

criticism that has been levied against it by some of my distinguished colleagues. Nevertheless, its purpose of protecting the jobs of our Nation's construction workers must persuade us to reform, rather than repeal, the act. I ask my colleagues who support repeal, do we continue to live under a Davis-Bacon law, which we agree needs reform, or continue on under current law which will not be repealed now or in the foreseeable future. The logical answer is to support and vote for sensible reform, as in my bill S. 1183. The Davis-Bacon reform bill which I sponsored is supported by the building trades unions and several coalitions of contractors groups whose 21,000 members across the Nation perform major construction projects covered by Davis-Bacon.

I urge my colleagues who will remain in this great body and the new Members who will arrive in the Senate and House in January to continue this bipartisan, management-labor compromise for it provides us with a rare window of opportunity to pass the reforms that Davis-Bacon urgently requires. Such broad-based support for Davis-Bacon reform was and is extraordinary on Capitol Hill and I hope that it can be recreated in the next Congress. ●

DR. CHRISTINA JEFFREY

● Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I have been contacted by my constituent, Dr. Christina Jeffrey of Kennesaw, GA, who was formerly the historian for the other body.

Dr. Jeffrey has asked that I place in the RECORD materials which would help correct unfounded media reports about her professional reputation. I am pleased to do this for Dr. Jeffrey because I have long noted the fact that the media is sometimes quick to report the negative, but slow to report corrections.

I know of Dr. Jeffrey from her service as a volunteer with other academicians on my nonpolitical advisory board which selects young men and women to serve as interns in my Senate offices. Based on what I know regarding her reputation among her colleagues who know her best, Dr. Jeffrey is a person of integrity with a genuine interest in public service as well as higher education.

It is sad that in this city, both elected officials and staff are often subjected to accusations and actions that go far beyond the bounds of fair play. I hope the following material helps clarify the facts involving Dr. Jeffrey's professional reputation.

The material follows:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Washington, DC, March 22, 1989.

Hon. RICHARD SHELBY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SHELBY: Your letter to Secretary Cavazos concerning Dr. Christina Price has been forwarded to me for reply.

Dr. Price's concern is understandable. She was generous in acting as a reviewer for the

National Diffusion Network (NDN) on the application for funding of a curriculum entitled "Facing History and Ourselves." Denial of that funding application has created an extended controversy, and disclosure of her comments in the media has created a great deal of misunderstanding about both the program and Dr. Price's own views.

I believe Dr. Price was acting in good faith, and was delivering honest opinions, when she reviewed "Facing History." She argues that here comments were written in a kind of academic shorthand, not for public consumption, and that in no way did she intend to convey an attitude of racism or anti-Semitism. We accept her contention. And to the extent that any Department of Education official has characterized Dr. Price herself as racist or anti-Semitic, we do indeed apologize.

However, it is also true that some of Dr. Price's review comments were ambiguously phrased, and that portions lifted out of context and reprinted in the media could lead an objective reader to conclude that she favored presenting the Nazi or KKK point of view in the interests of "balance or objectivity." While the best education about any historical issue requires an understanding of the motivations of all parties, the teaching of the Holocaust demands clear delineation between good and evil. To the extent that outside observers believed Dr. Price to be advocating a morally neutral approach to the teaching of the Holocaust—and to the extent that they further believed this represented the position of the Department of Education—it is not surprising that they would raise strenuous objections.

It should also be noted that under the Freedom of Information Act, the Department of Education was required to release a list of reviewers, and the evaluations of the projects submitted by them, without identifying which reviewers made which comments. We complied with FOIA requirements in supplying this information. Dr. Price was informed of this policy in a letter from Dr. Shirley Curry, director of the Recognition Division, on November 19, 1986. It read in part: "Your review of applications for grants becomes part of the official government record and will be a determining factor in choosing who will be funded. If requested, applicants will be given copies of the reviewers' comments. However, the names of the reviewers will be removed from the review instruments before being sent out."

The most difficult aspect of this episode is that I am sure Dr. Price feels as strongly about appropriate teaching of the Holocaust as we do (and for that matter, as strongly as those who created the "Facing History" curriculum). She did what was asked in good faith. Unfortunately, what she wrote left room for misinterpretation.

In the event that this controversy continues, you may rest assured that I will do everything possible to ensure that no further confusion arises, and that no one in this Department casts aspersions on the character of Dr. Price.

Thank you for your interest in this matter. Since you wrote on behalf of Dr. Price, we trust you will be providing her with a copy of this response.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA HINES,
Assistant Secretary.

CATHOLIC LEAGUE,
New York, NY, September 26, 1996.

Hon. SAM NUNN,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR NUNN: As president of the nation's largest Catholic civil rights organization, I am delighted to write a letter of support for Dr. Christina Jeffrey. Dr. Jeffrey,

as the public knows, was terminated as House historian on the grounds that she promoted the inclusion of the Nazi perspective in Holocaust curriculum.

What the public does not generally know is that Dr. Jeffrey is a determined anti-Nazi scholar whose reputation has been unfairly maligned by uninformed ideologues. It was a disgrace that she was terminated in the first place, and it is doubly disgraceful that her reputation remains unfairly tarnished. That is why I am appealing to you to clear her name by submitting this letter, and others like it, into the Congressional Record.

I have spent most of my life as a college professor, and, having taught Political Sociology, I know that it is important for students to understand the mind-set of those who sponsor genocide. Yes, in the hands of a Nazi sympathizer, such a pedagogical approach could be misused to engender empathy for terrorists. The same is true of virtually any topic of an incendiary nature. But when taught by someone with the impeccable moral credentials of a Dr. Jeffrey, such an orientation can yield very positive results, both scholarly and morally. After all, if the goal is to stop another Holocaust from ever happening again, it is critical that everyone know the psychology and social soil in which genocidal ambitions flourish.

Dr. Jeffrey represents the very best of her Catholic training: she wants to help craft a world where injustice does not prevail. It is a travesty that injustice has been visited upon her, even if those who perpetrated it remain sadly ignorant of her character, intentions and effects.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. DONOHUE,
President.

GEORGIA CONFERENCE, AMERICAN
ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS,

Carrollton, GA, October 24, 1995.

Re Christina Jeffrey.

To: Whom it May Concern.

From: Don Wagner.

The national office of the American Association of University Professors, in response to a request from the Georgia Conference-AAUP, wrote to Secretary of Education Richard Riley to protest the treatment which Dr. Christina Jeffrey received from the Department of Education, i.e., the release of her name without her knowledge or permission in conjunction with a grant review she did for the Department in 1986. This treatment led ultimately to her being fired as House historian by House Speaker Newt Gingrich. The peer review process is designated to be confidential and the Department, when it breaches that promised confidentiality, damages the whole system, and can, as we saw in Dr. Jeffrey's case, unfairly harm the individuals involved. The Department of Education responded to our inquiry positively and shares our concerns about confidentiality and Dr. Jeffrey's case.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOLARS,

Princeton, NJ, October 31, 1995.

The National Association of Scholars is pleased to endorse the public vindication of Professor Christina Jeffrey, to whom we extend every good wish for the rehabilitation of her career. Now that a fair reading of the evidence has finally been rendered, no one could possibly doubt her complete professional integrity and basic human decency. Clearly, she is no Nazi sympathizer or crank racist, and it is regrettable that her reputation has had to endure such calumny.

It is just as clear, however, that this entire incident should never have occurred. When in 1986 Professor Jeffrey was invited by the US Department of Education to evaluate

grant proposals for various projects, she was assured that such consultations—because of the candor essential to the process—were held in strict confidentiality. But in 1988, one of her reviews was leaked to the press and quickly found its way to a congressional committee where she was pilloried as anti-Semitic, based on a selective reading of private comments removed from their proper context. She was subsequently vindicated, although the unfortunate affair proved not to be at an end. After her appointment as House Historian last year, these false and preposterous changes were resurrected in Congress and the major media made a particularly unseemly rush to judgment based on her presumed guilt. Not surprisingly, her summary dismissal followed, based on nothing more than hearsay and a complete misreading of the original incident in 1988. Those in the Congress and the media responsible for circulating these distortions owe Dr. Jeffrey a profound apology.

We are gratified, once again, that Professor Jeffrey has finally received some justice. The lessons to be drawn for the future, however, seem obvious: if scholars working in government service are guaranteed anonymity—an essential component in many professions—this must be respected by political leaders and journalists. Otherwise, given the sad experience of Mrs. Jeffrey, many academics will be understandably chary of accepting similar opportunities for public service lest the same fate befall them.

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE,
New York, NY, August 22, 1995.

Prof. CHRISTINA JEFFREY,
Department of Political Science and International Affairs, Marietta, GA.

DEAR PROFESSOR JEFFREY: Thank you for your letter. I, too, found our meeting in Atlanta rewarding. I understand and appreciate your explanation—and remorse—for what we both agree were ill-considered, poorly chosen remarks.

I want to assure you that, after examining the facts and circumstances of the controversy involving the "Facing History and Ourselves" Holocaust curriculum, ADL is satisfied that any characterization of you as anti-Semitic or sympathetic to Nazism is entirely unfounded and unfair.

Your clear repudiation of any form of Holocaust denial and your advocacy of Holocaust education demonstrate that the "Facing History" incident reflected neither an inclination to deny the reality of Nazi persecution of Jews nor anti-Semitism, but was simply a regrettable mistake.

I welcome your very useful suggestion for a conference on Holocaust education at Kennesaw State College, perhaps involving other colleges in the area. ADL would be pleased to act as a co-sponsor and to offer our resource materials and guidance for such a worthy proposal.

I commend your effort to set the record straight and your appreciation of the need for historical accuracy and for teaching the lessons of the Holocaust. I hope this communication will help you to put the unfortunate controversy behind you and allow you to move ahead with your important educational work.

Sincerely,

ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN,
National Director.

OUT OF SPOTLIGHT, REPUTATION RESTORED
(By Dick Williams)

For Newt Gingrich and his staff, the issue of Dr. Christina Jeffrey was one of damage control. For the press, it was a one-day story. For the cynical, it was the allotted 15 minutes of fame for Jeffrey, an associate

professor of history at Kennesaw State College.

For Jeffrey, her professor husband, Robert, and their children, it was personal. The events of January scarred her and damaged the family reputation and finances. Today she is asking—to use the words of former Labor Secretary Ray Donovan—"Where do I go to get my reputation back?"

It will be an uphill battle.

Jeffrey has been on a roller coaster. In the excitement of Gingrich's accession to speaker of the House, she was named House historian early this year. It was a plum, a career-maker, for someone at a commuter college. Then came the accusation that changed her life. In 1986, while consulting for the U.S. Department of Education, she criticized a junior high school course on the Holocaust.

"The program," she wrote then, "gives no evidence of balance or objectivity. The Nazi point of view, however unpopular, is still a point of view and is not presented, nor is that of the Ku Klux Klan."

In the shorthand of the press, that sentence became her assertion that "the Nazi point of view" wasn't presented. If she had it to do over again, you can bet she would phrase her objections differently. To properly understand Nazism and the origins of the Klan, students should understand the forces that spawned them, the economy, the resentments and the paranoia. To understand how they came to be is to understand how such perverse movements can be prevented.

But Jeffrey's text and context were lost to the shorthand and the headlines. Major Jewish groups were quick to condemn her, and Gingrich was lightning quick in firing her. She didn't land in the U.S. Capitol; she arrived in a revolving door that sent her spinning back toward Georgia—her reputation shredded in one day's headlines around the nation.

Fortunately, both Jeffreys were able to regain the jobs they had quit to go to Washington. They lost a good deal of money in the relocation, but they are on the mend. And this week came vindication, though you had to look hard to find it.

Abraham Foxman, director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith wrote to exonerate her. When she was dismissed, the Anti-Defamation League had praised Gingrich, saying Jeffrey's views were "misguided and profoundly offensive."

Now Foxman says he agrees with Jeffrey that her remarks were ill-considered and poorly chosen, but he told The Washington Post that if Gingrich gives her a job again, the Anti-Defamation League would say, "God bless."

"I want to assure you," he said, "that after examining the facts and circumstances of the controversy involving the 'Facing History and Ourselves' Holocaust curriculum, [the Anti-Defamation League] is satisfied that any characterization of you as anti-Semitic or sympathetic to Nazism is entirely unfounded and unfair."

In a perfect world, such a letter would right the good ship Jeffrey. But the story was lost to the trial of Mark Fuhrman, air attacks in Bosnia and Hillary Rodham Clinton's stern and stirring speech in China.

The story received no national play. The truth is, the corrections never catch up with the headlines, unless one has the resources of Philip Morris.

Still, for Christina Jeffrey, her academic reputation has been restored, even if the views of the broader public will take longer to change. She speaks now of "peace of mind," and—of course—a book. If she is successful, she might get even in a lot of ways. ●

TAX-FREE LIQUIDATION LEGISLATION FOR NOT-FOR-PROFIT CORPORATIONS

● Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure to be an original cosponsor of S. 2141 introduced Friday by Senator FEINSTEIN. This legislation will expand charitable giving by families and businesses by permitting the tax-free liquidation of closely-held corporations into tax-exempt charities and foundations.

Voluntarism and charity are concepts deeply imbedded in my personal philosophy. At a time of shrinking Federal discretionary dollars, governments on all levels, Federal, State, and local, are forced to reduce spending throughout their budgets. With the general decline in Federal services, an increasing burden is being shouldered by nonprofit organizations and private citizens. During this critical stage in restructuring Government and returning flexibility to our local communities, Congress should do all that it can to encourage private philanthropic efforts. By supporting legislation like S. 2141, Government can assist charities in helping those in need without increasing Federal spending and contributing further to our enormous deficit.

It is also important to note that many organizations from the State of Oregon and across the country are supporters of the concept of this legislation. In the State of Oregon alone, the Boys & Girls Clubs of Portland, the Portland Art Museum, the Oregon Health Sciences University, the Meyer Memorial Trust, and the Catholic Charities of Portland have all promoted this type of legislation. ●

SALLIE MAE PRIVATIZATION IN OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I am pleased that the omnibus appropriations bill includes provisions in title VI that would privatize the Student Loan Marketing Association, known as Sallie Mae. This is the first time that a major government-sponsored enterprise has been cut loose from its Federal moorings, and that is an important precedent.

I began calling for Sallie Mae's privatization in 1991, when I questioned the high salaries it was paying its executives, and I raised concerns about the organization's intense and often-deceptive lobbying against student loan reforms. That did not seem appropriate for a government-created entity.

This is not the privatization bill that I would have written. Untying the company's ties to Federal taxpayers may take years, longer than I believe is necessary. Sallie Mae is not being required to repay any significant amount to taxpayers. It is true that a fee was imposed in 1993, but the company has found a loophole to avoid paying a large part of that fee, and the privatization bill fails to close that loophole.

But despite these flaws, this is an important development, particularly in