

submit information on their SBIR and STTR programs as well. This should leave us with a firm basis in the future to look at these programs and to reform them as necessary.

The commercialization component of the SBIR and STTR programs can be seen through the program's phases. Phase I is for defining an idea; phase II is for developing the idea to the point where it is useful commercially or to the Government. Phase III is the point where the programs' successes are harvested either through private sector commercialization or through Government purchases of products and services. These programs have a second goal of providing value to the Government, a goal which can be complementary to the commercialization goal. If Phase I and II grants are coordinated with the agencies' priority research and development programs, agencies should have a base of relevant expertise in the small business community for the Phase III work to build on. We, therefore, hope to see future SBIR and STTR solicitations positioned in the mainstream of agency and interagency priority initiatives.

Members of our committee continue to be concerned about the extreme concentration of SBIR and STTR grants in a small number of companies located in a few States. We know there are tens of thousands of small businesses throughout the country with high quality scientists and engineers on their staffs, many of which might benefit from SBIR or STTR participation. This will not happen as long as the program keeps awarding hundreds of grants each year to a handful of companies. We also wonder how companies can remain small businesses if they truly have the management capabilities to write hundreds of research proposals and to carry out dozens of research projects for the Government each year. If they really are moving the research results of all these projects towards commercialization, why aren't they becoming big enough to outgrow the program? Our legislation partially addresses this problem by requiring the SBA to perform outreach activities to encourage applications from a much larger and more diverse segment of the small business community. However, we did not have time in this authorization to agree upon more direct legislative solutions to the multiple awards problem. It is a problem that is serious enough that it should not be ignored any longer. We, therefore, urge participating agencies to be aggressive in broadening the base of program participants and warn agencies who persist in continually awarding many grants to the same companies to be prepared to show that these favored few companies are both adding value to the Government and aggressively developing markets for their research results.

LEE HAMILTON: A PUBLIC SERV-
ANT REFLECTS ON THREE DEC-
ADES IN CONGRESS

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 6, 1997

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member would take a moment to recognize my distinguished colleague from Indiana, the Honorable LEE HAMILTON. First as chairman and now as

ranking Democrat on the Committee on International Relations, LEE HAMILTON has consistently sought to promote the U.S. national interest and to advance our bilateral and multi-lateral relations around the globe. He has applied his Indiana common sense to many of the most difficult international issues that this country has been forced to address.

LEE HAMILTON was chairman of the Europe and Middle East Subcommittee when the Berlin Wall fell and when the Soviet Union collapsed. He was instrumental in crafting the SEED Act that provided timely assistance to the fledgling democracies in Central Europe, and he was the driving force behind the Freedom Support Act that support democratic institutions in Russia. These are just a few of his more recent landmark legislative accomplishments, Mr. Speaker, for which the distinguished gentleman can rightly take pride.

Mr. Speaker, although the distinguished gentleman sits on the other side of the aisle from this Member, this Member has regularly sought him out for advice and guidance. Years ago, when this Member was a junior member of the minority on the International Relations Committee, LEE HAMILTON helped this Member pursue a number of initiatives that, without this help, would have been impossible. LEE did not have to do this, and no one ever knew of his help; however, it meant an enormous amount to this relatively junior Member.

Mr. Speaker, LEE HAMILTON recently was awarded the Edmund Muskie distinguished Public Service Award for his 3½ decades of service to the Nation. This Member congratulates Mr. HAMILTON and would ask to submit into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the gentleman's statement, "Reflections on the Congress and the Country," which he delivered to the Center for National Policy which was honoring him on September 29, 1997, with the Edmund Muskie Award. This gentleman wishes LEE and his wife Nancy all the best in the years ahead and thanks them for their remarkable contributions to our Nation.

REFLECTIONS ON THE CONGRESS AND THE COUNTRY

I really do not recall enjoying speeches any more than I have tonight. Thank you one and all. Some I thought could have been a little longer, others I found a bit restrained, but overall it has been an immensely satisfying evening.

I shall think often of this evening and the high honor you have paid to me. I've always wanted to walk off the stage before I was shoved off, and your nice gesture makes me think I have done that.

Politicians do a lot of things very well but I'm not sure retiring is one of them. I've always felt that you should leave when others think you should stay.

It has occurred to me in times past that the United States government needed the equivalent of a House of Lords for retired politicians. I'm beginning to think more favorably of that idea. I'm not quite sure what its purpose would be and I know that the taxpayers wouldn't tolerate it, but it would be a nice gathering place for a bunch of has-beens. It would keep us out of mischief and perhaps more importantly keep us off the television, and an occasional good thought or deed might from time to time emerge.

No award comes to one person alone. All who receive an honor stand on the shoulders of many others. I acknowledge no all-inclusive list tonight of people who share this award with me, but among them most importantly are: my wife, Nancy, and our children,

Tracy, Debbie, and Doug; I cannot begin to tell you the contributions they have made—but for a sample consider not having their husband and father around the house for 30 weekends a year for 30 years; the man who got me started in this political business, and he has remained a trusted friend and advisor, Dick Stoner, and his wife, Virginia; and, of course, a long list of outstanding staff members, without whose help I would have accomplished very little. The best advice for any Member remains: hire a staff a lot smarter than you are; and I have done that.

The award is all the more meaningful because it is named for Edmund Muskie. I still remember the clarity and persuasiveness of his statements on the budget, the environment, and foreign policy.

Mike Barnes and Mo Steinbruner have been doing an excellent job of continuing his important work at the Center for National Policy. As Madeleine Albright correctly noted last year, CNP is more than a think tank, it's an action tank.

And a word of special appreciation to Hank Schacht, the Chairman and CEO of Lucent Technologies. If you want a model for an American business executive, look no further. He combines all the skills of an outstandingly successful business executive with a commitment to the public interest that is simply extraordinary.

I've been asked to reminisce for a few minutes. Obviously they didn't expect anything too heavy from me this evening, and I'm pleased to comply.

EARLY YEARS IN CONGRESS

I've been fortunate to serve many years in Congress. I've served with 8 Presidents. I've worked with 11 Secretaries of State. And when I complete my 17th Congress, I'll be one of only around 80 Members in the history of the House who have served that long.

I remember, of course, my early years in Congress. I remember that the Speaker of the House then, John McCormack, could not remember my name. He called me John and Henry and Carl on various days. Then one day before the Democratic caucus to elect the Speaker he called me on the phone. I told him I wouldn't vote for him, but would vote instead for Mo Udall. That's probably not the smartest judgment I ever made. From that day on, however, he knew my name, and the next time he saw me in the hall he called me Lee. And to his eternal credit he never held it against me.

I remember those early days when Members of Congress could put a new post office in every village and hamlet, and I did. I built 17 in my first year in Congress.

And I remember needing only one staffer to help me answer constituent mail, and getting only an occasional visit from a lobbyist. I also remember that I could accept any gift offered, and make any amount of money of outside income, unrestricted and unreported. I even remember—in those pre-Vietnam and pre-Watergate days—people believing and trusting what government officials and politicians said.

I remember that when I first ran for Congress in 1964, my total campaign budget was \$30,000, compared to \$1 million last election.

And I remember many close personal relationships across the aisle. Early in my career, I made a parliamentary mistake on the floor. A senior Republican (and good friend) came over, put his arm around me, and gently pointed out my mistake and how to correct it—and this was on a bill he opposed. I can't imagine that happening today.

I remember walking into the House Foreign Affairs Committee room, which was then a small room now occupied by the House TV-radio gallery. I was told by the staff director there were no seats at the

Committee table for me or the other two freshmen Democratic Members. He told me that if I wanted a seat I had to arrive before the lobbyists and the spectators came in. But it really didn't matter whether I came or not; as a freshman I was not going to be recognized to speak.

UNFORGETTABLE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

I remember some unforgettable Members of Congress, including the awesome—even fearsome—Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Emanuel Celler. I was the designated spokesman when a group of us went to talk to him about the President's proposal to extend the term of House Members from two or four years. We favored the bill and had introduced it. And I asked him how he stood on the bill. His response has become a part of Washington lore. He said, "I don't stand on it, I'm sitting on it. It rests four-square under my fanny and will never see the light of day." And of course it didn't, and we learned something about congressional power.

I remember Chairman Jamie Whitten, who would bring the most complicated appropriations bill, thousands of pages in length, to the floor of the House and spend his entire allotted debate time on a conference report thanking everyone under the sun, and saying nothing about the bill. The first few times he did it I thought he might not be smart enough to explain the bill. I finally figured out that he was too smart to explain it, and he never did, and he always got it passed.

I remember how deeply disappointed President Johnson was when I offered the first amendment to reduce U.S. involvement in Vietnam. It was a switch of position for me, although others had preceded me. I was one of his favorites from the class of '64, and he had come to campaign for me in '66. He had taken a special interest in my career. I will never forget his eyes when he asked me, "How could you do that to me, Lee?"

I remember Hale Boggs addressing President Nixon and members of his entire Cabinet in the Cabinet Room. He made an impassioned plea as only he could do on a subject I've long since forgotten, and as he left the room he did so with the observation, "Now, Mr. President, if you'll excuse me, I have some important people waiting to see me in my office."

The memories go on and on in an endless line of splendor. With each one of them it reminds me that serving in the House of Representatives has been a high privilege, but a good bit of fun too.

GOOD ADVICE

And I remember the good advice I got. I got good financial advice from President Johnson. He had the freshmen gather in the Cabinet Room. I don't remember much of what he said except one thing; he told us "Buy your home." He said, "If you're like most politicians it'll be the only decent investment you'll ever make."

I remember Tip O'Neill putting his arm around me as we walked down the hall and giving me some advice. He called me Neal for my first decade here because I reminded him of a Boston baseball player by the name of Neal Hamilton. He said, "Neal, you can accomplish anything in this town if you're willing to let someone else take the credit."

I remember Wilbur Mills, a marvelous man, a superb legislator, who came, of course, to an unhappy ending. One evening we walked out of the Capitol together. His picture was on the cover of *Time* magazine; he was known all over the country; he was the foremost legislator in Congress—people sought his advice and clamored to speak with him even for a few seconds. I asked him where he was going, he said "I'm going back to Arkansas. I'll have a public meeting." He

mentioned some small Arkansas town and said "There'll be about 15 or 20 people there." I never forgot it. As we departed he said "Lee, don't ever forget your constituents. Nothing, nothing comes before them."

And I remember Carl Albert who said always respect your colleagues and never forget that each one of them serves in this House because they were elected to do so by the American people.

PUBLIC ATTITUDE TOWARD GOVERNMENT

But let me go beyond the specific remembrances and turn more serious for a moment as we conclude.

There's been a massive change of attitude toward the role of government since I first came here. In the early 1960s many were brimming with optimism over the potential of federal programs to solve all kinds of problems—alleviating poverty, curbing racial discrimination, providing health coverage, rebuilding American's cities.

Today the mood has shifted toward pessimism about what government can achieve that is worthwhile. Many believe that government creates more problems than it solves.

Over these past 30 years I've been struck by the decline in public respect for government. In recent years it has threatened the ability of government to make good policy. Of course skepticism has always been a healthy strain in American thinking. Our Constitution reflects that with all of its checks and balances. And we all know that government can be inefficient, inaccessible, and unaccountable. But when healthy skepticism about government turns to cynicism, it becomes the great enemy of democracy.

I think the operative question in American government today is the same as it was at Gettysburg when Lincoln asked "Can this nation so dedicated and so conceived long endure?" That question may put it in rather apocalyptic terms, but it nonetheless is on the mark.

A constituent put the right question to me the other day, "What's the most important thing you can do to restore confidence in government?"

RESTORING CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

You'll be happy to know I'm not going to try to answer that question in any length tonight.

But my basic response to my constituent was that to restore confidence in government we have to make government responsive, accessible, and workable.

I believe that representative democracy is our best hope for dealing with our problems. We live in a complicated country of vast size and remarkable diversity. When I was in high school we had 130 million people. Today we have almost 270 million. So in my working lifetime the population of the country has more than doubled. Our voters are many; they're spread far and wide; and they represent a great variety of races, religions, and national origins. It isn't easy to develop a system that enables such a country to live together peacefully and productively.

Representative democracy, for all of its faults, permits us to do that. It works through a process of deliberation, negotiation, and compromise—in a word, the process of politics. Politics and politicians may be unpopular but they're also indispensable. Politics is the way that we express the popular will of the people in this country. At its best, representative democracy gives us a system whereby all of us have a voice in the process and a stake in the product.

In many ways, we have lost what the founding fathers possessed—the belief that government can work. Government is certainly still needed to provide for our national security and help promote our general

welfare. Sometimes government gets in our way, but other times it can be helpful to ordinary people in their effort to succeed, to have opportunity, and to correct instances of oppression and injustice.

Those of us who see important reasons for government to act must be willing not just to criticize government and try to improve its operations, we must also work to improve public understanding of what government can do, what it cannot do, and what it has done. I simply do not see how it is possible to deal with many of our problems without a minimal public confidence in government.

I know that many people say the government and Congress don't work very well. And it's certainly not difficult to point out instances when they don't. But on the other hand, given the size of the country and the number and complexity of the challenges we confront, my view is that representative democracy works reasonably well in this country. I do not for a moment agree with those who think that the American system has failed or that the future of the country is bleak.

IMPROVING OPERATIONS OF CONGRESS

My main interest during my years in Congress has been to make government responsive, accessible, and workable. Part of that representative democracy system, of course, is the role of Congress.

Congress is an enormously important and resilient institution. I'm impressed almost daily with the way it tackles difficult national problems, manages conflict in the country, acts as a national forum, reflects diverse points of view, and over time usually develops a consensus that reflects the collective judgment of a diverse people. It has helped create and maintain a nation more free than any other. It is the most powerful and most respected legislative body in the world.

It is not, of course, perfect. It has some major flaws. It doesn't think enough about the long term, for example; it can be much too partisan; and the system by which we finance our elections is a mess. But I nonetheless believe that Congress is—overall but not perfectly, often but not always—responsive to the sustained and express will of the American people. It's a much more responsive body than people think. Congress does usually respond to public opinion if that opinion is conveyed strongly by the American people, as we have seen in the recent work to balance the budget.

I have seen many changes over the years, but I think America is a better place today than it was when I came to Congress in 1965:

The Cold War is over, and we are at peace.

As the preeminent military power in the world, we do not worry about an imminent threat to our national security.

It is hard to find a place on the map where the U.S. is not engaged in some manner trying to make things better.

We enjoy the world's most competitive economy.

The new global trading system means new challenges and a host of new opportunities.

The Internet brings a world of knowledge to the most remote classroom or the most remote home.

We have greatly improved the lot of older Americans with programs like Social Security and Medicare.

Women and minorities have had new doors opened to them like never before.

And, by far the most important of all, this still is the land of opportunity where everyone has a chance, not an equal chance unfortunately, but still a chance to become the best they can become.

Congress did not single-handedly bring about all of these changes. But it played a

major role in every one of them. Congress is still the protector of our freedom and the premier forum for addressing the key issues of the day.

As I receive this award from the Center for National Policy and look back over my years

in Congress, I'm not cynical, pessimistic, or discouraged. I'm optimistic about Congress and about the country. I am grateful for every day I've been a part of this body and I do not know of any place in the world that I would have preferred to be. I believe that

inch by inch, line by line, I've had a small—very small—part in making this a more perfect union and making this country stronger, safer, and freer.

What more could anyone want?