

why shouldn't we do this for those American companies who face foreign competition for their products and services every day in the marketplace?

I want to point out a few more things about what Jones Act opponents are proposing.

Their draft legislation assumes that the foreign workers brought into our maritime coastal trades will pay no federal or state income taxes, nor will the owners of those vessels under foreign flag pay any U.S. taxes. And that would be the case.

As I read the proposal, these companies under foreign flag and their crew members are not only exempt from U.S. taxes and U.S. minimum wage laws, but also the National Labor Relations Act, federal hours-of-service regulations, child labor laws, Coast Guard safety regulations, the U.S. civil rights laws, our national laws relating to health insurance, pensions and other benefits, and all other state and federal legal requirements.

Jones Act opponents say these foreign vessels and crew members should meet "international standards." Does that mean that the navigation and safety crew members must be able to speak English, so they can communicate with environmental and rescue workers, or Coast Guard authorities? I guess not.

And nothing in the proposal talks about how our nation would deal with all those Americans left unemployed by the repeal of the Jones Act, or how we would compensate American vessel owners whose investment in modern, U.S.-built ships would be destroyed.

Let me tell you a little about my own situation. I am management. I am an owner. I risked capital to be in this business. I have negotiated with labor unions. My company has more than 2,000 employees whose fathers and grandfathers and uncles have all worked for our tug and barge company over the 106 years it has been in business.

We don't want to fire these people. Who wants us to do this? Is this what America is about?

If we can do this in the transportation sector, I guess we can do it anywhere—manufacturing, communications, health care, education, and I guess we could even fire all of our government workers and bring in low-cost people to work in government and man our armed forces. I submit this is not a sound idea.

I was very curious as to who was financing these people who are calling for repeal of the Jones Act, and who was supporting them. I was pleased that not one of our customers in Alaska or the West Coast was among their supporters. But I did find that over 90 percent of those supporting him were trade associations representing wheat or grain producers. I would just like to note that, while Jones Act carriers receive not a dollar in federal subsidies or handouts, \$5.5 billion in federal subsidies goes to wheat and feed-grain farmers each year. I am not here to argue against the farm program but I think it should be recognized that the people who want to get rid of U.S. citizens in domestic transport are the same people who are taking \$5.5 billion dollars a year for their own industry from the taxpayers, but they are not advocating that foreign grain companies and foreign grain workers come in and take over their jobs and companies in the United States. All these farm executives and their corporate staffs and trade organizations and employees make good wages. I think that's fine—I am not against that. I am not even against the farm program. But I do have a problem with that industry trying to destroy my industry without first getting their own financial house in order.

So, please, in considering these public policy issues, think about those you

represent—the taxpaying American citizens. If you do that, I think you will have no trouble telling the Jones Act Reform Committee that they should go out of business rather than telling my industry that we should go out of business.●

SPARE US THE CHEAP GRACE

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, one of the people who has been most effective in prodding our conscience is Jonathan Kozol, author of several books, including an important one on literacy, another on the sad plight of our schools, and more recently, "Amazing Grace: The Lives of Children and the Conscience of a Nation."

Unfortunately, as we balance the budget—which we should have done long ago—we are horribly distorting the priorities this Nation should have. The use of the word "horribly" may seem out of place, but for many of the poor, our budget will result in horrors.

To say we want to balance the budget, then start with a \$245 billion tax cut is like adopting a New Year's resolution to diet, then having a huge desert.

Compounding that is the fact that the tax cut is largely for those of us who are more fortunate, while those who will suffer will be the neediest in our society.

Time magazine recently had an essay by Jonathan Kozol titled "Spare Us the Cheap Grace," which I ask to be printed in the RECORD after my remarks.

Among other things, Jonathan Kozol says, "What does it mean when those whom we elect to public office cut back elemental services of life protection for poor children and then show up at the victim's funeral to pay condolence to the relatives and friends? At what point do those of us who have the power to prevent these deaths forfeit the entitlement of mourners?" The piece follows:

[From Time magazine, Dec. 11, 1995]

SPARE US THE CHEAP GRACE

(By Jonathan Kozol)

It is hard to say what was most shocking about the death of Elisa Izquierdo—the endless savagery inflicted on her body and mind, or the stubborn inaction of the New York City agencies that were repeatedly informed of her peril. But while the murder of Elisa by her mother is appalling, it is hardly unexpected. In the death zones of America's postmodern ghetto, stripped of jobs and human services and sanitation, plagued by AIDS, tuberculosis, pediatric asthma and endemic clinical depression, largely abandoned by American physicians and devoid of the psychiatric services familiar in most middle-class communities, deaths like these are part of a predictable scenario.

After the headlines of recrimination and pretended shock wear off, we go back to our ordinary lives. Before long, we forget the victims' names. They weren't our children or the children of our neighbors. We do not need to mourn them for too long. But do we have the right to mourn at all? What does it mean when those whom we elect to public office cut back elemental services of life protection for poor children and then show up at the

victim's funeral to pay condolence to the relatives and friends? At what point do those of us who have the power to prevent these deaths forfeit the entitlement of mourners?

It is not as if we do not know what might have saved some of these children's lives. We know that intervention programs work when well-trained social workers have a lot of time to dedicate to each and every child. We know that crisis hot lines work best when half of their employees do not burn out and quit each year, and that social workers do a better job when records are computerized instead of being piled up, lost and forgotten on the floor of a back room. We know that when a drug-addicted mother asks for help, as many mothers do, it is essential to provide the help she needs without delay, not after a waiting period of six months to a year, as is common in poor urban neighborhoods.

All these remedies are expensive, and we would demand them if our own children's lives were at stake. And yet we don't demand them for poor children. We wring our hands about the tabloid stories. We castigate the mother. We condemn the social worker. We churn out the familiar criticisms of "bureaucracy" but do not volunteer to use our cleverness to change it. Then the next time an election comes, we vote against the taxes that might make prevention programs possible, while favoring increased expenditures for prisons to incarcerate the children who survive the worst that we have done to them and grow up to be dangerous adults.

What makes this moral contradiction possible?

Can it be, despite our frequent protestations to the contrary, that our society does not particularly value the essential human worth of certain groups of children? Virtually all the victims we are speaking of are very poor black and Hispanic children. We have been told that our economy no longer has much need for people of their caste and color. Best-selling authors have, in recent years, assured us of their limited intelligence and low degree of "civilizational development." As a woman in Arizona said in regard to immigrant kids from Mexico, "I didn't breed them. I don't want to feed them"—a sentiment also heard in reference to black children on talk-radio stations in New York and other cities. "Put them over there," a black teenager told me once, speaking of the way he felt that he and other blacks were viewed by our society. "Pack them tight. Don't think about them. Keep your hands clean. Maybe they'll kill each other off."

I do not know how many people in our nation would confess such contemplations, which offend the elemental mandates of our cultural beliefs and our religions. No matter how severely some among us may condemn the parents of the poor, it has been an axiom of faith in the U.S. that once a child is born, all condemnations are to be set aside. If we now have chosen to betray this faith, what consequences will this have for our collective spirit, for our soul as a society?

There is an agreeable illusion, evidenced in much of the commentary about Elisa, that those of us who witness the abuse of innocence—so long as we are standing at a certain distance—need not feel complicit in these tragedies. But this is the kind of ethical exemption that Dietrich Bonhoeffer called "cheap grace." Knowledge carries with it certain theological imperatives. The more we know, the harder it becomes to grant ourselves exemption. "Evil exists," a student in the South Bronx told me in the course of a long conversation about ethics and religion in the fall of 1993. "Somebody has power. Pretending that they don't so they don't need to use it to help people—that is my idea of evil."

Like most Americans, I do not tend to think of a society that has been good to me and to my parents as "evil." But when he said that "somebody has power," it was difficult to disagree. It is possible that icy equanimity and self-pacifying form of moral abdication by the powerful will take more lives in the long run than any single drug-addicted and disordered parent. Elisa Izquierdo's mother killed only one child. The seemingly anesthetized behavior of the U.S. Congress may kill thousands. Now we are told we must "get tougher" with the poor. How much tougher can we get with children who already have so little? How cold is America prepared to be?●

LIFE OF BARBARA JORDAN

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, as the Nation mourns the loss of Barbara Jordan, I would like to take a few moments to celebrate her life.

Barbara Jordan became active in politics around the same time as I did. John Kennedy was running for President and the winds of change were sweeping across a nation and inspiring a young generation of new leaders.

It was different world for women then, one where the doors weren't nearly so open as they are today. And make no mistake about it—the doors are open wider today for women and for minorities because of the path cleared by Barbara Jordan.

Her start in politics was quite humble. She was a self-described "stamper and addresser"—meaning literally that she volunteered on President Kennedy's campaign licking stamps, addressing envelopes, and putting them in the mail. So many women started this way—behind the scenes doing the mundane but essential labor of grassroots politics.

But Barbara Jordan was not underestimated for long. Her most enduring talents—the power of her voice and the strength of her words—were quickly discovered and no one tells that story better than she did herself:

I had a law degree but no practice, so I went down to Harris County Democratic Headquarters [in Texas] and asked them what I could do. They put me to work licking stamps and addressing envelopes. One night we went out to a church to enlist voters and the woman who was supposed to speak didn't show up. I volunteered to speak in her place and right after that they took me off licking and addressing.

They would have been foolish not to.

If Barbara Jordan is remembered for just one thing, it will be the power of her words. Her message united people from vastly different walks of life, bringing them together to stand as one and nod their heads in unison and say, "Yes, each one of us can make a difference, and together we can make this nation stronger."

Where her words traveled, legions followed. And our Nation did change for the better as we began to offer opportunity to all our citizens.

Barbara Jordan broke all kinds of barriers throughout her life. If she were an athlete, she would have been a world-class hurdler because she spent

her whole life leaping over barriers with grace and dexterity. She broke records.

In Texas in 1966 she became the first Africa-American State senator. She entered that body with outright denunciations from some of her male colleagues, but when she left for Washington, DC, those same men endorsed a resolution commending her.

In 1972, Barbara Jordan and Andrew Young, of Georgia, became the first black southerners in Congress since Reconstruction.

In the U.S. House of Representatives, she quickly rose to prominence as a member of the House Judiciary Committee during Watergate. During the crisis, Barbara Jordan became one of our Constitution's greatest champions.

"My faith in the Constitution is whole," she told her colleagues and the American people. "It is complete. It is total. I am not going to sit here and be an idle spectator to the diminution, the subversion, the destruction of the Constitution."

Whether it be freedom of speech, freedom of choice or equal opportunity, we in this Congress are also facing fundamental questions about the integrity of our Constitution. It is my hope that our faith in that sacred document is as whole and as complete as Barbara Jordan's.

After she left Congress, Barbara Jordan continued to give this Nation a lifetime of service—teaching young people in preparation for careers in public service. Her chairmanship of the independent U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform, which is referred to as the Jordan Commission, took on the very difficult issue of fair immigration policy.

And just as young Barbara Jordan listened to the words of JFK and was "bit by the bug" of politics, so did she go on to inspire another generation of young leaders when she took the podium at the 1992 Democratic Convention. Speaking with an authority and voice that could only be Barbara Jordan's, she issued a new challenge to each and every one of us to reexamine our relationships with each other and what we stand together for as a nation. Above all else, she encouraged us to put our principles into action where help was needed most—in the hearts of our great cities.

She said, "We need to change the decaying inner cities to places where hope lives. Can we all get along? I say we answer that question with a resounding 'yes'."

Throughout her life Barbara Jordan was a voice for common ground, for the ties that bind. Hers were powerful, healing, uplifting words that challenged and inspired women and minorities, indeed all Americans, to reach for something higher and to believe in themselves and their own ability to change the world and make it a better place.

Her life was a testament to that idea.

A nation mourns a great loss, but it is my hope that the spirit of Barbara

Jordan will live on forever in the many Americans who have been touched deeply by her powerful words and exemplary life. I certainly have been.●

ANNIVERSARY OF ROE VERSUS WADE

● Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today marks the 23d anniversary of the monumental Supreme Court decision, *Roe versus Wade*, which legalized abortion nationwide and affirmed the right of all American women to choose safe, legal abortion services. I join Americans across the country in commemorating this important day in our history.

Yet this is a bittersweet celebration. We are still fighting to safeguard our rights, and battles are being waged on many fronts. Each year, antichoice forces in Congress use the appropriations process to erode women's abortion rights every chance they get. In 1995, they were successful in denying Federal workers abortion coverage in their health benefit packages. They will try again this year for more victories.

On this special anniversary, we must remember those who have suffered and lost their lives because of their commitment to protecting the health of women in our country. Increasingly, the radical minority in the anti-abortion crusade has turned to violence to pursue their agenda, with blatant disregard for who is caught in their crossfire. Over the last several years, I, like so many Americans, have been greatly disturbed by images of clinics under siege by vandals and arsonists, and horrified by reports of doctors murdered because they perform abortions—a legal procedure. We cannot let our reproductive rights be taken away because of a threat of violence, nor can we allow the actions of radical fanatics to dictate our Nation's public policy decisions. Just as our clinics are under attack, so too are our personal freedoms.

Emboldened by their momentum, Mr. President, antiabortion forces in both Houses of Congress passed H.R. 1833, the so-called Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995. By their own admission, this is the first step in the antichoice movement's strategy to deny women their right to choose—one procedure at a time. This legislation is an affront to the women of this country, and an unprecedented intrusion into the autonomy of medical professionals to determine the best methods of care for their patients. I am reminded today of the frustration I felt during debate of this bill, of the misinformation and divisive rhetoric infused in the conversation.

The antichoice majorities in Congress may have forgotten that most Americans feel abortion should be legal. They may also have forgotten about the days of back-alley abortions and women dying of infection from unsanitary procedures. Well, I haven't