

And the more money a candidate has the more he can spend on television and thus increase his chances of winning. The temptation to play along with special interest groups is great, even though it will tend to increase national deficits.

The other huge obstacle to reducing federal deficits is the apparently high percentage of the public that is not well-informed about federal financial problems and/or are easily influenced by political propaganda. That includes people who pay little attention to what elected officials do from day to day until near election dates and then do their duty by listening to an occasional campaign speech and short (but expensive) political commercials.

They do not realize that the records of politicians are a far more reliable indication of what a politician will do in the future than are sounding promises. And people who fail to vote because "all politicians are dishonest" or "my vote won't make any difference" make it easier for the candidate with the most to spend to get elected.

Of course the special interest groups which spend large sums on campaign contributions (in effect a form of bribery) and seek costly special privileges from the government, are a very important cause of our inability to eliminate deficits. As long as they can prevent passage of comprehensive campaign finance reforms such as those narrowly defeated by the Republicans and some moderate Democrats a year or two ago, expect little change.

Other causes of budget deficits are the failure of our educational system and the mass media to educate the public better concerning basic political functioning.

Can politicians who get elected to high office really be blamed for our dangerously high and still growing national debt of nearly five trillion dollars? After all, every one of them was elected by more votes than those who were defeated.

My answer is yes. Either most or many of them at times put their personal interests, the interests of their party and/or the interests of their key supporters ahead of the long-run best interests of the United States.

Let me illustrate with the issue of the extremely narrow defeat of the proposed balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

Leading Democrats charge that Congress can balance the budget any time there is the will to do it. They claim that whenever the Republicans present a concrete plan showing the cuts they propose to achieve a balanced budget, then the Democrats will negotiate with them to achieve a balanced budget.

The Democrats know that the Republicans will not, probably cannot, do this. The president is still smarting over the way Republicans and Mountain State Democrats defeated his proposal to charge reasonable prices for logging, mining and grazing rights on federal forest land.

Many liberal Democrats feared that if the amendment were adopted, Republicans might succeed in raiding Social Security funds so extensively that the system would be bankrupted when the baby boom generation retired. There are very good arguments against both of these extreme positions.

A reasonable compromise would be an excellent solution but was not seriously considered by either side. Apparently many Republicans and Democrats alike feared that the amendment could force them to make very difficult decisions which might jeopardize retaining their positions in Congress.

Right-wing Republicans favor policies which could easily result in a bigger gap between the rich and the poor and even larger deficits as happened between 1981 and 1994. Many liberal Democrats point out the seri-

ous potential risks of passage of the proposed amendment to balance federal budgets. But these are only potential.

Failure to balance federal budgets without such an amendment appear almost certain and dreadful consequences of failure to pay as we go are virtually certain. Few people seem to realize how many shattering consequences are almost inevitable.

Melvin Brooks is a retired Southern Illinois University at Carbondale professor.●

HONORING MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY BASKETBALL COACH JUD HEATHCOTE ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a great man and a great head coach: Jud Heathcote of the Michigan State Spartans. After this season ends, players and fans of college basketball at Michigan State will have to learn to live without the institution that is Jud Heathcote. He will be sorely missed.

Jud Heathcote's 340 wins in 19 seasons at MSU make him State's all-time winningest coach. Jud passed the previous mark of 232 in February 1990. His teams hold the first through seventh-highest victory totals on MSU's all-time single-season list. To top it off, Coach Heathcote's Spartans won the NCAA championship in 1979 and won the Big Ten in 1978, 1979, and 1990.

As he retires, Jud, his wife Beverly, and their children Jerry, Carla, and Barbara can look back on a long-running, successful career. Jud capped off a very successful tenure as Head Coach at the University of Montana by serving as assistant coach of the U.S. Pan American team in 1975—a team which brought back the Gold Medal. Beginning at MSU in 1976, Coach Heathcote became Big Ten Coach of the Year by the 1977-78 season. He repeated this performance in 1985-85 and went on to become the National Association of Basketball Coaches [NABC] Coach of the Year in 1989-90 and College Sports Magazines's Coach of the Year in 1994-95.

Noted for his special expertise in coaching defense, Jud also produced at MSU a team that this year led the Big Ten in field goal percentage, and was ranked seventh nationally. His dedication to the game, his concern with the well-being of the players and the integrity of the MSU program and his personal warmth and decency all make him a coach for all seasons.

We will miss Coach Heathcote, but are grateful for his many contributions to basketball, MSU and Michigan, and wish him all the best in his retirement.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. MAURICE VANDERPOL

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, on April 22, 1995, many special guests from the Netherlands and this Nation will gather at the Wang Center in Boston to celebrate the permanent endowment of Young at Arts, the Wang Center's edu-

cational outreach program, with special recognition to Dr. Maurice Vanderpol for his enthusiasm and outstanding leadership in this effort.

In 1989 Dr. Vanderpol established the Walter Suskind Memorial Fund in memory of Water Suskind, whose courage saved the lives of hundreds of children from Nazi concentration camps during the Second World War. The fund was established as a permanent endowment for Young at Arts. This program teaches a curriculum in the arts to young children around Boston—possibly some of whom are the grandchildren of those Walter Suskind saved 60 years ago.

Due to Dr. Vanderpol's tireless effort over the past 6 years, the campaign to raise \$1 million for the endowment was successful. This success, along with Dr. Vanderpol's exemplary leadership and extraordinary support in keeping alive the memories and the dreams of a people brutalized by the horrors of war, is why I wish to recognize Dr. Maurice Vanderpol on this day.●

FAREWELL TO BISHOP LOUIS HENRY FORD

● Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, Bishop Louis Henry Ford died last Friday, after many years of service to his church, and to the people of Chicago.

Bishop Ford was the presiding International Bishop of the Church of God in Christ, and the spiritual leader to over eight million people, as well as the founder and pastor of the St. Paul Church of God in Christ in Chicago.

Louis Henry Ford arrived in Chicago in 1933, after graduating from Saints College in Mississippi, and was soon ordained an Elder in the Church of God in Christ. Three years later he founded St. Pauls and embarked on his long career of saving souls and strengthening the community around him through religion. It is through his efforts that the membership of Church of God in Christ has risen to 8.7 million parishioners in 52 different countries, and is now the largest Pentecostal Church in the United States.

Indeed, Bishop Ford's involvement in the community was much more than just religious. He served many years on the Cook County Board of Corrections and often was called upon to consult with the city government, especially on Chicago schools and race relations issues. He was respected as a leader in the civil rights movement, and he continued that tradition as he rose to leadership in the Church of God in Christ. Throughout the years Bishop Ford has been given numerous honors and awards, including the declaration of October 25th, 1990, as Louis Henry Ford Day in Chicago. Indeed, his work was recognized by President Clinton in 1993, when he addressed the 86th Annual Holy Convocation.

Bishop Louis Henry Ford was a well-loved and important member of our community. he spent his life helping

people through the church. My greatest sympathy is with his wife Mother Margaret Ford, and his children Charles H.M. Ford and Janet Oliver Hill, and all his family members.

It is clear that Bishop Ford's legacy in the church will continue to help inspire people, and strengthen the community he loved long into the future. Bishop Ford will be greatly missed, but never forgotten.●

BISHOP'S VIEWS ON WELFARE REFORM

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, Howard J. Hubbard, Bishop of Albany, recently presented his views on welfare reform in the diocesan newspaper, the Evangelist. The bishop served for 4 years as chaplain at Community Maternity Services, a diocesan program for pregnant teens and their children, so his statement is based on practical experience. Having worked with many welfare mothers at CMS, he refers to a number of them by name in his reflections. Bishop Hubbard has been in the trenches, as they say, so I believe my colleagues would do well to examine his views on the subject.

Mr. President, I ask that Bishop Hubbard's column be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

HIS EXPERIENCES GIVE BISHOP IDEAS ON WELFARE REFORM

(By Bishop Howard J. Hubbard)

The present debate over welfare reform is very complex. Most everyone agrees that the current system isn't working. There seems to be a consensus as well that a major focus of attention must be the growing number of women, especially teenagers, having children out of wedlock.

Teenage pregnancy is a national crisis. Teens and their children are in danger of failing to develop to their full potential; and too often, they become dependent, rather than contributing, members of society. Adolescents who have children are still children themselves.

In the past decade, teen pregnancy in particular and child care in general have become key elements of our national agenda. Teenage sexual activity and childbearing have increased in recent years, and a growing proportion of births to teenagers takes place outside of marriage:

In 1989, more than one million U.S. babies were born to unwed women;

Almost 350,000 of those babies were born to women under the age of 20;

Nearly three-fourths of American children growing up in single-parent families experience poverty for some period during their first ten years;

Becoming a parent as a teenager increases the chances that a mother will not complete high school, that she will fare poorly in the job market, and that she and her children will live in poverty.

THOUGHT AND EMOTIONS

On the rational level, policymakers are seeking to address the aspects of the welfare system which foster dependency and contribute to a permanent underclass where lack of family stability, child abuse, drug usage and inferior education perpetuate the vicious cycle of poverty.

On the emotional level, however, there is the cry of frustrated citizens who feel that

they are bearing the brunt of a system out of control.

That mentality—which is so often heard on the talk shows or reflected in letters to the editor—was captured in caricature form by Sandra Smokes in her Jan. 29 column in the Albany Times Union: "Get those baby-making, lazy welfare mothers out of here and let them take their school-lunch-eating, government-dependent children with them. Put them in orphanages, put them anywhere, just get them out of here."

MEETING THE WOMEN

As one who served as chaplain for four years at Community Maternity Services (CMS), our diocesan program for pregnant teens and their newborn children, I think it is important to get beyond the stereotypes. Then we can reflect carefully upon who these women are and what motivates their behavior before arriving at solutions. Let me share a few snapshots of the young women I came to know at CMS:

Sharelle was in a series of foster homes (her mother was 15 when she had Sharelle) and is now living on her own with her infant son. She dropped out of school, and her only hope is to meet someone who will support them.

Gail represents the young girls who had abortions in the past year. She made no plans for future sexual overtures and carried within her a gnawing need to bring the baby back. Pregnant again a year later, she thought maybe this was God's way of letting her repent. She thought her penance was to be a perfect mother to this child.

Tammi was an unpopular and unattractive teen who was unhappy with herself. She would respond to any attention from any of the young men of her acquaintance. She felt terribly lonely the morning after.

Amy, almost 16, has been dating Joe, 18, for a year. Amy's parents have not talked to her about sexuality; much of what she has learned has come from afternoon soaps. By the time Amy and Joe had promised each other it wouldn't happen again, she was pregnant.

Cheryl was active in CYO, played her guitar at Mass and was the pride of her family. She fell madly in love with Tom. They occasionally agreed to intercourse because "love gives all" and because "maybe virginity is selfish." She prayed that soon she would be able to talk her boyfriend out of this; but before she could, she was pregnant.

While those young women come from a variety of economic and social backgrounds, they all show the same characteristics: lack of self-esteem, poor and no communication with parents, and a desire to escape their present situation by pursuing the type of happiness and fulfillment that MTV or the soaps promise.

SOLUTIONS

There is no simple or single solution to their situations. Each woman differs in terms of specific barriers she faces and resources she should have available to promote her self-sufficiency and to guide her to social and economic independence.

But, based upon my years of experience with these young women and so many others in similar straits, as well as documented research, I believe that any program of welfare reform designed to address their needs constructively must take into account several factors:

1. Welfare programs are not among the primary reasons for the rising number of out-of-wedlock births.

Greg Duncan and Jean Yeung, in a comprehensive report titled "The Extent and Consequence of Welfare Dependents," conclude that "most research examining the effects of higher welfare benefit levels on out-

of-wedlock childbearing finds that benefit levels have no significant effect on the likelihood that black women and girls will have children outside of marriage, and no significant effect, or only a small effect, on the likelihood that whites will have such births. We strongly urge the rejection of any proposal that would eliminate the safety net for poor children born outside of marriage. Such policies do more harm than good."

In the short term, that means that more, not less, in assistance may be the appropriate and most effective approach in dealing with these women.

2. Policies and programs of intervention with mothers and their children must be cognizant of and sensitive to the unique circumstance and diverse needs each faces.

For example, there is a difference between the 19-year-old who has two years of college credits and needs some assistance in caring for her one-year-old son as she seeks employment or job training, and the 17-year-old who is a high school dropout and who has a learning disability as does her two-year-old child.

Therefore, public policies and programs to assist single-parent mothers must be tailored to fit specific needs, and will require appropriate goals and realistic individualized time frames for achieving such.

3. The major goal in working with pregnant women, especially adolescents, is to educate for the purpose of reducing teen pregnancies, and to facilitate movement to maturity, independence and non-repetitive behavior (which would include personal support, daycare and adoption options, etc.).

Those goals can best be accomplished, through building parenting skills, connecting families with resources in the communities where they live, and promoting a partnership with parents for the full and healthy development of their children.

4. Quality, affordable and accessible daycare and health care as well as ongoing education or job training are prerequisites for success.

5. There must be a strong moral component in any program for single mothers as well as a values-laden dimension which promotes marriage, family life, caring, truth-telling, the goodness of sexuality, and the importance of its discipline and the value of schooling and work.

6. There must be a pragmatic component which addresses handling finances, child care, house management, cooking, shopping, responsible decision-making and personal relationships.

7. Where possible, birth fathers must be part of the program, which should include a focus on their rights and responsibilities, especially their responsibility for supporting their child, at a minimum financially.

CHURCH'S ROLE

For all this is work, there cannot be hidden agendas on the part of government, families, social agencies and the teenagers involved. Rather, there must be a forthright presentation of issues and interactive responses that are proactive.

The Church—through the efforts of Catholic Charities—stands ready to participate in such a program of welfare reform. To do less is to try to address a complex and multi-causal problem by settling for a massive and unwieldy system that, in the long run, falls painfully short of its goals.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. MICHAEL H. MESCON

● Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Dr. Michael H. Mescon, Dean Emeritus of Georgia State University, as he is honored by