

and VA inpatient facilities and nursing homes could be reserved for veterans for whom there is no other feasible alternative.

I am especially pleased that this bill would reauthorize the Homeless Chronically Mentally Ill [HCMCI] program. This program has been effective in serving the most disadvantaged, most needy and often most difficult population of vets to reach. It is precisely the kind of program that Senator Hubert Humphrey would have approved of in that passes his litmus test for judging a society by the way it deals with the most vulnerable and needy of its citizens. HCMCI authorizes VA outreach workers to contact homeless vets, assess and refer vets to community services, and place eligible vets in contracted community-based residential treatment facilities. This program is one of the two major VA homeless programs and now operates out of 57 medical centers in 31 States and the District of Columbia. I backed extension of this program unequivocally in the 103rd Congress, and I am even more convinced now that it merits reauthorization.

Another extraordinarily valuable, effective, and humane program that this measure would reauthorize is known as the Compensated Work Therapy and Therapeutic Transitional Housing program [CWT/TR]. It is a demonstration program authorizing the VA to renovate 50 residences as therapeutic transitional houses for chronic substance abusers, many of whom are also homeless, jobless, and mentally ill. VA would also be authorized to contract with nonprofit corporation which would own and operate the transitional residences in conjunction with existing VA compensated work therapy programs. Once a residence is fully renovated and operational, rent collected from vets in the program usually exceed operating costs. A preliminary VA evaluation of the program indicates that well over 50 percent of participants complete the program and have had substantially better sobriety, employment, and housing status than before entering the program. I strongly backed extension of this program in the last Congress and have no doubt that there is an urgent need to further extend this program that serves those are among the most needy of our veterans.

Finally, Mr. President this bill would extend VA's authority to enter into enhanced use leases, which would permit other parties to use VA property so long as at least part of the property will provide for an activity that furthers the VA mission and enhances use of the property. An excellent illustration of how this program would operate is a plan to establish at the Minneapolis VA Medical Center [VAMC] a managed care clinical research and education center on land owned by the VAMC. An HMO would build a facility on VAMC grounds that would be large enough for VA personnel to do impor-

tant clinical research and provide additional space for VA personnel to provide patient care to vets. Additionally, VA personnel would gain first-hand experience in managed care and make the VA more competitive in a managed care environment. Finally, the program would ready the Minneapolis VAMC for participation in the Minnesota State health care reform program should this become feasible.

In closing I want to thank my colleague, Senator ROCKEFELLER for his leadership in preparing this legislation and urge my colleagues to give it their full support. ●

A BULLET FROM AMERICA THREATENS AN INVALUABLE BEIRUT SCHOOL

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, my wife and I took off on a rare vacation of any length, when we spent 10 days in Spain and Portugal over the Easter recess.

While I was there, I picked up the New York Herald Tribune and read the Tom Friedman column, which originally appeared in the New York Times, paying tribute to Malcolm Kerr, who served as president of the American University in Beirut.

An incidental surprise in the article was to learn that Steve Kerr, who plays for the Chicago Bulls, is the son of the late president of American University.

Mr. Friedman has a point to make on what we ought to be doing in the field of economic assistance to other countries. I ask that the Tom Friedman column be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

A BULLET FROM AMERICA THREATENS AN INVALUABLE BEIRUT SCHOOL

(By Thomas L. Friedman)

WASHINGTON.—When I was a reporter in Beirut in the early 1980s the three most chilling words anyone could say to you were: "Have you heard?" The news that followed was almost always bad. That is why I shuddered on the morning of Jan. 18, 1984, when a banker friend called me to say: "Have you heard? Malcolm Kerr has been shot."

Malcolm was the president of the American University of Beirut, an expert on Arab politics and a friend of mine. I immediately ran over to the AUB campus. By the time I got there Malcolm was dead, the gunmen were gone and the only trace left of the murder was the bullet hole that had gouged the wall on the stairs to his office.

I have been thinking about Malcolm and the AUB lately because his widow, Ann Zwicker Kerr, has just published an affectionate memoir of both entitled "Come With Me From Lebanon." The book chronicles how they met on the AUB campus in 1954, she as a junior year abroad student from Occidental College and he as the son of AUB instructors. (Ann's parents wanted her to go to school in Europe, she wanted to go to India, so they compromised on Lebanon.)

Years later, after marrying, she and Malcolm returned to the AUB as teachers, and finally, after 20 years at the University of California at Los Angeles, they came back to run the AUB in the middle of the Lebanese civil war, out of a conviction that it was an institution worth saving. In Malcolm's case, it became an institution worth dying for.

I fondly recall sitting on the veranda of Marquand House, the AUB president's resi-

dence overlooking the Mediterranean, drinking freshly squeezed lemonade and listening to Malcolm's sober and always biting analysis of Arab politics. I was reminded of it reading Ann's book, in which Malcolm complained that there were "two rival student groups each wanting to organize its own Miss AUB contest—a Miss Left-Wing AUB and a Miss Right-Wing AUB, and after heroic efforts the dean of students finally got them together, only to have the army move in and scrap the whole thing!"

No one knows who murdered Malcolm, but clearly it was extremists intent on driving the United States, and its marines, out of Beirut. (He left behind four kids, one of whom, Steve, plays guard alongside Michael Jordan for the Chicago Bulls.)

I hope this book gets read by two audiences. For the general reader it is a thoughtful period piece about Americans abroad—a reminder of that generation of American secular missionaries, most of them teachers and doctors who, long before the Peace Corps, dedicated their lives to spreading the gospel of Jefferson and Lincoln in the Arab East. They came innocent of any imperial ambitions and they both nourished and were nourished by the local educational institutions they ran.

I also hope it is read by all those in Congress who today are so eagerly, and mindlessly, slashing U.S. foreign aid. Because when America cuts foreign aid, it isn't just cutting payoffs to the Guatemalan army. It is also cutting off the AUBs.

Who cares? Well, consider this: When the United Nations was founded in San Francisco, there were 19 AUB graduates among the founding delegates, more than any other university in the world. Educational institutions like the AUB are literally factories of pro-Americans.

Since its founding in 1866 it has graduated 34,000 students from all over the Middle East, who were educated in the American system and exposed to basic American values and standards. Today those graduates are cabinet ministers, business executives and educators peppered throughout the region.

Most important, the AUB is still one of the only real liberal arts colleges in the Arab world. It is the best answer to Islamic fundamentalism. In fact, most of the AUB's students today are Sunni and Shiite Muslims, who still see an American degree, not a Khomeini decree, as their ticket to advancement in the world.

But the AUB today is struggling. In 1985 it got about \$15 million a year in American foreign aid. Today it gets \$1.8 million. Tomorrow, if some in Congress have their way, it could get nothing. It would be an ironic tragedy if the AUB, having survived civil wars, bombings and the murder of Malcolm Kerr, were to have the fatal bullet put in its head by a stingy U.S. Congress controlled by people with no sense of America's role in the world or the institutions that sustain its values abroad.

Mr. SIMON. I visited the American University in Beirut long before I was a Member of Congress and was favorably impressed by what they did. The stunning statistic, which I had never read before, that there were 19 American University in Beirut alumni among the founding delegates at the San Francisco U.N. Conference, is dramatic evidence of the good work that they do.

The first lesson from the Tom Friedman column is that we should adequately support this fine and important university.

But there is another lesson to be drawn. Until the political earthquake of November 8, 1994, I served on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and chaired the Subcommittee on African Affairs. I learned to my chagrin, a little more than a year ago, that only 1½ percent of American economic aid to sub-Sahara Africa goes for higher education.

In our aid programs we have to meet emergencies—and Africa has more than its share of emergencies—but we also have to be looking long-term, and one of the ways that we help Africa long-term is to see to it that they have leadership in the future. One of the most effective ways to see that they have good leadership in the future is to make an investment in higher education.

I hope we reflect on the Tom Friedman column.●

RICH NATIONS CRITICIZE UNITED STATES ON FOREIGN AID

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, recently, I read a New York Times article titled "Rich Nations Criticize U.S. On Foreign Aid," by Steven Greenhouse. It referred to a report of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], and I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

RICH NATIONS CRITICIZE UNITED STATES ON FOREIGN AID

(By Steven Greenhouse)

WASHINGTON, April 7—An organization of wealthy industrial nations issued a stinging report today criticizing the United States for moving to cut foreign aid when it already gives a smaller share of its economic output to such assistance than any other industrial nation.

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, a Paris-based group of 25 nations, said the United States, once far and away the world's leading donor, was setting a poor example by cutting its aid budget and warned that the move might prompt other countries to follow suit.

Using unusually blunt language, the report said that "this seeming withdrawal from traditional leadership is so grave that it poses a risk of undermining political support for development cooperation" by other donor countries.

The report said the United States had slipped to No. 2, well behind Japan, in the amount of foreign aid provided excluding military assistance. The United States provided \$9.72 billion in 1993, compared with \$11.3 billion for Japan.

It said the United States contributed 15-hundredths of one percent of its gross domestic product for economic aid, putting it last among the 25 industrial nations. The average among these nations was 30-hundredths of one percent, while Sweden, Denmark and Norway all give 1 percent of their overall output to foreign aid.

J. Brian Atwood, Administrator of the Agency for International Development, the Government's principal aid arm, welcomed the report, making clear that he intends to use it as ammunition in the Clinton Administration's fight to persuade Congress not to cut foreign aid. At a news briefing today, Mr. Atwood criticized Congressional committees for proposing to cut \$3 billion from the \$21

billion international affairs budget, which includes State Department spending as well as foreign aid.

The report was written by the O.E.C.D. Secretariat and was overseen by James H. Michel, the chairman of its development assistance committee. Mr. Michel was an assistant administrator of A.I.D. in the Bush Administration.

Mr. SIMON. After reading the article, I asked for a copy of the OECD report, and it is a somewhat technical but important insight into our deficiencies.

Let me give a few quotes from the report:

A perplexing feature of the US development assistance effort is that while public opinion responds readily to situations of acute needs in developing countries (contributions to private voluntary agencies are among the highest per capita among DAC Members), there is no strong public support for the Federal aid budget. This may be explained in part by the fact that the public greatly overestimates the share of foreign assistance in the US Federal budget. According to a recent poll, the majority of respondents believe it to be around 20 percent of total US Government spending. In fact, USAID spending represents only 0.5 percent of the Federal budget and the US has the lowest ODA/GNP ratio among DAC Members.

Two other important points are made:

There is considerable apprehension in the donor community that some proposals may be given voice in the new Congress which raise the possibility of major cut-backs in US aid and even a turning away by the US from the common effort for development which it inspired over 30 years ago.

The second important point:

The US has accumulated substantial arrears both to the U.N. system and to be the multilateral concessional financing facilities, due to Congressional reluctance to approve the necessary appropriations. Plans discussed with Congress in 1994 to eliminate these arrears over the next few years are welcome. At the same time these plans appear to imply a reduction in US contributions to future financing of these agencies and facilities. This would represent a shift in burden-sharing to other DAC Members, and might have serious consequences for upcoming replenishments of the International Development Association (IDA) and the soft windows of the regional development banks.

But perhaps more telling than anything else is the percentage of gross national product [GNP] that is used for foreign aid among the 21 wealthy nations.

I ask my colleagues to look at this table, and I do not believe we can look at it with pride.

Mr. President, we are shortly going to be making decisions on our budget, and one of the questions is: Are we going to be less sensitive to the needs of the poor, both within our country and beyond the borders of our country?

I hope we will provide a sensible and humanitarian answer, that suggests we should be helpful to those in need.

The table follows:

Net ODA from DAC countries in 1993

[As percent of GNP]

Denmark	1.03
Norway	1.01
Sweden	0.98
Netherlands	0.82
France	0.63

Net ODA from DAC countries in 1993— Continued

Canada	0.45
Finland	0.45
Belgium	0.39
Germany	0.37
Australia	0.35
Luxembourg	0.35
Switzerland	0.33
Italy	0.31
United Kingdom	0.31
Austria	0.30
Portugal	0.29
Japan	0.26
New Zealand	0.25
Spain	0.25
Ireland	0.20
United States	0.15

Total DAC 0.30●

AFRICA

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the World Bank issues an annual report on regional perspectives.

Because I formerly chaired the Subcommittee on Africa for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and have a continuing interest in that continent, I read their report on Africa with special interest.

There are some things that are worth noting.

One is that, excluding South Africa, the gross domestic product [GDP]—national income—grew by just 1.4 percent. That is a low growth rate for an area with a high population growth rate. Fundamentally, it means there is a continuing decline in the standard of living that should concern all of us.

The high debt burden they mention is also something to be concerned about.

They did note "the political transition sweeping the continent, noting that a few years ago there were only six democracies in Africa and the number had reached 29 by the end of June 1994." But they also note in the story that while in general democracies fare better, some of them are having a difficult time, and there are exceptions to democracies faring better, including the repressive Government of Sudan.

Mr. President, I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

AFRICA

The year 1993, on the whole, was a difficult one for the countries of the Africa region, as gross domestic product (GDP), excluding South Africa, grew by just 1.4 percent. Although this represents an improvement over 1992, it is nevertheless disappointing, considering the region's high rate of population growth and the level needed for development. As in previous years, the countries implementing major reforms, and therefore benefiting from the Special Program of Assistance (SPA), saw their aggregate output increase by 2.1 percent, or more than the average for the region.¹ The sixteen core (or steady) reformers did still better, as their GDP rose by 2.8 percent; the countries comprising the CFA Zone, however, saw their economies contract for a third consecutive year.² A positive development in 1993 was that, on average, the low-income countries performed better than the middle-income

Footnotes at end of article.