

# AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

## COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Friday, December 22, 1995, between the first and second rollcall votes.

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

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

### PRESIDENT CLINTON'S GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

• Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, we are in the 7th day of a partial Government shutdown. The President is playing politics with this issue and he should stop it. He is trying to blame Congress for his failure to sign the legislation which would have averted this crisis. In addition, he is trying to divide the House freshmen and the House Republican leadership. And, he is trying to divide House and Senate Republicans. Such desperate tactics on his part are doomed to fail.

Yesterday, in a demonstration of solidarity, House Republicans—conservatives and moderates alike—told the Nation that the President's politics of division wouldn't work, that they remained united in our struggle against President Clinton's efforts to undermine a balanced budget agreement. More importantly, they rightly pointed the finger of blame for the partial Government shutdown directly at the White House.

Congress has sent three spending bills to the President which would have kept open the Departments of Veterans Affairs, HUD, Commerce, Justice, State, and Interior. What did President Clinton do? He vetoed all of these bills, and in so doing delayed benefits checks to our Nation's veterans. He had the power to prevent the shutdown of these agencies and to keep Federal workers on the job. Instead, with the stroke of a pen he sent thousands of Federal workers home during this holiday season.

The Congress did its job and passed appropriations bills which responsibly reduced Government spending and which would have kept agencies open. But, President Clinton wasn't interested in that. He was looking for a photo opportunity. He vetoed funding bills and closed down parts of the Government. He should be and will be held accountable for this shutdown.

Furthermore, workers at the Departments of Labor, HHS, and Education could be at the desks today if the Democrats would end the filibuster which they began in September.

When you look at the Government shutdown, the facts simply don't support the President's extremist rhetoric. In reality, this crisis has been engi-

neered by the President to bolster his reelection campaign. After being viewed as irrelevant for so long, the President has now identified himself with something he believes in passionately. He is passionate about spending—deficit spending. He is passionate about preserving the status quo which heaps trillions of dollars of debt on our children and grandchildren.

I hope that he will abandon his harsh scare tactics and get serious about balancing the budget. It was not until just a few days ago that he agreed to finally offer a balanced budget plan using honest numbers. He finally abandoned his preferred strategy of cooking the books as a way to balance the budget. Such policies won't lead to a balanced budget. They never have and they never will. President Clinton had chosen the path of certain failure. Congress rightly did not follow him down that dead-end road.

Although Congress has already passed legislation once to provide for veterans benefits, we have an opportunity today to overturn the President's action which cut off these funds. The men and women who have served our Nation in the armed services should not be used as a bargaining chip in this budget struggle between Congress and the President. I support the immediate restoration of funds for veteran benefits, and I hope that we will pass such legislation today.

Finally, I call upon the President to give America a Christmas present in the form of a balanced budget and a working Government. I call upon him to sign the funding bills which he has rejected, and I call upon him to help end the Democratic filibuster of the Labor, HHS appropriations bill. If the President wanted—all of this could be done before Christmas.●

### MEDICARE REIMBURSEMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

• Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I join with my esteemed colleague from Texas Senator GRAMM, to introduce this bill for Medicare reimbursement to the Department of Defense [DOD] for care provided in our military medical treatment facilities to Medicare eligible beneficiaries. When these dedicated men and women made a commitment to a career of service in the Armed Forces, a promise was made to them that upon retirement they and their family members would continue to receive health care for life in our superb Military Health Services System [MHSS]—if they so chose. In fact, approximately 230,000 of the 1.2 million Medicare eligible retirees currently do choose to get their health care at military treatment facilities. Regrettably, as the military downsizes and Defense health budgets are cut, without Medicare reimbursement, the MHSS will no longer be able to provide health care for these retirees. Many of these retired servicemembers and their families made career-long sacrifices based

in part on the expectation that they would have guaranteed health care. I believe it is important that our Nation continue its firm commitment and honor the promises made to those individuals and their families.

Mr. President, this bill provides an additional benefit to the Nation—more cost effective health care for this population. If the MHSS can no longer provide their health care, 230,000 more retirees who are already Medicare eligible will be forced into the Medicare system—at a substantially higher cost than that for DOD reimbursement. As a taxpayer, this just makes good business sense.

Mr. President, these dedicated servicemembers kept their promise to our nation and now I believe it is right that the Nation keep its promise to them. This bill will enable the MHSS to continue to provide health care services to Medicare eligible retirees and their families as promised for those who choose to receive their care in our military facilities.●

### THE AU PAIR PROGRAM

• Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, over the past several weeks, my office has received many telephone calls from concerned Minnesotans regarding the partial shutdown of the Federal Government and the lack of funding which has resulted for the program which brings nannies from foreign countries into America.

Nannies have been coming to the United States through the Au Pair program, a cultural exchange program run by the United States Information Agency (USIA) which oversees the matching of young people from abroad with American families in need of live-in babysitters.

Approximately 13,000 young adults have participated in this program over the years and 10,000 American families have benefitted from the helping hands these visiting babysitters provide. They are paid a weekly salary of \$115 plus room and board for their services.

When its appropriations expired at the end of the last fiscal year on September 30, the entire Au Pair program was put into limbo until it could be funded again. It had been included in three separate appropriations bills, but each has failed to become law due to objections over issues unrelated to the Au Pair program. On December 11, Senator HELMS recognized the pressing nature of the situation and introduced S. 1465, legislation funding and extending the Au Pair program for 2 years. The bill passed the Senate on December 13 and a related measure was introduced in the House that same day. It was passed by voice vote on December 18.

Late Wednesday night, this legislation was delivered to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. But now, 3 days later, it continues to sit on the President's desk awaiting his signature. Furthermore, while many families wait, there has been no indication yet as to whether the President will sign or veto this bill.

Therefore, I call on the President to swiftly review this matter, to continue the care and attention given to this issue by Congress, and to sign S. 1465 without delay.

This is a bill that swiftly passed both Chambers; on behalf of the families that await its enactment, it deserves equally swift consideration by the White House.●

#### CRIME IS DOWN BUT DRUGS ARE UP: SOLUTIONS ARE NO MYSTERY

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the crime news is good and bad.

The good news is that murders in the United States were down 12 percent for the first 6 months of 1995, and the FBI reports an astounding and welcome drop.

The bad news is that drug and alcohol use among our Nation's eighth graders is on the rise, and because of that, as they grow older the crime rate probably will rise again.

Adding to this likelihood are the numbers. There are more eighth graders than their counterparts 4 years older, and as the numbers grow, we will probably have more, not less, bad news. Ten years from now there will be 25 percent more young males between the ages of 14 and 17.

What can be done?

There are no magic bullets, but there are some things that will help. They include:

Get treatment and counseling for adult drug and alcohol addicts.

Children of addicts are much more likely to be addicts. Illinois is like most States: people who want help often cannot get it. Considering the extent of our problem, we are woefully short on treatment facilities. Rev. George Clements, a quietly dynamic Roman Catholic priest, has suggested that all churches and synagogues and mosques should adopt one addict. That's not as easy as fixing the church roof or serving as usher or singing in the choir. But it is a greater test of the meaningfulness of faith. The most effective way to reach children is through a parent.

Discourage youthful cigarette smoking.

Young people who smoke cigarettes are much more likely to take up drugs and alcohol.

Enrich education programs so that they reach all young people.

Those who have great difficulty in school are more likely to give up, to see little future for themselves and reach out for the escape mechanism of drugs or alcohol. That is why budget cuts that reduce access to Head Start and other education programs are short-sighted. By the second grade—at the latest—teachers know which students need special help. They should receive it then, not wait until they make it through high school—if they make it through high school.

Start jobs programs that put people of limited skills to work. Show me an

area of high unemployment, and I will show you an area of high crime, whether it is African-American, Hispanic, or white. Show me an area of high unemployment, and I will show you an area with a high drug use rate and high alcoholism, whether it is African-American, Hispanic, or white.

Real welfare reform must include jobs. Without a jobs factor, anything called welfare reform is political public relations. We need something like the WPA of a half-century ago. It would be the most effective anti-crime and anti-addiction program we could have.

Keep parents from giving up.

That's not a Government program, but it is vital. A parent living in a tough neighborhood with drug sales visible in the area has a difficult time, but must strive to give her—or his—child hope. And do simple things like encouraging homework, use of the library, and careful use of television.

And attending religious services.

Harvard University's Richard Freeman found that "among black urban youth, church attendance was a better predictor of who would escape drugs, crime and poverty than any other variable, income, family structure, and the church-going youth were more likely to behave in socially constructive ways."

Yes, there are some discouraging signals for the future, but if we are really concerned, and then act, the future will be brighter.

None of these items I have listed is dramatic, yet if we were to act on all of them, there would be a significant change for the better in our future.●

#### AWARD PRESENTED TO ARTHUR S. FLEMMING

● Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President. I want to share with my colleagues the remarks made by William L. Taylor in presenting to Dr. Arthur S. Flemming the American Civil Liberties Union's Human Rights Award. These thoughtful remarks outline the career of a man who truly represents the highest ideal of public service.

Antoinette and I have enjoyed a warm personal friendship with Dr. Flemming and his wife Bernice for many years. In addition to the number of significant Federal posts held by Dr. Flemming, he served for a time as the president of the University of Oregon. As someone who has followed Dr. Flemming's professional and personal life with interest and respect, I can say that no one is more deserving of the ACLU's Human Rights Award than Dr. Flemming, as Mr. Taylor's fine remarks make amply clear.

Mr. President, I ask that Mr. Taylor's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF WILLIAM L. TAYLOR IN PRESENTING THE ACLU'S HUMAN RIGHTS AWARD TO ARTHUR S. FLEMMING AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE VIRGINIA ACLU, DECEMBER 9, 1995

The American Civil Liberties Union does itself honor by honoring Arthur Flemming

and it does me a great honor by asking me to introduce Arthur.

Arthur is, in my view, the greatest exemplar of public service in this nation in the 20th Century. He served in the federal government over a period of more than 40 years beginning in 1939 as an appointee to the Civil Service Commission of President Roosevelt and ending in the early 1980s when he was Deputy Chair of the White House Conference on Aging, a member of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians and Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, a post from which he was fired by President Reagan because Arthur believed in civil rights. But after these 40 plus years—and at the age of 77, Arthur began a new career serving the public in the private sector by heading coalitions and groups that work for the goals Arthur is most deeply committed to—preserving Social Security, extending health care to all and advancing the civil rights of all persons.

But it is not simply his longevity in public service that makes Arthur Flemming's career remarkable. (although I cannot refrain from noting that Arthur was born in 1905, 15 years before the ACLU was founded—so they have been advocates for justice for about the same period of time). It is also the quality of his service that makes him a long distance runner. Everybody who knows Arthur has his own story about Arthur's readiness to travel whenever he hears the call (I can remember in 1988 getting a call from an editor of the Yale Law Journal who said he wanted to extend an invitation to Arthur to speak at a symposium on the 20th Anniversary of the Fair Housing Act. He called me because he wondered whether Dr. Flemming would be able to make the trip to New Haven. At the time I got this call, Arthur was preparing to travel, I think to 28 cities in 30 days to speak on behalf of the Republicans for Dukakis). But what is more impressive than Arthur's seeming inability to stay away from airports is the reason he travels. Other people of renown travel to participate or be seen at international conferences, to go to dinners with other famous people. Arthur travels to attend meetings and rallies where he will have the opportunity to communicate with everyday people on the issues he most cares about—health care, civil rights and civil liberties and other issues that affect the dignity and well being of the American people.

And he is ready and willing to do the work in the trenches that other people may spurn once they reach a certain position. I remember in the 1980s going with him to a meeting of State civil rights officers where he had been asked to listen to the whole day's proceedings and then give a summation. By mid-afternoon, as the sessions went on (and on) most of us were flagging, but Arthur was still paying rapt attention. At 5:30, Arthur gave not only a fine analytical summary of what people had said—but he delivered an inspirational speech, rallying the troops to keep the faith during the hard times of the 80s.

And that talk was characteristic of so many I have heard Arthur give during the years we have worked together at the CCR. As Elliot Richardson has observed, Arthur speaks with "simplicity, force and deep conviction." He has, I might add, the gift that all of the great advocates I have known have—an ability to understand complex matters and then reduce them to their essentials so that people will understand what is at stake. And despite many years in Washington, he has never become so jaded as to lose the capacity to be angered at injustice. So, for example, when the Reagan Administration pursued its policy of denying people welfare benefits without affording them due process and then ignored court orders to rectify the situation except in the jurisdiction