

many already do: with embarrassment when they haven't lived up to what they know to be right and with pride when they know they've done it right.

That's why I remember that beaming clerk in Tupelo 28 years ago. And, by the way, I don't recall the faintest indication that her black colleague found it demeaning to have been hired for what may have been the best job of her life.

### THE WRONG TARGET

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, recently, Bob Herbert, a columnist for the New York Times, had a column about affirmative action and how the politics of meanness is in the ascent.

My colleagues have heard me address this question before. Affirmative action is basically an excellent thing that has helped to make opportunity available to many people who otherwise would not have it. Has it been abused occasionally? Yes, like any good thing is abused, just as religion and education are abused.

In this column, he concludes "All of this will pass. Eventually we'll find our higher selves."

I hope he is right.

But there is both the beast and the noble in all of us, and unless our leaders appeal to the noble in us, instead of the beast—instead of hatred and fear—the better instincts in our people will not come forward. That is true, not only in the United States but in any country.

It is important for politicians, journalists, members of the clergy, business leaders, labor leaders, and people of every walk of life to call upon us to reach out and do what is noble.

"One nation, under God, indivisible" should be more than a phrase in our country.

At that point, I ask that the Bob Herbert article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1995]

#### THE WRONG TARGET

(By Bob Herbert)

One of the many important issues to emerge battered and distorted from the insidious cavern of political demagoguery is affirmative action. If you listen to the latest crop of compulsively deceitful politicians, or tune into the howling degradation of talk radio, you might become convinced that the biggest problem of discrimination in the United States today is bias against white men.

The complaint is that legions of African-Americans, women and assorted others are taking jobs, promotions, classroom slots, theater tickets and the best seats on the bus from the folks who really deserve them—white guys.

The arguments against affirmative action are almost always crafted in racial terms because the demagogues know that race is the way to get the emotional flames roaring. In fact, the primary beneficiaries of affirmative action are women. If all parties would lower their voices and try to communicate in good faith, it could be pointed out that while there are problems with affirmative action—including some serious problems of fairness—the negative impact on white men has not been great, and the problems are correctable.

What you do not want to do, in a country where there are still prodigious amounts of race and sex discrimination, is abandon a long and honorable fight for justice in the face of political hysteria.

The Federal Glass Ceiling Commission recently reported that 95 percent of top corporate management positions in the United States are held by white men. Throughout corporate America, women, blacks and Latinos are paid less than white men for doing the same work. And if you believe there is a bias against white males in hiring, just pair up a white guy with a black guy and send them off in search of the same job.

Racism against blacks and sexism against women abound. And yet the outrage we hear today is about discrimination against white men.

A report on discrimination in employment commissioned by the Labor Department found very little evidence of employment discrimination against white men. The report was prepared by Alfred W. Blumrosen, a law professor at Rutgers University. It found that a "high proportion" of the so-called "reverse discrimination" claims brought by white men were without merit.

The politicians will tell you that the attack on affirmative action is a cry for racial justice. That is not so. It is an expression of the anger and frustration felt by large numbers of overwrought and underemployed white men. Their anxiety is understandable, but affirmative action is not their enemy. Downsized to the point of despair, their wages stagnant or falling, their prospects dim, these men are caught up in the treacherous world of technological innovation, economic globalization and unrestrained corporate greed. Buffeted by forces that seem beyond their control (forces that are affecting everybody, not just white men), they listen to the demagogues. *It's the blacks doing it to you. It's the women. They're getting your piece of the pie. Otherwise you'd be O.K.*

#### AFFIRMATIVE ACTION ISN'T ANTI-WHITE

The Clinton Administration, under pressure, is reviewing Federal affirmative action programs. Fine. Let whatever abuses exist come to light. Scrap whatever programs are unnecessary or unfair. Where affirmative action is being used to help the disadvantaged, remove the racial or ethnic requirements. There are white kids all over the country who are economically and educationally deprived. Give them a hand.

But neither Bill Clinton nor anybody else should back off from the commitment to fight what is still an enormous and debilitating problem—discrimination against blacks, other ethnic minorities and women. Where affirmative action is needed to counter the effects of discrimination, let it be.

The United States is going through a period in which the politics of meanness is in the ascent. In many circles, it is unfashionable to be compassionate. Putting down others is the dominant mode of political expression, preferably with a vicious remark accompanied by cruel laughter.

All of this will pass. Eventually we'll find our higher selves and chase the dogs of bigotry and fear and ignorance from the yard. I am convinced this will happen. We are Americans, after all. We are better than we have been behaving lately. •

#### DR. HENRY FOSTER SHOULD BE CONFIRMED

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I had the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives with Congressman Paul Findley, who is now retired and

writes a Sunday column for the Jacksonville Journal-Courier in Illinois.

My friend, Gene Callahan, who once served as administrative assistant for Senator Alan Dixon, still get the Jacksonville newspaper, and he sent me Paul Findley's commonsense reaction to the nomination of Dr. Henry Foster.

I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

#### DR. HENRY FOSTER SHOULD BE CONFIRMED

(By Paul Findley)

During a discussion at a meeting of the Pittsfield Rotary Club, a member asked if I favor the confirmation of Henry Foster, M.D., President Bill Clinton's nominee to be surgeon general of the United States.

My answer was affirmative. Based on what I believe to be factual about Foster's career, he should be confirmed. The president is entitled to have a surgeon general of his own choosing, barring the disclosure of some important flaw in character or record.

A casual reader glancing at headlines and picking up snippets from televised news reports might easily reach the erroneous conclusion that Foster's record is badly flawed, that he is a back-alley disgrace to the medical profession who has spent a long career performing abortions.

It was a curious happenstance that the question was raised in Pike County, once the family home of a physician who fit that dreary description and gained a reputation as one of Chicago's preeminent abortionists. This was a half-century ago when abortion was illegal, not just in Illinois but throughout the nation. Never indicted, the doctor in question made abortion his career, performing the surgery clandestinely in various parts of Chicagoland. It was his specialty. So far as I know, he did nothing else. He catered mainly to people who could not afford to travel to Sweden for the desired surgery. Legend had it that he periodically hauled bags of money back to Pike County.

By contrast, the president's nominee is not an abortionist. In the years since abortion has been made lawful by ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court, Foster, by his own account, performed 39 abortions, all of them to save the life of the mother or to end pregnancies caused by rape or incest. He has delivered several thousand babies and declares that he abhors abortion.

Some years ago, like many other physicians, he performed procedures that sterilized institutionalized women who were determined to be severely mentally retarded. At the time, that procedure was legal and broadly accepted by the medical profession. Both law and medical policy have since changed. Under existing law, sterilization can be performed only through court order.

Abortion, of course, has been legal for many years in the United States and is widely practiced. In fact, the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education now requires that programs to train doctors in obstetrics must include abortion skills. About a million abortions are performed here each year, notwithstanding widespread controversy that sometimes becomes violent and even fatal. House Speaker Newt Gingrich, although anti-abortion, wisely advises his Republican colleagues in the Senate, where the confirmation vote will occur, not to focus on Fosters, abortion record.

Although, like thousands of other U.S. physicians, Foster has performed a few abortions since the procedure became legal, it has never been more than a minor part of this 38-year practice. To his credit, he has been candid on all points.

He is former dean and acting president of Meharry Medical College in Nashville, widely praised for bringing new vitality to the school. He has initiated a successful program to discourage teen-age pregnancies called "I Have a Future."

His nomination is praised by Dr. Louis Sullivan, a former Secretary of Health and Human Services under President Bush and himself a medical school president.

The White House bungled the Foster nomination process by failing to get the facts straight about his background in abortions and related matters, but that is no discredit to the nominee. Certainly, the president could have found a less controversial nominee. (He could have chosen a dermatologist, for example).

But the important fact is that Foster is the nominee. He is the president's choice. He has a significant record of leadership in the medical profession. There is not the slightest hint of unethical or illegal conduct. Unless some shocking revelation comes to light, he deserves confirmation by a strong bipartisan vote. ●

### PEACEKEEPING SAVES LIVES

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, in catching up on my reading, I came across an op-ed piece in the Washington Post by Brian Urquhart, who has contributed to U.N. peacekeeping efforts throughout the world in a significant way, until his retirement from the United Nations.

In his op-ed piece, he makes the point that John Foster Dulles said that a peacekeeping force was desirable and that compared to what we do in general, expenditure on arms is an economically way to bring stability to the world.

How right he is.

If we were to even suggest that we spend 1 percent of our defense budget on U.N. peacekeeping, it would be a significant and helpful shift for the United States, as well as for the world.

At this point, I ask that the op-ed piece by Brian Urquhart be printed in the RECORD.

The opinion piece follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1995]

#### PEACE-KEEPING SAVES LIVES

(By Brian Urquhart)

"As you know the United States . . . has a strong interest in the early establishment of standby arrangements for a United Nations Peace Force. The interest of the American people in this concept is further demonstrated by the fact that during the past year resolutions were adopted by both the House of Representatives and the Senate calling for the establishment of a United Nations force."

These words, written by an American secretary of state, John Foster Dulles, to a U.N. secretary general, Dag Hammarskjöld, are a good measure of how different the climate in Washington is these days toward the idea of U.N. peacekeeping operations.

"I want to assure you that the United States is prepared to assist you in every feasible manner in strengthening the capacity of the United Nations to discharge its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, a task to which you have already contributed so much," Dulles wrote in that 1958 letter.

Hammarskjöld responded cautiously. At that high point in the Cold War he feared that a standing U.N. force, actively opposed

by the Soviet Union, would become a political football between East and West, destroying the fragile innovation of peace-keeping which he had pioneered during the Suez crisis of 1956 and the Lebanon crisis of 1958.

President Eisenhower and Dulles, on the other hand, evidently saw a standby U.N. peace-keeping capacity as being greatly in the interest of the United States. In fact, just 18 months later Eisenhower, pressed by the new prime minister of the Congo for U.S. intervention there, adroitly referred him to the United Nations. The resulting peacekeeping operation was widely regarded as an extraordinary success in dealing with the chaos there.

Since that time the United Nations has undertaken some 25 such assignments of varying sizes in different parts of the world. Given the desperate origins of most of these operations, it is scarcely surprising that not all have achieved all their objectives. But it is worth noting that in the present controversy over peace-keeping, the successful operations—which constitute the majority—are seldom mentioned.

In recent months, for example, there has been much discussion of placing U.S. troops in the Golan Heights as part of the Middle East peace process, but little mention of the U.N. Disengagement Observer Force, which has successfully presided over peace on the Golan Heights since 1974. Somalia and Bosnia are constantly invoked, but the Nobel Peace Prize of 1988 and later successes in Namibia, Cambodia, El Salvador and Mozambique are routinely forgotten.

The prevailing attitude in Washington toward U.N. peace-keeping these days seems to be a radical reversal of the earlier U.S. attitude. The impression is often given now that past U.S. support of these efforts was an aberration, a charitable—and largely unwise—gesture of condescension. But in fact, from Suez in 1956 to the present time, U.N. peace-keeping has far more often been a vital element of U.N. foreign policy.

During the Cold War, it was vital to maintaining international peace and security, because, among other things, it kept regional conflicts out of the U.S.-Soviet orbit and lessened the potential of such conflicts for provoking nuclear East-West confrontation.

In the post-Cold War world, that motivation for supporting peace-keeping no longer exists. The United Nations' new involvements are for the most part in massive civil and ethnic conflicts where human, not international, security is involved, although such disasters often cause major destabilization in neighboring states as well as strong emotional reactions worldwide. It is this change in the basic character of conflict that has led the more vocal opponents of U.N. peace-keeping to argue that there is little or no U.S. national interest in it.

But as Charles William Maynes has pointed out in testimony before the House International Relations Committee, today's great powers are "like the most successful members of any community. They have a stake in the general health of the community. They cannot and should not be the world's policeman."

Great powers have major economic and other interests in global stability, but they find it increasingly unwise to intervene on their own in regional conflicts. It was considerations such as these that underlay the enthusiasm of Dulles and Eisenhower for building up the peace-keeping capacity of the United Nations. Even the United Nations' most criticized operations such as UNPROFOR in ex-Yugoslavia often serve as a useful pretext for avoiding more intensive U.S. involvement and a screen for differences with allies. Imperfect though they are, they also save thousands of lives.

U.N. peace-keeping can be, and will continue to be, an invaluable—even an indispensable—instrument of peace. Its capacity and effectiveness need to be strengthened, not diminished. To be sure, new forms, rules and methods, including a training system, need to be developed. But the cost of peace-keeping—contrary to widespread belief—is small by comparison with the cost of massive military involvement, which timely peace-keeping often succeeds in making unnecessary. John Foster Dulles got it right. ●

### DIRECT LOANS BENEFIT STUDENTS

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, we are going to hear a lot about direct lending during the coming months.

It is a success for everyone but the people who profit from the present system. I want banks in America to be successful, but if we are going to subsidize banks, we ought to do it openly and not do it in the name of aiding students.

The Daily Illini, which is the student newspaper of the University of Illinois, had an editorial recently about direct lending. The University of Illinois is one of the schools that is now on the direct lending program.

I think my colleagues would be interested in what the student editorial says. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Daily Illini, Jan. 31, 1995]

#### DIRECT LOANS BENEFIT STUDENTS

Students love direct lending. College administrators love direct lending. So why are the House Republicans thinking of limiting the program?

William Goodling, House Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee chairperson, wants to cap the number of new student loans under direct lending at 40 percent, which is how large the program is expected to grow in the next academic year. The original legislation called for a 60 percent growth in the program by the 1998-99 academic year.

Goodling's reasoning is not clear yet, but there are already plenty of reasons why direct lending should be expanded, not curtailed.

The old system of going through the Student Loan Marketing Association, or Sallie Mae, doesn't work well. Students have to negotiate a long process involving complicated forms. And the overhead has been huge. Besides Sallie Mae, the federal government operates a system of more than 35 "guarantee agencies" to collect payments and repay on defaulted loans.

By contrast, the year-old direct lending program delivers loans fast and without hassle. As a result, the University has seen fewer students encumbered during registration for the spring semester and fewer student deferring payments or needing emergency loans, according to Orlo Austin, director of the office of student financial aid.

His office has also benefited from having control at the local level. Direct lending is less complex than the federal guaranteed-loan system because schools do not have to cut through a massive bureaucracy to get ahead of students' payments, he said.

And Austin isn't the only administrator happy with the program. "(Direct lending) makes those of us in financial aid more sophisticated and user-friendly in helping to