

Senate on Friday, December 15, 1995, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE
WHITewater DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED
MATTERS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee to Investigate Whitewater Development and Related Matters be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Friday, December 15, 1995 to conduct a hearing pursuant to Senate Resolution 120.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

SUPPORT FOR THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT AND LEBANESE AMERICAN UNIVER- SITY

• Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to comment on an issue which has important policy implications for the United States as a world leader in promoting education. With the end of the cold war, we, as a nation, must re-examine how the United States can most appropriately provide world leadership in the future. The need for the United States to continue to provide such leadership is not a serious contention. However, as we debate a foreign policy direction that will advance American interests in a more interdependent world, we should bear two important considerations in mind: We must act with budgetary responsibility and we must not assume that government itself is always the best agent to implement our international goals.

I believe that private entities, such as educational institutions, have an important role to play in advancing our foreign policy goals. American education is recognized throughout the world as one of our greatest national assets, and it can be invaluable in shaping America's image abroad, promoting political and social pluralism, instilling the American ideals of tolerance and freedom of expression, expanding markets for U.S. commodities and products, and encouraging private initiative and economic growth.

An American education is prestigious and in high demand in virtually every country. Those receiving such an education frequently rise to their country's most senior leadership positions in government and in the private sector. As effective instruments to spread American influence, privately sponsored American educational institutions undoubtedly surpass direct U.S. Government programs. Quite modest levels of government assistance can be leveraged by these private institutions to achieve fundamentally important American goals, and do so without costly government bureaucracy.

In no part of the world can the contribution of American education to

United States foreign policy be of greater significance than in the Middle East. Fortunately, we are in a strong position to use education as a cornerstone of our policy there because of the presence of two American educational institutions with which I happen to be personally acquainted: The American University of Beirut [AUB] and the Lebanese American University [LAU]. The excellent work of these two institutions deserve special attention. Both schools have long proved themselves as beacons of tolerance and rationality in that part of the world. Furthermore, in the future, these schools will have an increased importance as the Middle East looks for the institutional structures which will help the region move from the currently emerging formal peace to a more lasting warm peace.

Mr. President, as we know, the future of Lebanon, in no small measure, rests with the talent, intellect, and ingenuity of its people, especially the youth. Educating young Lebanese is essential, therefore, to rebuilding the country. LAU and AUB are instrumental in this rebuilding. These universities, moreover, promote the use of American-made goods, enhancing international reliance on American goods and services. Students who are educated by using American computers, for example, will rely on American computers when they pursue their careers. Furthermore, these institutions nurture democracy by educating successive generations of leaders who are committed to American democratic values and who understand the tangible economic, political, and social benefits that a commitment to democracy produces.

These New York State chartered institutions continue to have strong American ties and a long tradition of teaching students the value of an American education. As a result, their students learn to appreciate such fundamental American values as tolerance, freedom of thought and expression, and private initiative. Maintaining these attributes is extremely important to the people of Lebanon as well as to those in the region of the Middle East.

The American University of Beirut and the Lebanese American University have nurtured the best American tradition of voluntarism. Having been established by individual citizens motivated by a strong conviction, these institutions have had a responsibility to better society. Such a tradition continues today. I believe it is good policy for us to encourage this spirit of voluntarism and, in the process, achieve important United States goals such as helping to rebuild Lebanon's democracy and promoting regional sustainable development.

These educational institutions also help promote American culture and values amongst the influential decision makers in the Middle East. These universities train students who are then able to communicate, share values, and work with Americans in business, gov-

ernment the sciences, and other mutually beneficial endeavors. This has a direct impact on promoting free-market reforms in the countries of the Middle East. Graduates of AUB and LAU appreciate American entrepreneurship and market-based economies, and from their positions as leaders in both private firms and public agencies, they guide their countries in this direction. Their familiarity with American culture and products also opens opportunities for the United States to develop export markets and investments in the region.

AUB and LAU also are addressing other problems of concern to Americans such as health and environmental issues. They engage in innovative programs of study and research on issues of water quality, migration patterns, desertification and pollution abatement. Both institutions are leaders in high quality health care in the Middle East, which advances America's concern with global public health.

But perhaps the single most important contribution these institutions are making to American interests in the region comes in connection with the Middle East Peace process. They have given vital assistance to that process by creating an intellectual climate that encourages rational dialogue, and by educating men and women with the vision and skills to achieve conciliation and cooperation. And once a formal peace is finally achieved, AUB and LAU will be in the forefront to encourage a warm peace of meaningful interaction among all parties in the region.

The Administration, Mr. President, will soon deal with the difficult funding choices as the budget necessarily begins to decrease. And I understand that budget realities may dictate assistance to a smaller number of universities abroad than in the past. However, as decisions are being made to allocate funding levels, I strongly urge the Administration to maintain as a high priority continued funding for the American University of Beirut and the Lebanese American University. I am not alone in this conclusion, as clearly reflected by the language contained in both the House and Senate Appropriations Committee reports. The Senate report states:

The Committee continues to strongly support the important work carried out by institutions funded under the American Schools and Hospitals Abroad (ASHA) Program. The Committee support is based in part on the effective use of public resources to leverage private sector funds. The Committee believes that several institutions which have received funding under ASHA have distinguished records and deserve further support including: The American University of Beirut which has trained Middle Eastern leaders for 130 years in a strong liberal arts tradition encouraging freedom of expression, private initiative, and tolerance. Its academic quality, longstanding relationship with regional governments, network of prominent alumni and distinction as a hub of high level global expertise make the university a primary resource for regional development. The Lebanese American University

(formerly Beirut College) is the most rapidly growing institution of higher learning in Lebanon and is an increasingly important resource for talent in this expanding region.

The House report contains similar language.

The Committee notes that over the years a number of quality educational institutions have received both development and Economic Support Fund assistance, including the American University of Beirut, . . . and the Lebanese American University. The Committee recommends that best efforts be made to continue assistance for institutions of this nature, with the highest priority assigned to those lacking alternative sources of funding.

Mr. President, I believe that continued support of these two institutions is in the national interest of the United States. As I have stated, continued funding of these institution is a congressional priority and I hope that the administration will agree. •

THE BENEFITS OF LEGAL IMMIGRATION

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, as immigration reform legislation moves closer to the House and Senate floors, a new study has appeared that confirms what many of us on both sides of the aisle have been saying all along: That legal immigrants confer net economic benefits on American society.

The study, entitled "Immigration: The Demographic and Economic Facts," is authored by University of Maryland professor Julian SIMON (no relation) and published by the Cato Institute and the National Immigration Forum in association with a diverse coalition of over 20 organizations. I would like to include for the RECORD a Los Angeles Times article from December 11, 1995 previewing the report's findings, which include the following:

The current rate of immigration is only about one-third the rate of immigration at the beginning of the century.

Total per capita government expenditures are lower for immigrants than for native-born Americans.

The effect of immigration on Americans' wages is limited.

Because new immigrants are more concentrated than native-born Americans in the youthful labor force ages, they tend to contribute more to the public coffers than they draw out.

Educational levels among immigrants have increased from decade to decade.

These conclusions again confirm that current levels of legal immigration are not a problem for America. In fact, the legal immigrants of today demonstrate the same work ethic and imagination that characterized their predecessors of decades ago, and continue to be a vital component of our Nation's well-being.

The same cannot be said of illegal immigrants. These individuals should be the subject of our attention as immigration reform legislation winds its way through Congress. This administration has demonstrated an unprece-

dent commitment to preventing illegal immigration through increased enforcement at the border and in the workplace. We in Congress should continue this effort and work hand in hand with the administration in this endeavor. In so doing, however, we should not disturb our system of legal immigration, which works now and has worked in America for centuries.

The difference between legal and illegal immigration is the subject of much public confusion. It is up to Congress, with the help of such reports as the SIMON report, to keep the two issues distinct, and to focus its attention on the real immigration problem: illegal immigration.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 11, 1995]

STUDY PANTS A POSITIVE PICTURE OF IMMIGRATION

COSTS: BOTH LEGAL AND ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS USE FEWER GOVERNMENT RESOURCES THAN NATIVE-BORN CITIZENS, REPORT SAYS

(By James Bornemeier)

WASHINGTON.—A new study on the effects of immigration finds that total per capita government expenditures are much lower for immigrants—legal and illegal—than for native-born citizens.

The report also paints an upbeat picture of immigrants' educational achievements and asserts that the nation's natural resources and environment are unaffected by the influx of immigrants.

"As of the 1970s, immigrants contributed more to the public coffers in taxes than they drew out in welfare services," the report says. "The most recent data * * * show that each year an average immigrant family put about \$2,500 into the pockets of natives from this excess of taxes over public costs."

The study, to be issued this morning in Washington by the National Immigration Forum, an immigration-advocacy group, and the Cato Institute, a conservative think tank, comes at a time when Congress is wrestling with major immigration bills and public opinion is increasingly negative on immigration issues.

Legislation is progressing in both houses of Congress to clamp down on illegal immigration and—to the dismay of many immigration advocates—restrict entry of legal immigrants as well.

The issue has split Republicans, some of whom see the free flow of legal immigrants as an economic boon to the country. Immigrant-rights groups say the political activism to stem illegal immigration has unfairly led to the limitations on legal immigrants.

But groups pushing for stronger restrictions on immigration branded the report, authored by University of Maryland professor Julian L. Simon, as biased.

"Julian Simon is not a liar," said Dan Stein, executive director of the Federation for American Immigration Reform, "but he gets as close as anyone can be to one. He is intentionally deceptive, manipulative and grossly in error." Signifying the sensitivity of the issue, more than 20 interest groups and think tanks have signed on to the report, and they span the political spectrum—from the immigrant-rights group, the National Council of La Raza, to the Progress and Freedom Foundation, an organization closely associated with House Speaker Newt Gingrich.

House Majority Leader Dick Armey, a strong supporter of legal immigration, is scheduled to address the Capitol press conference where the report is to be released today.

Among the report's most controversial findings is Simon's conclusion that government expenditures are lower for immigrants than for native-born Americans.

According to the report, the average immigrant family received \$1,404 in welfare services in its first five years in the country. Native-born families averaged \$2,279, Simon writes. The report makes these other points:

The number of illegal immigrants in the United States—estimated at 3.2 million—is not very different from a decade before.

More than half of illegal immigrants enter legally and over-stay their visas; less than half enter clandestinely.

New immigrants are more concentrated than native-born citizens in the youthful labor force ages when people contribute more to the public coffers than they draw out.

Immigrants on average have a year less education than natives—about the same relationship as has been observed back to the 19th century.

Such optimistic findings collide with the views of other researchers.

"His numbers are conventional and unremarkable," said Mark Krikorian of the Center for Immigration Studies in Washington. "The question is what sort of spin Julian puts on them. He has his bias, and the bias has a very significant influence on the interpretation he has put on the facts."

As an example, Simon says the number of immigrant high school dropouts has been declining. For example, Krikorian said, Simon reports that the number of immigrant high school dropouts has been declining.

"But what he doesn't mention," said Krikorian, "is the gap between the percentage of American high school dropouts and the percentage of immigrant high school dropouts is widening. It's pretty obvious that the education gap is increasing. By not addressing [that] he makes his document an advocacy document." •

TRIBUTE TO PATTY CALLAGHAN

• Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I wish today to give tribute to one of Eastern Montanan's treasures, Patty Callaghan. Patty recently retired after 20 years with Action for Eastern Montana.

Patty retired as executive director to attend Luther Seminary in St. Paul MN. She hopes to return to eastern Montana as a lay leader with rural churches.

Montana needs more leaders like Patty Callaghan. Rural Montana needs the love for and knowledge of our state that people like Patty have.

Patty's work with action actually led to here decision to choose the seminary. When funding cutbacks in the programs that she administers forced her to look to other resources, Patty found the churches responding generously. She found the needs of rural communities to be much the same as the congregations—energy, leadership for change, accountability, respect and compassion.

Patty has dealt with many family issues that will serve her well in her new life. She found the work at Action for Eastern Montana rewarding and the Glendive community generous when a need was identified.

In a recent tribute to Patty, family members, coworkers, friends and many