

at the essence of all free, democratic and open societies. Our disagreements are dealt with civility and without violence or the threat of violence.

With each terrorist threat against the Government, our citizens lose a measure of their freedom. When an American seeks to exercise even the most basic of rights—renewing a driver's license, boarding an airplane or picking up documents at a government building—he or she is often subject to a thorough search of his or her person and property. Even the street in front of the White House—the people's house—has been closed and street traffic rerouted. Moreover, streets around the House, Senate and Capitol buildings have been blocked-off and barricaded. All of these measures have been done because of our heightened sense of vulnerability to terrorism. The humiliation and inconvenience that these situations present are mitigated only by the American people's acquiescence and realization that such practices are unfortunately necessary in today's world. But it does not have to be this way, and we must not become accustomed to the threat of terrorism. To the extent that we refuse to accept it, to the extent we refuse to be desensitized to violence, we will invigorate the will to fight it.

The most recent bombings in Israel have also had a direct impact on my home State of Illinois. The celebration of the Jewish holiday of purim is traditionally one of the more colorful festivals in the city of Chicago. Children are dressed in costumes, friends exchange gifts and there is laughter and merriment. However, as events of yet another suicide bombing in Israel unfolded, grief, anxiety and depression replaced joy, laughter, and merriment.

The juxtaposition of bombs and purim provides a context for understanding how we can draw inspiration and strength from history. Just as the Jews in Ancient Persia responded to danger with prayer and courageous action, so too must we. Mr. President, I, for one, am tired of lighting candles, attending memorial services and waiting for news of the next terrorist attack. It is time for us to be proactive and not merely reactive. We must declare all-out war against terrorism and terrorist organizations and take the fight to them wherever they exist—at home or abroad. We must make it clear to terrorists, their organizations, and the countries which sponsor and harbor terrorists that their actions will not produce the desired result—the interruption or abandonment of the peace process—and that the United States and other nations will no longer permit their actions to go unpunished.

There must be a recognition, however, that terrorism cannot be defeated through unilateral action alone. World leaders must understand that it is in every country's interest to have this menace eradicated from the face of the Earth. Unless and until serious anti-terrorist actions are implemented

internationally, including the denial of safe haven and sanctuary for perpetrators of terrorism, we can expect more, not fewer, incidents like we witnessed in Israel these past 2 weeks.

Mr. President, we, the inhabitants of this planet, are one family. While differences and disputes are unavoidable, I believe all problems, no matter how intractable they may seem, are soluble. Peace and negotiations are not just the answer—they are the only answer.●

GENE R. ALEXANDER

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I want to commend and congratulate Mr. Gene Alexander of Benton, Illinois. On April 25, 1996, the school library at the Benton Elementary School will be dedicated as the Gene R. Alexander Learning Resource Center. Mr. Alexander was a teacher and principal in the Benton School District for 32 years.

Now that he has retired, "Mr. A." spends his free time volunteering for these same children. He does everything from cleaning school desks to teaching children about the American flag. His commitment to these children is inspirational.

We need more leaders like this and having a library dedicated to him is a fitting tribute. I want to commend Mr. Alexander on his hard work and his lifetime of dedication to the children that he serves.●

REFORM OF OUR TAX CODE

● Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I wanted to take a few minutes to talk about the tax burden that American families feel today and the drastic need for fundamental and comprehensive reform of our Tax Code.

During our brief break from legislative business over the past 2 weeks, I had the opportunity to visit with constituents in various communities in my State to discuss the effects of Federal tax policies on families. Quite clearly, the tax burden over the past few decades has greatly increased; the inequities of the Code have been exacerbated; and the incentives for savings have largely diminished. If it was anything that I heard during the course of nine town meetings, it was the demand for a fairer, simpler tax system and an even greater demand by taxpayers to keep more of what they earn.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, I served on the Ways and Means Committee, which has jurisdiction over tax legislation. I recognize that our current system of taxation is burdensome and intrusive, and I think we are all aware how complex our system is, given the large amount of time Americans spend in computing and filing their taxes each year.

On Monday, I had the pleasure of traveling through Pennsylvania with Senator SPECTER, along with our Governor, Tom Ridge, as we hosted the distinguished majority leader, Senator BOB DOLE. The significance of traveling

across my State on tax day brings with it a renewed commitment to fight for Federal policies addressing and correcting not only the many inequities in our system, but demanding a fundamental reexamination by this Congress of the Federal Tax Code as a whole.

I strongly believe that Congress must continue to explore comprehensive simplification of our Tax Code. Several of my colleagues have introduced legislation to institute various alternative tax systems as well as proposals to provide varying degrees of tax relief to American families. To reaffirm this commitment to tax fairness, I am pleased today to join Senator DAN COATS as a cosponsor of his legislation to provide not only for middle-class tax relief, but also to encourage increased personal investment and savings while balancing the growth of Federal spending in general.

This Congress, as a direct result of the Republican majority, has come as close as a veto pen to enacting tax fairness for American families—fairness and relief that many would have realized in preparing their tax returns by Monday evening's filing deadline. A year after the political battle over tax relief and a year later on tax day, the same challenges and needs remain in devising a tax structure that provides greater balance, incentives, and benefits to American families and taxpayers. These next few weeks in the Senate are critical and serve as another opportunity to readdress, pass, and finally enact these changes.●

HONORING BRIAN PALMER HAFNER

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments to acknowledge a very talented and promising resident of Massachusetts, Brian Palmer Hafner. Brian was chosen as a seventh place winner in the prestigious Westinghouse Science Talent Search, a national competition that recognizes the outstanding math and science achievements of high school students aged 16 to 18. Brian was recognized for his research involving T cells, research that may be instrumental in the future treatment of autoimmune diseases.

After graduation from the Roxbury Latin School, West Roxbury, MA, Brian intends to continue his scientific research as a molecular biology student at Princeton University. In addition to his scholarly accomplishments, Brian has won varsity letters in wrestling and cross country, numerous academic awards, and a service award for his work in tutoring inner-city students.

I applaud Brian on receiving the Westinghouse Science Award, and wish him success in his future endeavors.

TESTIMONY OF JONATHAN KOZOL

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I had a chance to read the testimony of Jonathan Kozol, an author who prods our conscience, before the House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, which I ask to be printed in the RECORD after my remarks.

It is a summary of where we are, as he points out, on this year that celebrates the 100th anniversary of the unfortunate *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision.

The need to do a better job, the need to show care, the need to create opportunity for everyone is here. The question is whether we will pay attention to this obvious need or whether we will ignore it, ultimately at our own peril.

The article follows:

COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES—U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 5, 1996

TESTIMONY OF JONATHAN KOZOL

Mr. Chairman: As you know, this year commemorates the 100th anniversary of *Plessy versus Ferguson*, but few of the poorest children in our nation will find much to celebrate. Public schools throughout the land, with rare exceptions, are still separate and unequal.

In New York City, to take only one example, public schools for poor black and Hispanic children are nearly as segregated as the schools of Mississippi 50 years ago. The city spends less than half as much per-pupil as its richest suburbs—a differential found, of course, all over the United States.

For many years, the only force that helped consistently to militate against these inequalities has been the Federal government. Although Federal money represents only a tiny fraction of the total education budget in our nation, it has been targeted at schools and neighborhoods in greatest need; and, while Federal aid may represent, on average, only 6 percent of local education budgets, it represents as much as 20 percent in our low-income districts.

Now, as the dismantling of Federal aid is being contemplated, as block grants are proposed as substitutes for targeted assistance to the poor, the plight of children in the most impoverished districts will inevitably worsen.

I remind you also of the gross and cumulative deterioration of schoolbuildings in low-income neighborhoods. "Deferred maintenance"—an antiseptic term which means that water buckets must be scattered around classrooms to collect the rain that penetrates a hundred-year-old roof, while hallways stink of urine from the antiquated plumbing in the bathrooms of a school—is well above \$100 billion.

Conditions like these do not just soil bodies. They also dirty souls and spirits, and they give our children a clear message. They tell them that, no matter what we say about "high expectations," no matter what exhaustive lists of "goals" and "standards" we keep churning out for the millennium, the deepdown truth is that we do not like them very much, nor value their potential as Americans.

Millions of children are going to class each day in buildings none of you would be prepared to work in for one hour. All the boosterism in the world, all the hype and all the exhortation, all the upbeat speeches by a visiting politician telling kids, "You are somebody," has no palpable effect if every single thing about the school itself—its peeling paint, its rotting walls, its stinking corridors, its crowded, makeshift classrooms in

coat closets, on stair-landings, and in squalid corners of the basement—tells our children, "In the eyes of this society, you are not anyone at all."

The notion of "retrofitting" schools like these for the computer age has something of the quality of a Grimms fairy tale. How will a school that can't repair the toilets or afford to pay for toilet-paper find the money to buy IBM or Microsoft? The gulf between the national "goals" and the degrading day-to-day reality of life for children in these schools has something about it that suggests delusory thinking. There is simply no connection between slogans and realities.

Despite all this, we face the strange phenomenon of being asked repeatedly, by those who spend as much as \$20,000 yearly to enroll their children in exclusive private schools, whether money really matters when it comes to education of the poor. "Can you solve these kinds of problems," we are asked, "by throwing money at them?"

I always find this a strange question, but especially when it is asked by those who do precisely this for their own children. Money cannot do everything in life. It can't buy decency. It obviously does not buy honesty or generosity of spirit. But, if the goal is to repair a roof or to install a wiring system or remove lead poison or to pay for a computer, or persuade a first-rate teacher to remain in a tough job, I think money is a fine solution.

A rhetorical device used by some politicians points to unusual districts such as Washington DC, or East St. Louis, Illinois, that spend a bit more money than some of the nearby districts but do poorly by comparison. This, we are told, is proof that "money does not matter." But, in most cases, there are districts that also plagued by pediatric illness like chronic asthma, by lead-poisoning, by astronomic rates of AIDS, and joblessness, and drug-addiction, and a global feeling of despair. Equality, as Dr. King reminded us, does not mean equal funding for unequal needs. It means resources commensurate with the conditions of existence.

It is true that there has been anarchic inefficiency in certain urban districts; this needs to be addressed. But even where efficiency has been restored, as in Chicago for example, funds are not forthcoming. Still we are told to "cut the fat" from the administration. But in New York, as in Chicago, there is no more fat to cut. We are now cutting at the bone and at the hearts of children.

And so we come at last to 1996 and to the present moment in the U.S. Congress, where the forces of reaction tell us it is time to "get tough" with poor children. How much tougher do we dare to get? How cold, as a society, are we prepared to be?

New York City, as things stand right now, can barely eke out \$7,000 yearly for the education of a first grade child in a school I've visited in the South Bronx, but is spending \$70,000 yearly on each child it incarcerates—\$60,000 on each adult. If Title I is slashed by Congress, it will devastate the children in this school. In the 1980s, these impoverished children lost the dental clinic in their building. A year ago, they lost the afternoon program where they could be safe in school while mothers worked or looked for jobs. This June, their teen-age siblings will lose summer jobs as Congress lets that program die as well. Only 10 percent of these children are admitted into Head Start programs. The one place to which they are sure of being readily admitted is the city's prison island—now the largest penal colony on earth.

Beyond the cutbacks, there is one more shadow looming, and that is the everpresent threat of education vouchers—a modernized version of a hated memory from 40 years ago, when Southern whites fled from the public

schools after the Brown decision, seeking often to get public funds to subsidize their so-called "white academies." They didn't succeed in this attempt, but now another generation—more sophisticated and more clever in concealing racial animus—is driving toward the same objective by the instrument of vouchers.

This time, they are smart enough to offer vouchers to black children and poor children too, but the vouchers they propose can never pay for full tuition at a first-rate private school and, in effect, will simply filter off "the least poor of the poor" who can enhance the voucher with sufficient funds to flee into small private sanctuaries that exclude their poorest neighbors. By filtering off these families from the common areas of shared democracy, we will leave behind a pedagogic wasteland in which no good teacher will desire to teach but where the masses of poor children will remain in buildings that are schools only in name. We are getting close to that point even now. Vouchers, combined with further fiscal cuts, will bring that day considerably nearer.

Some of us who stand up to defend the public schools may seem, at first, to be in an untenable position: We give the appearance of not wanting to change while pointing to how bad things are today. This is our fault, I think, because we tend to speak defensively about the status quo, and fail to offer a more sweeping vision for the future. We scramble to save Title I—and so we should. But Title I, essential as it is, is a remedial side-dish on the table of inequity. We should be speaking of the main course, but have largely failed to do so.

Our vision ought to be to build a public system that is so superb, so democratic, and well-run, that no responsible or thoughtful parent would desire to abandon it. To bring this vision to fruition, we would have to raise the banner of efficiency as high as any voucher advocate has done. We cannot defend dysfunction on the grounds that it is somehow one of the inevitable corollaries of democracy. But simply to support "efficiency" or to encourage innovations such as charter schools is not nearly enough. Innovative and efficient inequality is still unworthy of America. We also need to raise a bolder banner, one that cries out for an end to gross inequity, one that uses strong word for the savagery of what we do today: providing college preparation for the fortunate, bottom-level-labor preparation for the lower-middle class, and prison preparation for our outcasts.

None of my respected friends here in the House of Representatives believes that it is fair to rig the game of life the way we do. We wouldn't play Little League like this. We'd be ashamed. Our victories would seem contaminated. Why aren't we saying this in words Americans can hear?

There is too much silence on this issue among Democrats. It leaves the field to those who speak bombastically, with violence of spirit, as they swiftly mount their juggernaut of cutbacks, vouchers, and secession from the public realm. Virulent racism, as we know too well, is often just beneath the surface of discussion too. I heard few voices in the Congress that address this boldly. There is a sense of quiet abdication and surrender.

Despite my feeling of discouragement, I would like to add that I was reassured to see that Secretary Riley spoke out clearly on the voucher issue recently. As always, he was eloquence and fearless. The same eloquence and the same fearlessness are needed now among the Democrats in Congress. Some of those Democrats, whom I have had the privilege to know for many years, will be retiring soon. Before they do, I hope that

they will find the opportunity to wage one final battle for those children who cannot fight for themselves. I hope they won't leave Congress quietly, but with an angry sword held high. In that way, even if they lose this battle, they will leave behind a legacy of courage that a future generation can uphold with pride. •

BURTON MOSELEY

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, at the time the world was mourning the terror in Israel, my family was mourning the loss of my beloved uncle, Burton Moseley.

Uncle Burt was my late father's only sibling. Both before and after my dad passed away, Uncle Burt was a mentor, a friend, and a role model. He was a simple, honest man, an upright man who brought joy to those whose lives he touched.

No one had a harsh word about him, he never spoke ill of another person. He was, for almost all of his adult life, a Chicago police officer. He epitomized the very best in law enforcement, a person who cared about the quality of life in his community, and who saw fighting crime as a way to contribute. He remained active in the Guardians police organization to the end.

He was our hero.

SPLIT OVER MORALITY

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, people are concerned about what is happening to our country and they are not simply concerned about economics. They are concerned about many issues that reflect our culture in ways that are not healthy.

E.J. Dionne, Jr., one of the most thoughtful journalistic observers of our scene, recently had a column in the Washington Post titled, "Split Over Morality," which I ask to be printed in the RECORD after my remarks.

For those of you who saw it originally in the Post, it is worth rereading, and for those who did not, it should be read and clipped and saved.

The column follows:

SPLIT OVER MORALITY
(By E. J. Dionne, Jr.)

It is remarkable how quickly political talk these days turns to the question: What does the religious right want? Variations on the theme include: How much must Bob Dole do to get the votes of Christian conservatives? Can't President Clinton help himself by hanging the religious right around Dole's neck?

All this might be taken as a great victory by Ralph Reed and the Christian Coalition he directs. The obituary of the religious right has been written over and over since the rise of the Moral Majority in 1980. Yet none of this has stopped the Christian conservative movement from expanding its influence.

Reed and his troops have already gotten a lot of credit for help Dole stop Pat Buchanan's surge dead in the South Carolina primary. That is the very definition of political power.

Reed and his followers have every right to do what they are doing. Religious people have the same rights as union members, en-

vironmentalists, business groups and feminists. President Clinton himself has spoken at hundreds of black churches. The president is often at his most effective from the pulpit, an exceptionally good venue for his favorite speeches about the links between personal responsibility and social justice, crime and unemployment.

Democrats thus have no grounds for challenging Reed's argument that his people deserve "a place at the table" of national politics. What does need real debate is more important. It has to do with how moral issues should be discussed in politics, and also how they should be defined.

A lot of Americans—including many who want nothing to do with Ralph Reed—have a vague but strong sense that what's going wrong in American life is not just about economics. It also entails an ethical or moral crisis. Evidence for this is adduced from family breakdown, teen pregnancy, high crime rates (especially among teenagers), and trashy movies, television and music.

But unlike many on the Christian Right, these same Americans see strong links between moral and economic issues. Their sense that commitments are not being honored includes family commitments, but it also includes the obligations between employer and employee and the question of whether those "who work hard and play by the rules," as the president likes to put it, are getting just treatment.

Democrats, liberals and other assorted critics of the religious right have no problem in discussing these economic matters. But they have made the reverse mistake of Reed and his friends: The religious right's foes have only rarely (and only relatively recently) been willing to understand that many American families see the moral crisis whole. It's possible, and reasonable, to be worried about both trashy entertainment and the rewards that go to the hard-working. Human beings are both economic and moral creatures. But liberals often cringe when the word "morality" is even mentioned.

Giving the Christian right a near monopoly on moral discussion has narrowed the moral debate. This narrowing needs to be challenged.

To hear leaders of the religious right talk in recent weeks, for example, one of the pre-eminent moral issues of our time is whether gay marriages should be sanctioned by state or local governments. But surely this is not even the 10th or the 25th most important issue for most Americans. The resolution of this question one way or the other will do virtually nothing about the moral issues such as crime or family breakup that actually do trouble lots of people.

It's easy enough to recognize why tradition-minded Americans are uneasy with this broadening of the definition of "marriage." But turning this question into yet another political litmus test will only push the political debate toward yet another ugly round of gay-bashing. Is that what 1996 should be about?

What needs to be fought is a tendency described movingly by Stephen Carter in his new book, "Integrity." It is a tendency Carter quite fairly discerns all across the political discussion.

"I must confess that the great political movements of our day frighten me with their reckless certainties and their insistence on treating people as means to be manipulated rather than as the ends for which government exists," he writes. "Too many partisans seem to hate their opponents, who are demonized in terms so creative that I weep at the waste of energy, and, as one who struggles to be a Christian, I find the hatred painful." So would we all. •

WEST VIRGINIA WESTINGHOUSE SCIENCE TALENT SEARCH

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, today, I would like to take a moment to recognize the 40 finalists in the 55th Annual Westinghouse Science Talent Search. These exceptional American youth—hailing from 13 States, including my home State of West Virginia—are being honored as the Nation's brightest high school math and science students.

This program, sponsored by the Westinghouse Foundation, in partnership with Science Services Inc. since 1942, awards America's most prestigious and coveted high school scholarships in math and science. This year's finalists are among 1,869 high school seniors from 735 high schools located throughout the 50 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, including two West Virginia students, Namoi Sue Bates of Franklin and Bonnie Cedar Welcker of Parkersburg. Their independent science research project entries cover the full spectrum of scientific inquiry, from biology to solid state luminescence.

The honor of being named to this group far exceeds the value of the scholarships and awards bestowed. Over the years, finalists have included five winners of the Nobel Prize as well as those who have achieved brilliant careers in science, medicine, and related fields.

Mr. President, I want to commend each and every one of these outstanding American teenagers who truly embody the American dreams of discovering, curing, inventing, and changing the world.

PENTAGON REPORT PREDICTS BOSNIA WILL FRAGMENT WITH- OUT VAST AID

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, when the Bosnian intervention question came before the Senate, I strongly supported President Clinton's request, but added that I thought it was unrealistic to believe that we could go in and in 1 year pull out.

We made that mistake in Somalia and we should not make the same mistake again.

Recently the New York Times had an article by Philip Shenon titled, "Pentagon Report Predicts Bosnia Will Fragment Without Vast Aid," which I ask to be printed in the RECORD after my remarks.

It tells in very realistic terms why it is necessary to retain some troops in the Bosnian area in order to have stability in that area of the world.

If we fail to do that, we invite bloodshed and instability that will inevitably spread to Macedonia, Albania, and other neighboring areas.

The article follows: