

who didn't understand the law or hold it in particularly high esteem. After walking a beat for a year, he was assigned to the vice squad. In January 1964, Fred became the city of Charleston's and South Carolina's first African-American motorcycle patrolman. A year later, he was promoted to detective. In October 1969, he became the first African-American deputy sheriff for Charleston County.

Fred left the sheriff's department for the Marshalls Service in January 1972. Since then, he has served with great distinction and honor. Anybody at the Federal courthouse in Charleston will tell you that no matter what has happened, Fred has been there to help. I, like many other leaders and judges across South Carolina, am grateful for his dedication over the years. If it were not for a requirement that made his retirement mandatory, I'm sure Fred would provide many more years of outstanding and professional service.

Mr. President, Fred Stroble is held in such high esteem today because of the more than 30 years that he has helped people across South Carolina. I appreciate this opportunity to express my respect and gratitude, and to wish Fred many happy years of retirement, new challenges, and exciting opportunities.

MEXICAN ECONOMIC AGREEMENT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, after weeks of intense negotiation, the United States and Mexico yesterday agreed on a package of guarantees and swap transactions to help restore investor confidence in the Mexican economy while addressing United States concerns about the fundamental soundness of the Mexican economy and the level of risk to American taxpayers. I commend the President for his efforts to respond to this crisis while ensuring that adequate safeguards and conditions are in place to protect U.S. national interests.

I must say that, when the administration first proposed, in the immediate aftermath of the peso devaluation, a major U.S. response, I was quite skeptical. In many discussions with the administration I raised my concerns and urged that tough questions be asked about the wisdom of United States involvement and tough conditions be applied on Mexico as a precondition to any aid package.

Mr. President, I believe the administration has negotiated tough-minded terms for the package. I commend them for this and now believe it is both appropriate and in our national interest for this program to be put into operation.

In all candor, I continue to have some concerns about the possible long-term negative consequences of this whole crisis to our national economy and national economic interest. But I do believe as a nation we had to act and that the administration has acted skillfully. And if we did not act, real economic disaster could result.

The economic stabilization package signed Tuesday by Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin and Mexican Finance Minister Guillermo Ortiz actually consists of four separate agreements. The framework agreement sets the overall terms and conditions for U.S. support. These include commitments on the part of Mexico to reduce inflation, strengthen the peso, and encourage new investment by cutting Government spending, pursuing tight monetary policy, and raising short-term interest rates. Mexico is also committed to accelerate structural reforms in the transportation, telecommunications, and banking sectors, speed privatization, and improve financial transparency.

The Medium-Term Exchange Stabilization Agreement provides the basis for currency swap transactions, under which Mexico can exchange pesos for dollars for a period of up to 5 years. The interest rate charged for these swaps is to cover the U.S. risk for such transactions.

Under the guarantee agreement, the United States will provide guarantees for the issuance of Mexican debt securities with maturities of up to 10 years. This portion of the package is intended to convince investors to lend money to Mexico for longer terms at lower interest rates, thus alleviating the short-term debt burden that precipitated this crisis.

Finally, the oil proceeds facility agreement establishes the mechanism by which the United States is assured substantial repayment should Mexico default on its obligations. The agreement would set up a bank account in the United States into which foreign purchasers of Mexican oil would be required to make their payments. If Mexico fails to repay the United States under any of the financing agreements, the Treasury Department would be able, in effect, to take over that bank account.

All told, these agreements total \$20 billion in United States support for Mexico—a bold and comprehensive package designed to prevent an immediate shortfall from leading to long-term economic and political instability. This support is designed to entail no direct costs to our taxpayers. Mexico will be charged fees for the guarantees and interest for the medium-term swaps, and all of Mexico's obligations to the United States will be backed by proceeds from the export of Mexican crude oil and oil products.

Moreover, the U.S. action is more than matched by the international response. The IMF has offered an unprecedented \$17.8 billion in medium-term assistance, while the other G-10 countries plan to provide another \$10 billion in short-term credit through the Bank of International Settlements.

Mr. President, I believe it is essential that we continue to monitor this situation closely, and the agreements that were signed yesterday provide the means and expand our ability to do

just that. Even with this assistance, Mexico will face difficult economic choices, many of which could have an impact upon us.

I look forward to working with my colleagues and with the administration to ensure that Mexico lives up to its commitments under this package and that broad United States interests continue to be served through its implementation.

THE QUALIFICATIONS OF PETER EDELMAN TO BE A FEDERAL JUDGE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, an unfair, unfortunate, and negative campaign of distortions and preposterous character attacks has been under way for some time by partisans on the extreme right to prevent the nomination of an excellent lawyer, Peter Edelman, to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

I have known Peter Edelman well for more than three decades, ever since his years as an outstanding Senate staff member for my brother, Senator Robert Kennedy. A magna cum laude graduate of Harvard Law School, Peter served as a law clerk for Judge Henry Friendly on the Second Circuit Court of Appeals and Justice Arthur Goldberg on the Supreme Court.

In his subsequent career, he has consistently earned great distinction and respect for his service—in the Civil Division at the Department of Justice, as a vice president of the University of Massachusetts, as director of the New York State Division for Youth under Gov. Hugh Carey, as a partner in the Washington, DC, law firm of Foley & Lardner, as professor and associate dean at Georgetown University Law Center, and currently as counselor in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

By virtue of his outstanding ability, background, experience, judgment, and temperament, Peter Edelman is clearly and well-qualified to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals. As much as anyone I know, Peter Edelman understands that our laws are the wise restraints that make us free. He also very clearly understands the proper constitutional role of Federal judges in our Federal system.

I am confident that he would be an excellent Federal judge. I hope that President Clinton nominates him, and I believe he will be confirmed by the Senate. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to keep an open mind about this distinguished lawyer.

Last week, many of us received a letter in strong support of Peter Edelman, signed by 71 distinguished law professors, including 19 law school deans and 8 former law school deans. Because an editorial in the Washington Times earlier last week grossly distorted the letter, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD.

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

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER,
February 9, 1995.

Senator EDWARD KENNEDY,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: Enclosed please find a letter that we have sent to Senator Hatch. As you will see, it is a letter from more than seventy law professors and deans who are upset about the tactics being used by some who are attempting to stop the nomination of Peter Edelman to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. We are concerned that the current specter of distorted prenomination sniping is undermining the integrity of the constitutionally prescribed appointment process and we cannot stand by silently while this is occurring.

We appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

SUSAN BLOCH,
Georgetown University Law Center.
BARBARA BABCOCK,
Stanford Law School.

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER,
February 9, 1995.

Senator ORRIN G. HATCH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: As law professors concerned with protecting the Constitution and the judiciary, we are troubled to see orchestrated attempts to distort the record of potential nominees even before they have been nominated. In particular, we are very troubled by the attacks on Peter Edelman, a respected scholar with an extensive record of public service who has exactly the kind of qualifications the nation should look for in nominees for the Courts of Appeals. We urge you to remain open-minded so as not to encourage those seeking to derail the appointment process.

As you know, before joining the Administration, Peter Edelman was Associate Dean at the Georgetown University Law Center. In his outstanding career, Professor Edelman has been a clerk to Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg, a key aide to Senator Robert F. Kennedy, and Director of the New York State Division for Youth. As respected within academia as in public service, Professor Edelman has shown himself to be a sensitive, thoughtful, and responsible counselor, policymaker, and scholar. The judiciary and the nation would be well served by his presence on the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

To single out for attack, as his critics have, one article that Professor Edelman wrote in 1987 in an effort to provoke thought about the growing inequities in income distribution in this country is grossly distorting in at least two ways. First, it overlooks the fact that Professor Edelman has produced a body of work on poverty issues that sets out his framework for understanding the 1987 article. Second, the attack ignores the rest of his record of excellent service in all three branches of government.

Our constitutional system will be severely damaged if an organized campaign of misrepresentation can block the nomination of someone so clearly qualified. The President should nominate Professor Edelman and let the Senators decide whether or not to confirm. Peter Edelman should have the chance to explain his views and set forth his entire record in the framework of a confirmation hearing. We are confident that if you will receive his nomination with an open mind, you

will find that he is one of the most well qualified nominees you have seen in your tenure on the Judiciary Committee.

Professor Lee Albert, State University of New York at Buffalo, School of Law; Dean Barbara Bader Aldave, St. Mary's University of San Antonio, School of Law; Professor Ellen P. Aprill, Loyola Law School; Dean Judith C. Areen, Georgetown University Law Center; Professor Charles E. Ares, University of Arizona, College of Law; Professor Barbara Allen Babcock, The Ernest W. McFarland Professor of Law; Sanford Law School.

Professor Steven R. Barnett, University of California at Berkeley; Dean Daniel O. Bernstein, University of Wisconsin Law School; Professor Vincent A. Blasi, Columbia University School of Law; Professor Susan Low Bloch, Georgetown University Law Center; Provost Lee Bollinger, Dartmouth College; Dean Barry B. Boyer, State University of New York at Buffalo, School of Law.

Dean Paul Brest, Stanford Law School; Professor Robert A. Burt, Alexander M. Bickel Professor of Public Law, Yale Law School; Professor Alexander Morgan Capron, University Professor of Law and Medicine, University of Southern California; Associate Dean Catherine L. Carpenter, Southwestern University School of Law; Professor Stephen Lisle Carter, William Nelson Cromwell Professor of Law, Yale Law School; Professor David P. Currie, University of Chicago Law School.

Dean Colin S. Diver, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Professor David Feller, University of California at Berkeley; Professor Mary Louise fellows, University of Minnesota Law School; Professor David B. Filvaroff, State University of New York at Buffalo, School of Law; Professor Leslie Pickering Francis, University of Utah College of Law; Associate Dean George E. Garvey, The Catholic University of America.

Professor Carole E. Goldberg-Ambrose, University of California at Los Angeles, School of Law; Professor Jesse A. Goldner, Saint Louis University School of Law; Associate Dean Robert A. Gorman, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Dean David Hall, Northeastern University School of Law; Dean Joseph D. Harbaugh, University of Richmond, The T.C. Williams School of Law; Professor Phillip B. Heymann, Harvard University Law School; Professor Robert E. Hudec, University of Minnesota Law School.

Professor Stanley Ingber, Drake University Law School; Professor John H. Jackson, University of Michigan Law School; Professor Yale Kamisar, University of Michigan Law School; Dean John Robert Kramer, Tulane University School of Law; Dean Thomas G. Krattenmaker, College of William and Mary, Marshall-Wythe School of Law; Dean Jeffrey S. Lehman, University of Michigan Law School; Professor Howard Lesnick, University of Pennsylvania Law School.

Dean Lance M. Liebman, Columbia University School of Law; Professor Michael Melsner, Northeastern University School of Law; Dean Elliott S. Milstein, American University; Dean Gene R. Nichol, Jr., University of Colorado School of Law; Professor Robert O'Neil, University of Virginia School of Law; Professor Daniel H. Pollitt, University of North Carolina School of Law; Professor Burnelle Venable Powell, University of North Carolina School of Law.

Dean Henry Ramsey, Jr., Howard University School of Law; Professor Deborah L. Rhode, Stanford Law School; Dean John C. Roberts, De Paul University College of Law; Professor Jonathan Rose, Arizona State University; Professor Laura F. Rothstein, Uni-

versity of Houston Law Center; Professor Mark A. Rothstein, University of Houston Law Center; Associate Dean David Rudenstine, Yeshiva University, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law.

Associate Dean Frank E.A. Sander, Bussey Professor of Law, Harvard University Law School; Professor George Schatzki, University of Connecticut; Professor Philip G. Schrag, Georgetown University Law Center; Professor Peter H. Schuck, Yale Law School; Professor Teresa Moran Schwartz, George Washington University, National Law Center; Dean John A. Seibert, Jr., University of Baltimore; Professor Steven H. Shiffrin, Cornell Law School; President Emeritus Michael I. Sovern, Columbia University School of Law; Associate Dean Steven H. Steinglass, Cleveland State University, Cleveland Marshall College of Law; Professor Richard B. Stewart, New York University School of Law.

Professor Theodore J. St. Antoine, University of Michigan Law School; Professor David A. Strauss, University of Chicago Law School; Professor Peter L. Strauss, Columbia University School of Law; Professor Gerald F. Uelman, Santa Clara University School of Law; Professor James Vorenberg, Harvard University Law School; Dean Harry H. Wellington, New York Law School; Professor Patricia White, University of Utah, College of Law; Dean Richard S. Wirtz, University of Tennessee College of Law; Associate Dean Leah Wortham, The Catholic University of America School of Law.

Professors signing this letter, including the Deans, are signing as individuals and not as representatives of their schools.

IS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES!

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the incredibly enormous Federal debt is a lot like television's well-known energizer bunny—it keeps going and going—at the expense, of course, of the American taxpayers.

A lot of politicians talk a good game—when they are back home—about bringing Federal deficits and the Federal debt under control. But so many of these same politicians regularly voted in support of bloated spending bills during the 103d Congress—which perhaps is a primary factor in the new configuration of U.S. Senators.

This is a rather distressing fact as the 104th Congress gets down to business. As of Tuesday, February 21, 1995, the Federal debt stood—down to the penny—at exactly \$4,834,640,034,065.84 or \$18,352.38 per person.

Mr. President, it is important that all of us monitor, closely and constantly the incredible cost we incur each week due to this debt. As a matter of fact, in the past week the debt has increased over \$25 billion.

Mr. President, my hope is that the 104th Congress can bring under control the outrageous spending that created this outrageous debt. If the party now controlling both Houses of Congress, as a result of the November elections last year, does not do a better job of getting a handle on this enormous debt, the American people are not likely to overlook it in 1996.