

UNION BOSSES TAKING MONEY FROM WORKING FAMILIES TO PAY FOR THEIR POLITICAL AGENDA

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about campaign finance reform, and America thinks it is important that we have the freedom to support candidates that lift up the same ideals they do, freedom to determine which candidate will push for the public policies that will create a better America for their children.

But many working men and women in America cannot do that. See, every month they have taken from their paychecks compulsory union dues, and more than 80 percent of those dues come right here to Washington where union bosses obtain it. These union bosses are taking money from working families who are struggling to provide for their families, and they spend it on their own political agenda and on their own union candidates.

Mr. Speaker, that is not freedom, that is oppression. It is wrong, the Supreme Court said it was wrong in the Beck decision, and so we cannot have campaign finance reform without freeing American workers from the unlawful burden.

Let us make the Beck decision the law of the land.

VETERANS AWAIT CONGRESSIONAL MOVE ON FROZEN IRAQI ASSETS

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Stars and Stripes, the oldest national veterans newspaper in this land, tells the whole story. The lead headline is "Veterans Await Congressional Move on Frozen Iraqi Assets."

It is referring to the need for a congressional move on the Helms amendment, an amendment that would bar completely the right of every gulf war veteran to assert their claim against the frozen assets of Saddam Hussein. That amendment is wrong, and this morning this House has an opportunity to approve a motion to approve it on a record vote, to go down clearly on the side of the veterans of this country, who have defended this country, and respond to this issue.

And yet even this very morning in the morning newspapers, the author of the Helms amendment still insists on a position that would deny 1 red cent, veterans would not get 1 red cent, from Saddam Hussein if his position prevailed.

Let us approve the motion and send a message across the hall to Senator HELMS that we will stand up for veterans.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAWS DID NOT STAND IN THE WAY OF THE CLINTON-GORE REELECTION CAMPAIGN

(Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, when Americans opened up their newspaper last week, this is what they found:

DNC Teamsters and the Teamsters traded funds. Clinton-Gore campaign implicated in scheme to raise illegal donations. Court records show that the Clinton-Gore Reelection Committee and the Democrat National Committee conspired with Teamsters to divert money to a union boss's election. They conspired to hide these illegal contributions, and they conspired to swap funds with Teamsters. We know this because three aides to Teamster boss Ron Carey pleaded guilty to these felony charges of diverting funds through various political groups to the Teamsters. It was payback time over at the Clinton-Gore Reelection Committee, and so an illegal laundering scheme was hatched, and no campaign finance laws were going to stand in their way.

Here is how the laundry cycle worked: Take the union funds, put it to Democrat Senate and House election committees; the Clinton-Gore campaign pays back by calling their wealthy donors to send cash to the Carey reelection campaign.

And here we have just one more example of a Presidential legacy that makes Richard Nixon's legacy look like an ethics guide to the Boy Scouts.

MAKE MY OVERRIDE

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. A spokesman said the White House will reform the IRS and any congressional bill that goes too far will be vetoed; "veto," the magic word. I expect to see Groucho's duck any day here.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker, and it is time for Congress to take a stand. Who is kidding whom? The White House reforming the IRS would be like Barney Fife trying to reform Al Capone. My colleagues know it, I know it, and the American people know it.

Let us tell it like it is. If the President wants to carry water for the Internal Revenue Service, let him, and it is time for Congress to strap on the six-shooters and tell the President, "Make my override. Veto this."

Let us straighten those bums out.

ASKING QUESTIONS ABOUT CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. ROGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, for the last several weeks we have been treated to a daily passionate call for campaign finance reform from our friends on the other side.

To those in the audience who listen to these debates and are actually persuaded by the seriousness of this litany, I suggest they ask a few questions to those people who make a daily practice of delivering these impassioned speeches.

Ask them if accepting campaign contributions from foreign governments should be illegal. If so, why are they silent on the subject, and who do they perceive to be the ones violating this on a routine basis?

Should laundering money from foreign sources to conceal its origin be illegal? If so, ask them who they see as being responsible for this practice.

Should shredding evidence to conceal criminal activity be illegal? If so, who do they see as being responsible for this practice?

Should raising money in Buddhist temples be illegal? Should fundraising on Federal property be illegal? If so, why are they so strangely silent on these real practices?

Listen closely to what these members are not saying, rather than what they are saying, and get a great education as to where they really stand on campaign finance reform.

ARKANSAS AND AMERICA HAVE COME A LONG WAY IN 40 YEARS

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the gentlemen from Arkansas, MARION BERRY, ASA HUTCHINSON, VIC SNYDER, and JAY DICKEY, for their eloquent and passionate remarks in commemorating the 40th anniversary of the integration of Central High School in Little Rock, AR. They reminded me that 40 years ago I too lived in Arkansas and, like JAY DICKEY, was a college freshman. Our heroes were Ernie Green, Melba Patillo, Gloria Ray, Thomas Jefferson, Minnie Jean Brown, Daisy Bates, Wiley Branton, and the rest of the Little Rock Nine.

Someone commented that in 40 years Arkansas has come a long way. I agree. But then I say so, too, has America.

AMERICA'S VETERANS VERSUS TOBACCO COMPANIES

(Mr. EDWARDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, in the next hour this House will have a clear choice. It is a choice between America's veterans versus tobacco companies. It is a choice between veterans versus partisanship.

As someone who represents over 40,000 Army soldiers and 60,000 veterans

in my district, I am disappointed and outraged that a Republican leader in the other body would add language to the foreign aid bill that actually gives tobacco companies precedence over Desert Storm veterans regarding claims against frozen Iraqi assets. What a slap in the face to every Desert Storm veteran and all veterans everywhere.

Desert Storm veterans were first in combat. They should not be last in line regarding legitimate claims against the Iraqis.

Mr. Speaker, I did not see tobacco companies fighting in Desert Storm. But I did see American service men and women fighting there, and I did have constituents who died on the sands of Kuwait in service to their Nation.

□ 1015

Those people, not tobacco companies, should be put first in line. They stood up for us; today we should stand up for them, and I hope my Republican colleagues will join the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] and the Democrats, and will work together to defeat the Helms amendment to the foreign aid bill.

MANPRINT FOR THE U.S. ARMY

(Mr. SKELTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today, it is my pleasure to share with my colleagues a good news story, one about our Nation's military and, in particular, our Army. It involves a materiel acquisition program first developed in the 1980's for Army soldiers. It is called MANPRINT, which stands for manpower and personnel integration.

The MANPRINT program objective is to improve the performance of Army weapons and equipment through a man-machine total systems approach. That is, MANPRINT focuses on the interrelationship of the soldier and his or her weapon or equipment and the human requirements for maximizing system performance. In a nutshell, it does not make any difference if there is a tank that is capable of firing 10 rounds per minute if its crew can only operate it at three rounds per minute. Regardless of its technical capabilities, the tank is a three-round-per-minute tank due to the human factors that limit its output. This is the kind of problem MANPRINT addresses.

MANPRINT is an umbrella term that refers to seven disciplines that are critical to optimizing the man-machine, total-system approach. They are manpower, personnel, training, human factors engineering, system safety, health hazards, and soldier survivability. The central idea is to integrate considerations of these domains continuously into the acquisition process.

Thanks to MANPRINT the Army now has a vastly increased confidence that its new systems will perform as expected in the hands of its soldiers—and, at the same time, save lives and dollars. As I will explain later, MANPRINT

has, in fact, already saved hundreds of soldiers' lives and billions of dollars. It has returned thousands of percent on a trickle of investment dollars. It is, or should be, a governmental downsizer's dream come true. Moreover, in this day of increased reliance on technology, we are only beginning to explore the ramifications the Army's concept could have for our entire society.

There is an element of urgency associated with this Army program, however, and the very real danger that we could repeat mistakes of the past—the type where U.S. inventors or progressive thinkers create great ideas which we fail to appreciate and implement. Instead, other countries capitalize on them. You will recall the Dr. W. Edward Deming's ideas on quality were ignored in this country in the 1950's and then successfully adopted by the Japanese. We may be on the verge of committing such a mistake with the Army's MANPRINT program. The Army resources devoted to MANPRINT have been continually slashed during the drawdown. At the same time, the United Kingdom has picked up on the U.S. Army's idea and is already in the process of implementing it throughout all services in the royal force. Moreover, as the Japanese recognized, Deming's quality ideas applied to all technology, not just defense. Not surprisingly, the British are starting MANPRINT programs in the Departments of Trade and Industry as well.

In order to reduce the likelihood of our making the same error with MANPRINT as we did with Deming's quality management, I want to make sure my colleagues are familiar with this highly successful soldier-oriented concept for the design, development, manufacturing, and fielding of the Army's newest weapon's systems.

ARMY ACQUISITION PROGRAMS LED TO ADOPTION OF MANPRINT

I am sure that many of you recall the manpower and readiness problems that plagued the Army force modernization program in the early 1980's. It seemed that whenever a new system was put into the hands of the soldier, actual field performance often failed to match the standards predicted during its development. The Stinger anti-aircraft missile, for example, was designed to hit incoming aircraft better than 6 percent of the time. But if it had been placed in service as originally designed, it would actually have achieved hits only 30 percent of the time when operated by soldiers in combat units. The Stinger's problems were eventually corrected. But the problems of soldier utilization were so great in the Division Air Defense Gun, known as the DIVAD or Sergeant York, that the program had to be canceled. In the case of the Dragon anti-tank missile, that soldier's nightmare is still in the Army's inventory.

In addition to unacceptable performance from new systems, the Army experienced problems in crew performance. When the Army replaced an existing system with a newer, more technologically complex system, the newer system often generated requirements for soldiers of a higher level of skill and for more soldiers per system. The Army personnel system simply could not provide enough soldiers of the caliber required to operate and maintain such sophisticated systems.

The Army's first study on what to do about the disappointing performance and

unaffordable manpower costs of new weapons systems and equipment was conducted by retired Generals Walter T. Kerwin and George S. Blanchard in 1980. In examining the Army's concerns about the mobilization, readiness and sustainability of new systems, the report concluded that it was primarily a lack of consideration of the human in the system that was causing the problem. Human performance assessments either were not done or were too late to influence weapons design. Supporting the Kerwin and Blanchard findings, the General Accounting Office [GAO] published reports in 1981 and 1985 attributing 50 percent of equipment failures to human error. GAO, too, stressed the need for integrating into the acquisition process human disciplines, such as, in particular, manpower, personnel and training needs.

The recommendations for a new soldier-oriented approach to systems acquisition were taken very seriously in the mid-1980's. With the full support of the entire Army leadership, military and civilian, Gen. Maxwell Thurman, as the Vice Chief of Staff, directed that an entirely new approach to systems acquisition be adopted by the Army, one which required that systems fit the soldiers rather than that the soldier—through selection or training—fit the systems.

This new concept also affected industry because, as we all know, defense contractors actually design and develop Army systems. In the mid-eighties, the concept required a radical change in the way contractors did business. To successfully compete in the new Army acquisition process, industry had to focus on the human element and design systems that fit soldier's needs and capabilities. In the MANPRINT process, human parameters are specified in the same manner as any other component of the system. System performance is measured with the humans quantitative performance included as an inherent part of the total system performance. No longer could performance in the laboratory be extrapolated as satisfying the requirements of performance in the field.

The MANPRINT philosophy and examples of the array of concepts inherent in MANPRINT are documented in a book, "MANPRINT: An Approach to Systems Integration" (Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1990), edited by Dr. Harold R. Booher, who was the first senior Army civilian official appointed to direct the Army's MANPRINT program.

COMANCHE AND MANPRINT

Nowhere has the new soldier-oriented partnership between Government and industry been more visible than on the Army's Light Helicopter Experimental [LHX] program. Better known to us today as the Comanche, the LHX in 1986 was the Army's true experimental program, testing where it was possible to introduce cutting-edge technology into its inventory without running headlong into the problems of unsatisfactory performance and runaway personnel costs. Even opponents of Comanche cannot ignore the great advances achieved in this program beyond the standard of normal acquisition practices.

Perhaps the first indication that MANPRINT was not only viable but could revolutionize the military's procurement process was the successful development of the Comanche's T-800 engine. The MANPRINT approach fostered hundreds of design improvements affecting both maintenance and reliability. In one