians to help me resolve this crisis. I ask you to try to convince your governments to pay their arrears, and to pay future contributions on time, and in full.

I make this appeal to you because the United Nations is your organization. I make this appeal here because without peace, and without the global efforts of peace, and without the global efforts of the United Nations, all your efforts for development will be to no avail.

The United Nations is not one of the luxuries of international life. The work of the United Nations is of vital, critical importance:

Saving children from starvation and disease.

Providing food, clothing and shelter for refugees.

Delivering humanitarian relief to devastated areas.

Working to stop the cycle of natural disasters in lands repeatedly afflicted by them.

Countering the new international threats of crimes, drugs, disease.

Defending human rights in individual cases as well as through international commitments.

Advising, training, monitoring and institution-building in countries seeking to democratize.

Maintaining ceasefires, preventing conflicts from erupting, peacemaking between