

life here, about those who animate both this city and this institution. She readily acquired the same degree of sophisticated knowledge about my State of Massachusetts and those who animate our State and our politics and our lives. And she learned my preferences and patterns in personal and family needs and incorporated those into the schedule process. That is a very potent package, Mr. President. It is one for which many elected officials, for that competence, would give their right arm and leg in an effort to find that kind of person.

But I want to emphasize something. She brought a great deal more to the job than simply her capacity to be able to run the schedule. It is a special skill and it is a special knowledge. But I would like to just very quickly mention a couple of other very special traits.

First, she, among many people—and I have been blessed to have scores of people who have worked for me since I have been in the Senate—has a deep constitutional commitment to the principle that anything worth doing at all is worth doing well. No matter how long it took, no matter how early she had to come in in order to make it work, no matter what the complexity of the scheduling matter of which I or other staff members were depending on her to see us through, she saw it through.

I cannot begin to relate the number of days, Mr. President, on which when I arrived in the office—and I often arrive early—I found Pat there, the first person in the office and often, I might say, the last person to leave on the same day.

When I was flying out of Washington to Boston or elsewhere in the country, she was at her phone until she knew the plane had taken off, until she knew there was no delay, no cancellation, no crisis to rearrange. All who dealt with her and those who work in my office and those who work in other Senate or House offices or elsewhere in government, constituents in Massachusetts, and all others, knew her to be an utterly and remarkably dependable person.

It was her responsibility to make certain people understood. And because it was her responsibility, they did understand that they could depend on her. That is a very special brand of devotion, and I would respectfully suggest different probably from a lot of the mores that currently circulate at large in our country.

I also want to underscore that she did not just stumble into government by accident. This was not a place where she had to find a job. This was not a place where she wound up because she did not have the talent to find any kind of work anywhere else. This was a place that she worked for more than a quarter of a century with a purpose because she believed devoutly in the ability of this place to make a difference in the lives of other people and in the

ability of the democratic government, and more importantly, the fundamental responsibility of a democratic government to serve people.

Unlike those who hold the philosophy that government is just somehow inherently incapable of ever helping somebody, she believes intently that bureaucracy aside, government has the ability, well delivered, efficient, and well thought out, to be able to help people to do things for themselves, not to do things for them. I think that she also shares a deep belief that corporately good things can happen that improve the quality of life that individuals sometimes simply cannot do on their own.

She believes that government has, just as individuals have, a very special obligation to those who do not share the good fortune that others enjoy, and she particularly always shared and I think her work for Hubert Humphrey and Muriel Humphrey and Paul Douglas, and I hope she will feel for me, were part of her commitment to the impoverished, the illiterate, sick, elderly, the disabled, and those for whom life is hard in many ways, that others never know or know only in mild terms.

This foundation energized Pat Gray, and I think over all the years they gave her a stamina and the ability to persevere even when others would have thrown up their hands and walked away. It led her to spend her entire career in public service, when she really could have chosen a dozen other courses.

Recently, and to my benefit, Mr. President, that commitment caused her to remain at her post even after she was entitled to full retirement benefits. Her dedication to improving government, to making it work better, for the benefit of those who need and depend on its wide variety of services, is visible to everybody who ever came in contact with her. She knows that every person who works in government, regardless of his or her specific position or responsibility is a part of the whole, and therefore the effect of the whole, and she has been determined that her contribution would be measured as positive.

Finally, Mr. President, Pat has been nothing if she has not been tenacious. Surrender is simply not a word in her lexicon. If she believes it is her duty to accomplish something, all of us in my office, or in offices around her—including I might say, at peril several times learned—it is best not to inadvertently be standing between her and her goal. When it came to keeping that schedule, despite the uncontrollable interruptions, despite all the forces that tugged at it, no one could have mustered or demonstrated greater energy or commitment than she did.

It is a blessing, Mr. President, at the right time, after a lifetime of work, to leave the workplace for the pleasures of her retirement. But that time has now arrived for Pat. So, no longer

every week will she have to leave her husband Ken, himself a veteran of public service with Senator Douglas, Senator and Vice President Humphrey, Senator Stevenson, Senator Tydings, several Presidential campaigns, and a number of other posts, who has been retired for a couple of years, no longer will she have to leave him in their home on the side of Old Rag Mountain in the Blue Ridge in order to commute here for long days in the office and short nights in an Arlington apartment. No longer will she be unable to join him in Colorado at their mountain cabin for the few weeks of the summer that she gets, as she did forgo on occasion because of the Senate schedule. Ultimately her friends, her family, and above all, her garden that she cherishes will be the winners for this moment.

In my office, we will take a very, very special pleasure in knowing that she will be enjoying this well-earned time so much. After her many years of contribution to the U.S. Senate and to the country and to my State and to my office personally, we wish her, as I know everyone who has come in contact with her in the Senate and in Washington does, we wish her well. She has made her mark and we should all wish that we could live a life as clearly committed and devoted as hers.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Muriel Humphrey be printed in the RECORD.

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

APRIL 29, 1997.

DEAR PAT: How I wish I could be with you on this very special occasion. However, although I cannot be with you personally, I am pleased to have this opportunity to express to you my hearty congratulations and sincere best wishes as you retire after many years of dedicated public service.

Pat, I want you to know how grateful I am to you for all you have done for Hubert and me. We could always depend on your expertise, your loyalty, your friendship and support throughout the years, and that meant a great deal to us. You contributed substantially to whatever success we enjoyed and you were there to encourage us in times of struggle and challenge. You are truly a part of the Humphrey family!

It is certainly appropriate that your many friends and colleagues gather to honor you on this special occasion. I add my voice to theirs in wishing you all the very best for a long, happy and fulfilling retirement.

Again, Pat, congratulations!

Warm regards,

MURIEL HUMPHREY BROWN.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, April 28, 1997, the Federal debt stood at \$5,347,125,099,434.10. (Five trillion, three hundred forty-seven billion, one hundred twenty-five million, ninety-nine thousand, four hundred thirty-four dollars and ten cents.)

Five years ago, April 28, 1992, the Federal debt stood at \$3,884,477,000,000. (Three trillion, eight hundred eighty-four

billion, four hundred seventy-seven million.)

Ten years ago, April 28, 1987, the Federal debt stood at \$2,265,888,000,000. (Two trillion, two hundred sixty-five billion, eight hundred eighty-eight million.)

Fifteen years ago, April 28, 1982, the Federal debt stood at \$1,062,161,000,000. (One trillion, sixty-two billion, one hundred sixty-one million.)

Twenty-five years ago, April 28, 1972, the Federal debt stood at \$425,304,000,000 (four hundred twenty-five billion, three hundred four million), which reflects a debt increase of nearly \$5 trillion—\$4,921,821,099,434.10 (four trillion, nine hundred twenty-one billion, eight hundred twenty-one million, ninety-nine thousand, four hundred thirty-four dollars and ten cents), during the past 25 years.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-1757. A communication from the Vice Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, proposed regulations governing recordkeeping and reporting by political committees; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-1758. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule entitled "Grants Program to Indian Tribes" received on April 24, 1997; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-1759. A communication from the Acting Inspector General of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual Superfund report for fiscal year 1996; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1760. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, case number 96-07; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1761. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the cumulative report on rescissions deferrals dated April 1, 1997; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committee on the Budget, to the Committee on Appropriations, to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, to the Committee on Armed Services, to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, to the Committee on the Judiciary, and to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1762. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the certification of a proposed issuance of an export license; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1763. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to establish a small business loan program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1764. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, a rule entitled "Compensation for Certain Undiagnosed Illnesses" (RIN2900-A177) received on April 28, 1997; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 662. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel VORTICE; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KERREY:

S. 663. A bill to enhance taxpayer value in auctions conducted by the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. INOUE, Mr. GLENN, Mr. DODD, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. REID):

S. 664. A bill to establish tutoring assistance programs to help children learn to read well; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. KERREY:

S. 665. A bill to monitor the progress of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 666. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to States that do not give full faith and credit to the protective orders of other States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KERREY:

S. 663. A bill to enhance taxpayer value in auctions conducted by the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE RESERVE PRICE ACT

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, for most Americans a buck doesn't go very far. A dollar will not buy a cup of coffee at Starbucks, it will not buy a comic book at the 7-11, it will not buy a package of batteries at the True Value store, or even a gallon of gas at the Amoco station. But, at the FCC, a buck will buy a radio license to serve the city of St. Louis.

On Friday, the FCC completed an auction of radio spectrum which should cause every American taxpayer to be concerned. This action yielded less than 1 percent of the amount anticipated. Rather than raising \$1.8 billion as the Congress had expected, the FCC brought in only \$13.6 million.

Perhaps worse of all, several licenses were awarded to bidders for the incredible sum of \$1. That's well below the bargain basement. Mike Mills of the Washington Post aptly observed that a sign should be put in front of the FCC auction headquarters advertising "everything for a buck." One bidder won

four licenses at a dollar a piece. Those licenses combined would allow services to reach 15 million people. Another bidder won the right to serve St. Louis, one of the largest cities in America for \$1. It is as if we had returned to the days of license lotteries. That's one heck of a way to stretch a dollar.

Radio spectrum is a national asset. It must be prudently managed. The taxpayers count on the Federal Communications Commission to allocate spectrum among and between various uses to assure that the public interest is served and to assure that those uses do not interfere with each other.

In 1993, the Congress enacted legislation which revolutionized the way radio frequencies are allocated. After years of debate, the Congress took the step to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to use auctions to allocate licenses for radio spectrum. It was built on the premise that investors would pay for the right to offer new wireless communications services.

Prior to 1993, licenses were awarded by lottery or by a comparative application process. In both cases, license winners would often sell their licenses soon after acquiring them to others for substantial sums.

To cut out the middle man and give taxpayers a return from the valuable rights they were awarding, the Congress ordered the FCC to conduct auctions to award radio spectrum licenses.

In general, this approach has worked very well. It has proven to be an efficient means of allocating scarce resources and it has reaped billions of dollars of deficit reduction for the American taxpayer.

Unfortunately, something went wrong in this last auction. One problem was that the auction rules did not establish a minimum bid or a reserve price. That's how some lucky bidders won valuable licenses for a buck.

Mr. President, I offer legislation today which will help ensure that taxpayers are protected in future FCC auctions. The importance of this legislation is heightened by the increasing congressional reliance on spectrum auctions in telecommunications and budget policy. The President's budget alone relies on \$36 billion of revenues from spectrum auctions.

The Reserve Price Act requires the FCC to set a minimum price for each unit auctioned. If no one bids the minimum, then what is not sold will be re-evaluated and placed in the next scheduled auction. With a reserve price system, taxpayers will be guaranteed that national assets are not sold for a song.

The Chairman of the FCC reportedly said that the reason for the disappointing return from Friday's auction was the "the Congress got to greedy" with spectrum revenues. Perhaps, this auction was rushed. But with reserve prices, even a rushed auction would not have to be a disastrous auction.

I urge my colleagues to review and support the Reserve Price Act. The American taxpayer deserves as much.