

there. And it works here. It works very well here. It was working here quite well, extraordinarily well, until 1992 when, as a result of this NLRB decision, that policy was brought into jeopardy.

So this bill simply clarifies the policy. It says you cannot set up a sham union, cannot set up a company union, you cannot use this to undermine collective bargaining, but you can allow people to get together to talk about how they can make the workplace work better. This concept of team effort in the workplace is what is holding up repeal of the gas tax and increasing the minimum wage.

When people are cynical about Washington I guess sometimes they have a right to be, because what you have here is a money talks situation. The big labor bosses here in Washington have committed publicly, it has been reported across this country, \$35 million to defeat members of the Republican Party running for reelection to Congress—\$35 million. That is a lot of money. And money appears to talk, because the phone calls come in and the decision has been made to take down two items which, at least on that side of the aisle, although there are some on our side of the aisle who have reservations about some of these proposals—take down two items which have pretty much universal support and which were viewed as good policy: repealing the gas tax, which is regressive, and raising the minimum wage, simply because it affronts the big labor bosses here in Washington that we would try to make the workplace have a more cooperative atmosphere.

It is pretty outrageous but that is where we stand today. That is where we stand after the majority leader's proposal was rejected. Not only did the majority leader propose that, he went even an extra step. He said not only am I willing to give you a vote on repealing the gas tax, increasing the minimum wage, and also the TEAM Act issue, but I will let you even divide the question. He went so far as to say you can have your up-or-down vote on the minimum wage and you can have your up-or-down vote on gas tax. And that was rejected. That was exactly what has been asked for here for months by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Yet, suddenly we see the priorities. We see the priorities of the liberal side of the aisle. It is not this low-income worker about whom we have heard so much, it is not the person who has to pay that extra amount at the gas pump who is maybe having trouble making a living but maybe has to buy gas to get to work—it is not that person the other side of the aisle has as their No. 1 priority. No, it is some guy sitting in some building here in Washington who happens to have a big labor job. So that is what this is down to.

This is a simple question of money talks. It is regrettable. Hopefully the other side of the aisle will see this more clearly and come to their senses,

because this proposal the majority leader has offered is an extraordinary generous act on his part to try to resolve some fairly complex questions that have been confronting this legislative body.

I yield the remainder of my time and make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. PELL pertaining to the introduction of S. 1730 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask that I be permitted to proceed as if in morning business for up to 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO INDIA

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, there is good news and better news in the world today with regards to the progress and the stability of democratic procedures around the world. We are, as is evidenced from the day's proceedings, already well into our election season, though the actual election will not be held until next November, as has been our practice over the last two centuries.

It is possible in a country such as ours to take for granted national, State, and even local elections, as a part of the rhythms of our life. Yet, they are rare in the world. In the whole of the membership of the United Nations, some 185 countries now, there are only 7 States which both existed in 1914 and have not had their form of government changed by violence since then.

We are joined in that very special group, by the United Kingdom, four former members of the British Commonwealth—Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa—and Sweden. I would add Switzerland, though it is not a member of the United Nations.

Of the great powers of the world, the newest to begin a process of choosing leaders by elections is Russia, the Russian Federation and other members of the former Republics of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Yesterday, we learned with understandable anxiety that on Sunday Major General Aleksandr Korzhakov, the close aide and security advisor to President Boris Yeltsin of Russia, stated that it might be necessary to cancel the Presidential elections scheduled for June. He stated that the country was not ready to make a decision. It is clear his concern is that if the country were to make a decision now, it might not choose Mr. Yeltsin.

Mr. President, this will be the second Presidential election in Russian history. To his great credit, yesterday in Moscow, Mr. Yeltsin said that the election would not be postponed; it will take place as scheduled. Mr. Yeltsin went on to instruct General Korzhakov not to get involved in politics and to refrain from making such statements in the future.

On the other hand, in his statement, Mr. Yeltsin refers to his opponent, who is associated with former Communists in Russia and who has a program very much opposed to the economic reforms Mr. Yeltsin has been pursuing, albeit at times erratically, by stating that, "Korzhakov is not alone in thinking that a Gennadi Zyuganov victory would start a civil war."

Now, those are ominous terms, sir. Mr. Zyuganov is the candidate considered to be Mr. Yeltsin's chief opponent, and he represents a revival of Communist thinking and organization to some extent. The word "civil war" takes us back to the events of 1917 when the Bolsheviks seized power from a moderate provisional government, potentially a democratic government. Those events in St. Petersburg in the Winter Palace in 1917 are well-known to us—and were followed by four years of intense, agonizing war across all of Eurasia. A war in which the United States was involved with troops in Murmansk, Vladivostok, and elsewhere, as were the British and the French. The outcome was the triumph of the Soviet Union and the horror that followed for nearly three-quarters of a century, until its final dissolution in 1991.

We can only wish the democrats, or if you like republicans, well in the Russian elections. We should take note of how very tentative these advances can be, and take into account those who are voicing concern over the prospect of an election in which the outcome would result in civil war.

By extraordinary contrast, Mr. President, the Republic of India today concludes the third and final day of the largest election in human history. Some 590 million Indian citizens are eligible to vote in three separate days of balloting: April 27, May 2, and today, May 7. This will be the 11th national election since the founding of the Republic of India in 1947. A very large proportion of the electorate will have voted in some 800,000 polling places.

The task of keeping the polling stations open is formidable, yet the task is being accomplished and it suggests the magnitude of the achievement. In so doing, India continues to exist as a democracy, in defiance of just about everything that those who profess to know about the subject would argue are required as preconditions necessary for a democratic society. Yet India continues to remain a firm democracy and to exhibit an extraordinary commitment to law and to civic process.

Here is a country with 15 official languages, not to mention English which,

as Prime Minister Nehru described, enjoys "associate status." In addition, some 50 major regional languages. It is a country that stretches from the Himalayas in the north to Cape Comorin far into the Indian Ocean, approaching the Equator. It is the second most populous nation on Earth. There has never been a country of this size able to have regular and free, democratic elections. They are not without disturbances, few elections are anywhere; however, we do know that there will be a government formed in the aftermath of this election. There will be no civil war. There will be no civil unrest. There will be an acceptance of a democratic process without parallel in the history of mankind. It should cheer us up and make us realize that the last half century has not been for nothing. The current possibilities of a democratic society around the world are perhaps beyond what anyone could have imagined a century ago, and they are thriving and proudly prevailing on the subcontinent of India, in the Republic of India.

I am sure the entire Senate will wish to congratulate the people of India and all who have participated in this election. We take no position whatever as to the outcome. There are any number of parties with capable candidates. At the present time, the balloting should have been concluded, it being past midnight in India. Soon we will know the outcome.

It fell to that singular commentator, William Safire, in the New York Times, to note this event in a remarkable column in which he observes the Indian achievement. I think we should note the contrast of this achievement with the People's Republic of China which, though comparable in size, has never had an election of any kind.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Safire's column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 2, 1996]

#### THE BIGGEST ELECTION

(By William Safire)

WASHINGTON.—In 1975, when Indira Gandhi assumed dictatorial control of India and threw her opponents in jail, President Ford asked his U.N. delegate, Daniel P. Moynihan, what to make of that.

"Look at it this way, Mr. President," said Moynihan with a courtier's irony. "Under your Administration, the United States has become the world's largest democracy."

When Mrs. Gandhi later confidently stood for election, India's voters threw her out. Freedom was back, and the U.S. happily became the world's second-largest democracy.

This week, with dignity, honest balloting and relatively little violence, 400 million of India's citizens—65 percent of eligible voters, higher than here—go to the polls to select candidates from 500 political parties. It is the most breathtaking example of government by the people in the history of the world.

Americans don't hear a whole lot about it. President Clinton is busy being campaign manager for the Labor party in Israel's May

29, election, in effect telling Israelis to vote for Shimon Peres or else.

When he is not intervening shamelessly in Israel's political affairs, Mr. Clinton is barnstorming with Boris Yeltsin, trying to help him defeat Yavlinsky's reformers and Zyuganov's Communists in Russia's June 16 election. Washington is also headquarters for the Clinton campaign for the U.S. Presidency, where he beefs up beef prices to consumers while pouring strategic oil on troubled motorists. But in all the campaigning, no mention is made of India, where voters outnumber those in Israel, Russia and the U.S. combined.

As a result of this uncharacteristic White House forbearance, television coverage here about the biggest election has been next to nil. Not only do Americans not know for which Indian candidate to root, but hundreds of millions of voters are forced to go to the polls ignorant of Mr. Clinton's preference.

Why? Do nearly 900 million Indians not matter? American lack of interest is not new; a former Foreign Minister of India, one of Nehru's acolytes, told a U.S. envoy: "We would far prefer your detestation to your indifference."

One reason is that India strikes a holier-than-thou diplomatic pose, remaining non-aligned when there is no longer one side to be nonaligned against. Year after year, India is near the top of the list of nations that consistently vote against the U.S. in the United Nations.

We're wrong to let that overly irritate us. China votes against us, too, and unbalances our trade and secretly ships missiles to rogue states and jails dissidents and oppresses Tibet and threatens Taiwan and (cover the children's eyes) pirates our CD's—but we care more about what happens in China than what happens in India.

That's a mistake. Contrary to what all the new Old China Hands and other Old Nixon Hands tell you, India will draw ahead of China as a superpower in the next century.

Yes, China's economic growth rate has doubled India's, and China's Draconian control of births will see India's population exceed China's soon enough, to India's disadvantage. But China does not know what an election is. Despite the enterprise and industriousness of its people, despite the example of free Chinese on Taiwan and the inspiration of the dissident Wei Jingsheng, jailed in Beijing, China is several upheavals and decades away from the democracy India already enjoys.

Without political freedom, capitalism cannot long thrive. Already the requirements of political repression are stultifying the flow of market information in China, driving wary Hong Kong executives to Sydney. The suppression of dangerous data undermined technology in Communist Russia; it will hurt China, too.

Though more Chinese are literate, many more Indians are English-literate (more English-speakers than in Britain), and English is the global language of the computer. American software companies are already locating in Bangalore, India's Silicon Valley. Bureaucratic corruption scandals abound; India's free press reports and helps cleanse them, China's does not.

I'm rooting for Rao, the secular Prime Minister, who is more likely to move toward free markets than Vajpayee, his leading opponent. But whoever wins, it's a glorious week for the world's largest democracy.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I take the liberty of extending the congratulations of the U.S. Senate to the Government and peoples of India on the conclusion of this, the 11th national election as an independent nation in the world: proud,

increasingly prosperous, and with every expectation of becoming more so.

I thank the Senate for its courtesy and allowing this interruption. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TEAMWORK FOR EMPLOYEES AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1995

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, let me just comment on two things very briefly that, apparently, are going to be joined in the vote tomorrow. Let me say that if they are joined, I, if no one else, am going to ask for division on the question, so we can vote separately on these issues.

One of the issues is whether to repeal the 4.3-cent gasoline tax. I know it was very controversial as we argued about it here. But it was very interesting that after it passed, I went back to the State of Illinois and, up until a few days ago when it was raised again as an issue, of the 12 million people in Illinois, do you know how many people talked to me and complained about the gasoline tax increase? Not a single one. My guess is—and I see my friend Senator MOYNIHAN on the floor—that not a single citizen of New York complained to Senator MOYNIHAN about the 4.3-cent tax.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Not a one.

Mr. SIMON. My guess is that in the State of Tennessee people were not complaining. I talked to one of our colleagues from a western State, and they were not complaining. One of the advantages, Mr. President, of not running for reelection is, a year ago, just about this time, my wife and I took off for Spain and Portugal, flew to Madrid—at our expense, I hasten to add, not at the taxpayers' expense. And we rented a car and drove around Spain and Portugal. The highways were better than our interstate highways. But I paid \$4.50 a gallon. People talk about being overtaxed in the United States. In some areas, our taxes are excessive. But we have, next to Saudi Arabia, the lowest gasoline tax of any country in the world. If you were to ask, "What can we do to improve the environment?" one of the things we could do, frankly, is not to lower the gasoline tax, but to increase it. We ought to be increasing it to spend money to build our highways and use it on mass transit and that sort of thing. So I think any move to lower that tax is shortsighted.

And then the distinguished Congressman from Texas has suggested that we take the money from education. I cannot imagine anything more shortsighted. We need to invest more in education, not less. That just absolutely does not make sense.