

Fortunately, the new Congress and the new Clinton are certain not to legalize drugs. Unfortunately, it is less clear whether they will recognize the nasty new stain of intractability that drugs have added to crime, health costs and welfare dependency, and go on to tap the potential of research, prevention and treatment to save billions of dollars and millions of lives.

If a mainstream disease like diabetes or cancer affected as many individuals and families as drug and alcohol abuse and addiction do, this nation would mount an effort on the scale of the Manhattan Project to deal with it.●

#### AMERICA'S GOLD-STAR MOM: ROSE

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I am asking that a column written by Steve Neal, in tribute to the mother of our colleague, EDWARD KENNEDY, be placed into the RECORD.

It is a great tribute to Mrs. Kennedy. I did not have the privilege of knowing her well, but I wish I had.

In addition to what is said in the Steve Neal column, I believe it is not an exaggeration to say that no mother has contributed as much to the Nation in our 206 year history as Rose Kennedy.

Her life was a story of tragedy and triumph and a brilliant spirit, despite all the tragedies. The remarkable contributions that TED KENNEDY makes to this body and to the Nation are one of many tributes to Rose Kennedy.

At this point, I ask that the Steven Neal column be printed in the RECORD. The column follows:

[From the Sun-Times, Jan. 24, 1995]  
AMERICA'S GOLD-STAR MOM: ROSE  
(By Steve Neal)

Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy had style. She spoke on her son's behalf at a Veterans of Foreign Wars hall in Brighton, Mass. It was John F. Kennedy's first campaign. He was running for Congress in 1946. Mrs. Kennedy, who had lost her eldest son Joseph in World War II and had nearly lost another, didn't talk about her family's tragedy. She dazzled the crowd with her wit. As the daughter of a former Boston mayor, Rose Kennedy was a political natural. When she finished her talk at the VFW hall. Mrs. Kennedy got a rousing ovation. Then she introduced the young JFK.

Dave Powers, JFK's war buddy, recalled that Kennedy was "slightly over-whelmed that his mother could talk that well to an audience." As Mrs. Kennedy made her exit, her son stopped her and said, "Mother, they really love you."

So did the world.

Rose Elizabeth Fitzgerald Kennedy, who died Sunday at 104, was America's gold-star mother and one of the more extraordinary women of the 20th century. She taught JFK how to give a political speech and how to work a crowd. He couldn't have had a better teacher.

Three of her sons were elected to the U.S. Senate and her son John won the presidency of the United States. She took pride in their accomplishments.

"As Jack's mother, I am confident that Jack will win because his father says so, and through the years I have seen his predictions and judgments vindicated almost without exception," Mrs. Kennedy wrote in her diary in June, 1960. "And so, I believe it. He also says, and has said all along, that if Jack gets the nomination he can beat Nixon."

Mrs. Kennedy had a long memory. "We are all furious at Governor [Pat] Brown of California and Governor [David] Lawrence of Pennsylvania because they will not come out for Jack now. Their support would clinch the nomination for him. Joe has worked on Lawrence all winter but he still can't believe a Catholic can be elected."

Mrs. Kennedy wrote of JFK's first debate: "I watched Jack last night on the debate, praying through every sentence, as I had prayed during the day. He looked more assured than Nixon and looked better physically. Jack seemed to have the initiative and once or twice rose to inspiring heights of oratory." But she noted that he could improve: "People think that Jack speaks too fast. I agree and have already told him."

Four of her children had tragic deaths. She said that the wounds of those tragedies never healed. But her courage and faith kept her going. "One of the best ways to assuage grief is to find a way to turn some part of the loss to a positive, affirmative use for the benefit of other people," Mrs. Kennedy wrote in her memoirs. "I do believe that God blesses us for that and the burden is lightened."●

#### ANGUISH IN RWANDA

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, recently, the Washington Post had an interesting editorial titled, "Anguish in Rwanda."

It speaks of the need for the United Nations to have a few troops, to give some stability to a nation that is teetering on the edge of instability. Perhaps even that is a too favorable description of the situation.

I introduced legislation in the last session, which I will be reintroducing this session, to authorize the United States to have up to 3,000 troops that would be available to the United Nations for their efforts, subject to the approval of the President of the United States. We should call on other nations to do the same.

The great threat to U.S. security and the security of other nations today is instability. By having a small force, a group of volunteers from within our Armed Forces available, we could do much to provide stability in places like Rwanda.

I ask that the Post editorial be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 25, 1995]  
ANGUISH IN RWANDA

To protect a million-plus Rwandan refugees in Zaire, the United Nations appealed to 60 nations for peace-keepers. All 60 said no. The secretary general then asked for a few dozen U.N. officers to support soldiers from Zaire. Again the answer was no. Falling back, U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali now simply asks the Security Council to make available some Zairian troops assisted by civilian refugee officials. The prospects are uncertain.

In the camps there is no uncertainty, only desperation. The Hutus who perpetrated genocide in Rwanda last spring lost to the Tutsi-minority rebels and then carried many of their people, with their supporting community structures, into exile in Zaire. The international relief agencies found these structures essential to funnel in quick aid. But that gave new power and coin to the old Hutu hierarchy, including war criminals, who steal the aid and keep refugees from going home. A moral dilemma has split the agencies: Stay and sustain a regime of kill-

ers, or leave and let suffering refugees suffer more. This is the context in which the United Nations seeks to build an alternative security structure.

Last year's television pictures of the genocide publicized the need for emergency supplies, and many responded. But the humanitarian needs of the camps merge into an obscure zone of political struggle, and many lose interest. Dozens of countries were ready to send material aid. None is ready to expose its soldiers to risk for the Hutus. Nor is the problem confined to Rwanda. Its descent to a hollowed-out chaos where it can no longer order its own affairs is typical of the ethnic and national disputes that now disfigure world politics. Expect more in humanitarian crises, the CIA warned last month, and less in international relief.

So many things remain to be done. Right at the top ought to be the establishment of a standby humanitarian food-and-police service, run out of the Security Council, where the United States has a veto, so that when the next quaking call comes, the secretary general does not have to run around begging 60 distracted countries to help in vain.●

#### GOOD MORNING, VIETNAM

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, Senator FRANK MURKOWSKI and I had the chance to visit Vietnam. And shortly after we got back, I read the column by Tom Friedman in the New York Times about Vietnam, which makes so much sense.

We are now inching toward full diplomatic relations that should have occurred years ago. Sixteen years ago I had lunch with the Vietnamese delegation at the United Nations and urged full diplomatic recognition at that time. We should do it now—the sooner, the better.

I ask that the Tom Friedman column be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1995]  
GOOD MORNING, VIETNAM  
(By Thomas L. Friedman)

HANOI, VIETNAM.—In 1966, at the height of the Vietnam War, Senator George Aiken became famous for suggesting that we simply declare victory and bring American troops home. That victory was phony, but 29 years later we truly have one in Vietnam, if winning is measured by a Vietnam that is economically, politically and strategically pro-Western. Yet despite that victory, Washington is reluctant to open full diplomatic relations with Hanoi and consolidate its tentative move into America's orbit. It's time. It's time we started relating to Vietnam as a country, not a conflict. It's time that we declare victory and go back to Vietnam to reap it.

President Bush should have been the one to open relations. He knew it was the right thing to do, and he had the credibility with veterans' groups to do it. But he didn't. (Wouldn't be prudent.) President Clinton, despite his problems with Vietnam vets, has inched closer to Hanoi, by lifting economic sanctions last year and agreeing to a low-level liaison office this year. For months the State Department has been quietly recommending full normalization, but after the midterm Republican rout the White House said "Forget it." (Wouldn't be prudent.) That is America's loss.

Vietnam's 72 million industrious, literate people are building a market economy from the ground up. Because U.S. diplomats and businesses are not here in force as the foundation stones are laid and the legal system is reformed, this means U.S. standards, regulations and laws are not being wired in. Australia already dominates the phone system, British Petroleum has the oil sector and Singapore advises on the legal code.

I was riding in a taxi here the other day and the driver was studying English from BBC tapes. For 30 minutes I had to listen to a repetition of: "I like football. I like Manchester United," the prominent British soccer team. When they think football here they don't think Dallas Cowboys, and when they think telephones they don't think AT&T.

Strategically, the big issue in Asia will be the containment of China, whose military might, and appetite, will grow as China grows. There is no more powerful counterweight to Beijing than Hanoi, whose tiny army bludgeoned China's in their 1979 border war. China is Vietnam's historical enemy. Most of Hanoi's boulevards are named for heroes of the wars against China. The biggest display in the Hanoi Army Museum is not of Vietnam's victory over the U.S. in 1975, but its victory over the Mongols from the north in 1288. A U.S.-Vietnam entente would get China's attention—and keep it.

As for our M.I.A.'s, every U.S. official dealing with this issue says Vietnamese cooperation has improved (not diminished, as opponents of relations predicted) since we lifted the economic embargo. The reason is not anything the Hanoi Government is doing, but because the Vietnamese people, villagers and veterans, are now coming forward with information about graves and bones that they were holding back as long as America was embargoing them economically. U.S. M.I.A. officials say normal relations and more Americans traveling here would only elicit more grass-roots cooperation, which is the only way the 1,621 remaining M.I.A. cases will be resolved.

It is pathetic that a small, vindictive cult of M.I.A. activists in America—who broadcast U.F.O. sightings of P.O.W.'s roaming the Vietnamese countryside and demand we withhold normalization to punish Hanoi for war we never should have fought—have intimidated Washington into a Vietnam policy that is bad for M.I.A.'s and bad for America.

The Vietnamese, who have 300,000 M.I.A.'s, have let the future bury the past. As Deputy Foreign Minister LeMai told me: "If we nursed all of our grudges with all the powers that we have fought against, we wouldn't have relations with anyone. The war divided your society; recognizing Vietnam would put this behind you. It would heal your own wounds."

He's right. It's time we too buried the past. Hue today is a cuisine, not a battle; Tet is a New Year's celebration, not an offensive; Haiphong is a harbor, not something to be bombed at Christmas; and Highway 1 is where they run the Hanoi Marathon, not the military artery of an enemy nation. President Clinton didn't start this war, and he didn't fight this war, but with a little bit of courage, he could finally end this war. ●

#### A FRACTURED COMMUNITY AND SHORT OF PERFECTION

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, recently, the annual Man of the Year Award in St. Louis was given to two people rather than one, our two former colleagues, Tom Eagleton and Jack Danforth.

They are both among our finest.

I am pleased that the citizens of St. Louis appropriately honored both of them.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch published their comments on that occasion, and because of our association with the two of them and because of what they say about government and our attitudes toward one another in this excessively partisan climate, I urge my colleagues to read their comments.

I ask that their remarks be printed in the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 10, 1995]

#### A FRACTURED COMMUNITY

(By Thomas F. Eagleton)

I recently attended a meeting of St. Louis businessmen and heard Charles "Chuck" Knight, chairman and CEO of Emerson Electric, say the following: "Downtown's top attractions—the Arch, Busch Stadium, Kiel Center, Union Station, the convention center, the new football stadium, the casinos—will draw in excess of 12 million visitors annually. That's more than Disneyland."

Chuck Knight is correct in his enthusiasm for downtown St. Louis, Downtown St. Louis has been revived. Downtown St. Louis is being rescued.

But the city of St. Louis as a whole has not. The Arch does not a city make. Busch Stadium does not a city make. The Kiel Center does not a city make. A football stadium does not a city make.

A city is people. A city is neighborhoods. A city is the interrelation of people with common concerns and common hopes. A city is the cohesive interaction of its peoples and its purposes. A city is the sum of its treasure pact and its capacity to flourish in the future.

Today's city of St. Louis can glory in its past as one of America's great cities, but as presently structured, it is a fading city with a troubled future.

When I entered politics, the city of St. Louis had 850,000 people. Today it is 380,000. The 1994 official State of Missouri demographic report says that in 2020 the population of St. Louis will be between 225,000 and 275,000—much smaller than the Wichita of 2020.

There is a structural noose around the St. Louis region's neck. We don't discuss it much, but the St. Louis metropolitan area is the textbook example of the most politically fragmented, disarrayed urban region in the nation. We are America's worst-case governance scenario. When we succeed, we do so in spite of our structural handicaps.

Back in 1876, the voters approved the separation of the city from the county. There were five municipalities in St. Louis County at that time. There are now 90. One has 11 residents. There are 21 St. Louis County cities with under 1,000 people. Only nine exceed 20,000.

There are 43 fire protection units and 62 police departments.

In the St. Louis metropolitan region, resource disparities are staggering. The city has been tax-abated to excess. In the county, there continues a frenetic, never-ending "land rush" to capture tax base in unincorporated portions of the county.

I realize we live in a time when it is out of fashion to discuss the impact of government on private decision-making. I also realize that we like to cling to the sentimental notion that somehow quaint Webster Groves and Ladue, for example, are so self-sufficient as to have no need of interaction and interconnection with governmental conditions around them.

Just as the city of St. Louis has outlived its history, St. Louis County has outgrown its sentimental quaintness. Our city and our county are an aggregation of jerry-built, haphazard, fragmented, disconnected governmental units, many barely treading water. We have had a succession of Boards of freeholders, a Board of Electors, and a Boundary Commission. All have attempted to tinker with the governmental structure and for one reason or another have made no discernable improvement.

We have tried some targeted remedies, such as a Sewer District, Junior College District, Zoo and Museum District, and joint support for a hospital. We have Bi-State. These regional efforts have helped, but the city-county disunion persists.

St. Louis and St. Louis County still remain as the foremost textbook example of how free people can misgovern themselves on the local level.

Enough handwringing. What do we do?

We have two choices.

Creeping incrementalism. Deal with the situation at the margins—tinkering with charter reform—go to the Missouri legislature or voters for non-controversial changes.

Cold bath. Just as the end of communism required a bold, total leap into capitalism, so too the end of St. Louis-St. Louis County disunion will require a bold, total immersion. St. Louis, like Berlin, would be whole again.

I fervently believe in the latter precept. Incrementalism won't go to the root of the distress. I'll give an example. Whether the St. Louis Police Board is appointed by the governor or the mayor will not have an overwhelming, decisive impact on the destiny of St. Louis. Only the boldness of urban consolidation—one city—will be meaningful.

Let me be clear. I am not alleging that solving the governmental barriers of the St. Louis region will alone create a spontaneous regeneration of a new and greater St. Louis with unfettered decency and personal responsibility reigning supreme.

Eliminating the Berlin Wall has not as yet equalized East and West. Eliminating Skinker Boulevard as our own Berlin Wall between poverty and prosperity will not by itself ensure an instantaneous panacea.

It would allow for local government to do its part of the societal job at its united best rather than at its fragmented worst. It would allow for a consolidation of effort and a focus of responsibility that simply isn't possible when political authority is fragmented into bits and pieces.

The day should come when St. Louis recaptures its population, its tax base and its greatness.

To paraphrase a famous Jewish sage, if not now, when? If not us, who?

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 10, 1995]

#### SHORT OF PERFECTION

(By John C. Danforth)

It is a most special honor to be joined in anyone's mind with Tom Eagleton. For all of my political life, Tom has been for me the model of what a public servant should be—smart, energetic, dedicated, always committed to the principles in which he believed. It never mattered to me that his positions were not exactly my own. He was a very fine Senator, and he is a very good friend, and I am proud to share this honor with him.

I don't know whether I am making much more out of it than was intended, but it seems to me that there is a message in this dual award—a message from St. Louis to the country—that it is St. Louis' own answer to