

not been the lack of regulation. That has exactly been the problem, lack of regulation. We must have some kind of regulatory authority to look over the shoulder and watch and see what is happening. But the fact is there has been no regulation.

The fact is the Federal Reserve Board in the Greenspan era, more recently Bernanke, and the Bush administration have watched while all of these financial engineers have created the most sophisticated of securities and devices. The financial engineers created things such as derivatives, collateralized debt obligations, called CDOs, credit default swaps—\$23 trillion of notional values out there in credit default swaps—loan syndications, securitization, off-the-balance-sheet debt vehicles. It is unbelievable what has been going on, all in the name of financial engineering, and while the economy was going up, everybody thought they were all geniuses. And now as it is collapsing like a house of cards, the Federal Reserve and the head of the Treasury Department rush to try to help the big interests. The question is, what about the rest of the folks who are getting hurt? There are a lot of them. What about the rest?

I mentioned Bear Stearns was about to go belly up and the Fed and the Treasury Department assessed that could not happen because it would affect the entire financial system. I don't know whether they are right. I know it has become a kind of no-fault capitalism when the investment banks can take very big risks, and then when it comes time that it does not work out, the taxpayers come in and say: Don't worry, we will put up a safety net.

About 16 months ago, Bear Stearns gave the chairman of Bear Stearns, James Cayne, a stock bonus of \$14.8 million. The year before, he had gotten \$30.3 million in compensation. This company that went belly up over the last 5 years, the chairman, Mr. Cayne, made \$156 million in income. Let me say that again. This is a company that went belly up because it took risks that were way outside the norm, in my judgment. The chairman received \$156 million between 2002 and 2006. The CEO, Alan Schwartz, received \$141 million in income during that same period, and the former company president, Warren Spector, \$168 million.

Let me say that again. Three top officials at Bear Stearns, 15, 16 months ago received very large bonuses, and in the last 5 years received the following compensations: \$156 million, \$141 million, and \$168 million. This is like hogs in a trough, all except for the grunting and shoving, which we cannot yet hear, but we will, I assume. It is unbelievable. There is unbelievable greed in this system.

We are told again by the Secretary of the Treasury that this was not the fault of a lack of regulation. Of course, it was the fault of no regulation.

This is from the Wall Street Journal, March 2008:

A year ago at a Honolulu hotel, the heads of three Federal regulatory agencies charged with guarding the soundness of America's banks delivered this message: We're the ones you want regulating you.

Essentially telling them, we are going to compete for lax regulations. It doesn't matter what you do, we are not going to watch very much because we believe in deregulation.

So we have an unbelievable amount of hedge fund activity that did not use to exist in this country. It is now completely deregulated—hedge funds involved in derivatives way behind the curtain, and nobody knows what is going on; mortgage companies advertising that you ought to get a mortgage from them if you have bad credit because they wish to give you a mortgage, and then they slice it up in securities and send it around the world and no one knows what is in these securities. All of a sudden that piece of sausage explodes and we wonder why? It exploded because it never made good business sense, and now the American taxpayers are going to bail them all out.

We cannot begin to address this problem unless we understand that when the big interests are going to make hundreds of millions, even billions of dollars as a result of almost unprecedented greed, there needs to be some regulation. That is a fact. Regulation is not a four-letter word. It is an essential part of good government.

Long ago, I and others have been on the floor of the Senate talking about need for some regulation with respect to hedge funds, but we have not been able to get legislation through the Congress. But this is not just about regulating hedge funds; it is about the agencies that are already empowered to regulate refusing to do their jobs.

The Secretary of the Treasury today announced a series of steps that he portrays as a substantial addressing of the issues that are now involved in subprime lending and the other financial difficulties. But in many ways, it is moving the boxes around and, it appears to me to be deregulation rather than the need for additional regulation and additional oversight.

It is not just in this area of housing, it is not just in the area of investment banking or hedge funds. I have mentioned on the floor previously that there is unbelievable speculation in a range of areas. Oil—the fact is I believe, and there are some experts who believe, that the price of oil at the moment is about \$30 above where it ought to be. Why? Because for the first time hedge funds and investment banks are hip deep in the oil futures market, driving up the price of oil, having nothing at all to do with the supply and demand of oil. Once again, unbelievable speculation. For what purpose? For the purpose of unbelievable profitability.

We have not had investment banks previously buying oil storage capability so they can buy oil on the futures market and take it off the mar-

ket and put it in storage and wait until the price goes up. We have not had that before. That is the kind of speculation that I think is counter to the interests of this country's economy. It is not counter to the interests of those who want very large profits, even if the rest of the American people have to pay for that unbelievable speculation.

There are some who say, if we can address this issue now, the issue of housing, the issue of predatory lending, if we can address the issue of investment banks, the issues of some hedge funds, that will all be fine. That is not the case either. There are some other underlying problems that almost everyone in this world knows but no one is interested in doing anything about it. The dollar is losing value substantially for a number of reasons, but at least two of those reasons are obvious: No. 1, an \$800 billion trade deficit; No. 2, the \$700 billion required additional borrowing this year because of budget policy.

I know the President says the deficit is a projected \$410 billion. That is not true. Take a look at what our country is going to be required to borrow in the coming years—\$700 billion. You add an \$800 billion trade deficit to a \$700 billion borrowing requirement because of a reckless budget policy and you have \$1.5 trillion borrowing in 1 year against a \$14 trillion economy. People know that doesn't work.

I mean, the fact is, we have to fix this system, and we start, it seems to me, this week, with the proposition that if we can deal with the housing piece, at least you start trying to help some of the American people who really deserve some help at this point in order to keep their homes. That is the first piece of legislation on the floor of the Senate this week. That is a reasonable thing to do. If this Government, at its highest levels, can take billions and tens of billions of dollars around Wall Street and say to the Wall Street firms, here is \$29 billion if you will pay \$1.3 billion for a firm that used to be worth \$20 billion a couple weeks ago—if we can do that and assume all that risk on behalf of the American taxpayers for the kind of activities on Wall Street that represent, in my judgment, unsound business practices and unbelievable speculation, this Congress can certainly reach out to home owners across this country to say that we want to give them some help. We will see tomorrow or the next day what might or might not happen with respect to the willingness of this Senate to address this housing issue.

WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, I had a chance to meet Herman Wouk, who is one of America's greatest authors. He wrote "Caine Mutiny" and he wrote "War and Remembrance." He is 91 years old and a remarkable man, just a remarkable man. He was telling me something kind of in jest. He said:

You know, I don't know much about what happened after 1945, but I know everything that happened before 1945. He was talking about his body of work, his research on the Second World War and prior to that period of time. And he wrote wonderful books, as all of us know. He is one of America's greatest authors.

Herman Wouk and I were talking about the Iraq war and talking about the stories about the Iraq war, and he said to me: Do you know anything about the Truman Committee? Do you know anything about what happened in the Second World War with President Harry Truman, then-Senator Harry Truman, who created a committee, a special committee in the United States Senate, bipartisan, to go after this issue of contract fraud that was going on with respect to defense contracting? I told him I certainly did know about the Truman committee, and we have had, I believe, four votes in the Senate that I offered as amendments to establish a Truman committee.

At this point I want to show my colleagues a photograph of a man. I don't know this man personally. This comes from a Thursday, March 27, edition of the New York Times.

I read an article about this man on an airplane, and I was struck by it because it is such an unbelievable story, and it is another chapter of, in my judgment, a shameful series of chapters of abuse of the American people by contractors with respect to the Iraq war.

The New York Times published this article, and this is a picture of a 22-year-old man from Miami Beach. He had gotten contracts worth over \$300 million in U.S. taxpayers' dollars, and he had signed a contract with the U.S. Army to provide arms to Afghan soldiers.

Apparently, we, as taxpayers, and the U.S. Army, were trying to provide additional arms for the Afghan Army with which to fight and defend itself. So this 22-year-old man got a \$300 million contract from the Army Sustainment Command, through a company that had been a shell for a number of years established by this man's father. Mr. Diveroli is his name. This is a mug shot from the Miami Dade Police Department. He had allegedly assaulted a parking lot attendant and had a forged driver's license when he was arrested, which made him out to be 4 years older than he really was. He told police he had gotten the forged driver's license to buy alcohol, but now that he was over 21 he didn't need it any longer.

So this is a 22-year-old man who was the CEO of a company called AEY based in Miami Beach. And this is a picture of the building that was headquarters for his company, but there was nothing on any door in the building. Apparently, in one part of this building an office was supposed to be his office, but there was nothing that identified his office.

And here is a picture of his vice president, the vice president of this company, this company to which the U.S. Army gave a \$300 million contract. The vice president is a 25-year-old masseur named David Packouz. He is the former vice president of the firm that got \$300 million. So you have a 22-year-old and a 25-year-old masseur who get \$300 million from the U.S. Army.

Now, what did they do with the \$300 million? Well, the next photograph, again from the New York Times, shows outdated ammunition sold to Afghan forces, including 40-year-old Chinese-made cartridges. So these folks got \$300 million and they were providing mid-1960s cartridges to the Afghan Army, which the Afghan Army was receiving in cardboard boxes that had not been properly taped and were falling apart. The Afghan Army described these armaments as junk. Here is an Afghan policeman surveying 42-year-old Chinese ammunition that arrived in crumbling boxes.

Again, American taxpayers, through the Army Sustainment Command, paid hundreds of millions of dollars to a company that previously had been a shell company, a shell corporation, now run by a 22-year-old who says that he is the only employee of the corporation.

Now, Mr. President, I have spent a lot of time on the floor of the Senate on these kinds of issues. It is pretty unbelievable when you think about it. I don't know Mr. Diveroli personally. Never met him. I do know that three reporters from the New York Times did some extraordinary work—C.J. Chivers, Eric Schmitt, and Nicholas Wood, to expose his activities. I don't know how long it took them to do this investigative piece, but it is two full pages inside the New York Times. They obviously traveled to Afghanistan and other countries to finish this investigative piece. We wouldn't know about this issue were it not for investigative reports by the New York Times.

In January of 2007, that is just 14 months ago, the most recent award, which I believe was \$150 million, was given by the Army Sustainment Command, and the Army Sustainment Command said:

AEY's proposal represented the best value to the government.

I am telling you, this part of the U.S. Army has a lot of explaining to do to this Congress and to the American people. This is the same Army Sustainment Command and, incidentally, the same general in charge of the Army Sustainment Command who went to a hearing here in the Senate, and following my testimony before a hearing about the water problems in Iraq and about Halliburton Corporation providing water to the troops, non-potable water that was twice as contaminated as raw water from the Euphrates River, we had the evidence, internal Halliburton memorandums, saying it was a near miss. It could have caused mass sickness or death. This is

the same general who went to that Senate committee and said: Never happened.

Well, now the inspector general has finished an investigation and said in fact it did happen. It did happen. This general has some explaining to do.

I have asked Secretary Gates, the Defense Secretary, to ask this general to explain himself, and so should this Congress.

But I don't understand, I just don't understand how even following information sent to this country, to the Army Sustainment Command by U.S. military officers in Afghanistan, saying what they are sending over here in the form of armaments under this contract is junk and it needs to stop, even following that it continued. It is an unbelievable amount of government waste.

This is but one issue. And we wouldn't know about it if it were not for the New York Times. This has been going on for years. We have been fighting in Iraq longer than we were fighting in the Second World War.

Now, let me go back to something they did in the Second World War. Harry Truman, in this Chamber, stood up and offered a proposal to create the Truman Committee, bipartisan. For \$15,000, they created a committee, and it worked for 7 years and saved \$15 billion investigating waste, fraud, and abuse in defense spending during the Second World War. Now, Mr. President, I have been trying for 4 years to get this Congress to empower a committee and to impanel a bipartisan committee to go after this kind of waste, fraud, and abuse.

Let me go over just a few of the things. I have held, I believe, about 12 hearings in the Policy Committee, but the Democratic Policy Committee does not have subpoena power, and I have only held these hearings because other committees have not. Oversight is a responsibility of this Congress.

Mr. President, I want to show a photograph of Bunnatine Greenhouse. I have done it on many occasions. But the reason I wanted to show the photograph is because Bunnatine Greenhouse is a very courageous woman. This woman rose to become the highest civilian official at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This is a remarkable woman. By all accounts, according to people outside of government, she was the finest purchasing agent and an unbelievable public servant. But she blew the whistle on abusive Halliburton contracts. She said it was the most significant abuse of contracting authority she had seen in her career.

Guess what happened to her. It is what happens to too many whistleblowers. She got demoted and lost her job. She got demoted because she had the guts to speak out.

This whole issue has now been subsumed behind the wall in the Defense Department. We can't talk about it now because it is under investigation. This woman lost her job nearly 4 years

ago and was replaced, by the way, by someone who had no experience, not a day's worth of experience in contracting authority. That is the way it works over there. You blow the whistle, you pay for it with your career.

I called the person that hired Bunnatine Greenhouse one night at his home—LTG Joe Ballard. He had since retired from the military. And I said: General Ballard, Bunnatine Greenhouse spoke out about the billions of dollars given the Halliburton Corporation and the abuse and the way those contracts were let and she was demoted. Tell me about Bunnatine Greenhouse. You hired her.

He said: She is the best. She got a raw deal.

This is from General Ballard, since retired. Well, the Pentagon decided to award a big no-bid, sole-source contract to the Halliburton Corporation. It is called Restore Iraqi Oil, the RIO-C, and then they had other contracts—the LOGCAP contract. The waivers that were required were not given. This was short-circuited, and we have seen the result of this now for a long period of time.

Mr. President, I have been to the floor a good many times to talk about the hearings I have held, and I don't mean to single out Halliburton, it is just the company that has gotten the biggest contracts. But when a company gets hundreds of millions of dollars, or billions of dollars and then, in my judgment, is not performing and is taking all the money, we have a right to ask questions. We had \$85,000 brand new trucks left beside the road in a zone that was not considered hostile at all, to be torched and set on fire because they didn't have enough equipment, or didn't have a wrench to fix a tire; \$85,000 brand new trucks left to be torched beside the road in safe areas because they had a plugged fuel tank. The attitude is that it doesn't matter, the taxpayers will pay for that. It doesn't matter, it is a cost-plus contract. A cost-plus contract, taxpayers will pay for that.

Let me show a towel. It is sometimes the smallest issues that make the biggest points. Henry Bunting came and testified for the Halliburton Corporation. He worked in Kuwait. He was the purchasing agent for our troops in Iraq.

One of his jobs was to purchase towels, so he wrote out a purchase order for towels for the troops and his supervisor looked at that and said no, you can't buy those towels. Bunting wanted to buy plain white towels. He was told that he needed to buy a towel that has KBR's logo, Kellogg Brown & Root, a subsidiary of Halliburton, embroidered on it. He said the problem is that will triple the cost of the towels they are buying for the troops. His supervisor said you don't understand, it doesn't matter. These are cost-plus contracts. It doesn't matter.

Henry Bunting told us about tripling or quadrupling the cost of towels, about paying \$45 for a case of Coca-

Cola, about \$7,600 for a 1-month lease of an SUV, about 25 tons of nails sitting on the ground, on the sand of Iraq, because somebody ordered 50,000 pounds of nails and ordered them too short. It doesn't matter, the taxpayer pays for all that. Throw them on the sand and reorder.

How about charging for 42,000 meals for the soldiers, a day, and serving only 14,000 meals a day? Missing, 28,000 meals. It doesn't look like an innocent mistake to me. Rory Mayberry came to testify at a hearing I held. He was a supervisor of food service for the Halliburton subsidiary. He said we were told that when an auditor came by, don't you dare talk to an auditor. We forbid you to speak to a government auditor. He said they were routinely charging for more food for soldiers than soldiers existed—routinely. He said they were routinely serving expired, date-stamped food. The supervisor said it doesn't matter, serve it to the troops.

I mentioned the issue of water quality; again, the issue of requirement in the contract to provide water to our troops at the military bases in Iraq. That was a Halliburton contract. A couple of whistleblowers came to me and gave me the internal memorandum in the company. They were providing water that was twice as contaminated as raw water from the Euphrates River. I had it in writing. Yet Halliburton denied it and so did the U.S. Army. Only when the inspector general did the investigation I requested did we find out Halliburton was not telling the truth, nor was the U.S. Army. That is a sad comment.

I want to show a picture of some money. The fellow who was holding this cash came to testify. I believe I have a chart that shows the money. These are one-hundred dollar bills, in bricks, wrapped with Saran Wrap. This guy, named Frank—this was in a building in Baghdad. Down below in the vault of that building were several billion dollars.

By the way, \$18 billion of cash was loaded on C-130s, from this country, to go to Iraq—\$18 billion in cash. It was not accounted for.

There was a man who was contracted to be able to do the accounting. His name was Howell. His address was a residential home in San Diego, CA, and his company allegedly was NorthStar Consulting. No one has ever been able to find anything NorthStar Consulting did, except we know they got \$1.4 million and there is no evidence they had any accounting on staff, any accountant at all. There is no evidence that any of the \$18 billion in cash that was moved by C-130 airplanes to Iraq was accounted for.

This is \$2 million. This \$2 million.

By the way, Frank said from time to time they would throw these around as footballs in the office because there was a lot of cash around there. He said the refrain in their office was: You bring a bag because we pay in cash. He said it was like the Wild West.

This belonged to Custer Battles, by the way, this cash. They showed up in Iraq with no experience, a new company. They got \$100 million in new contracts very quickly and then a whistleblower—at least the whistleblower says they threatened to kill him. He said you can't do this. They took forklift trucks that belonged to the Baghdad Airport, allegedly painted them blue, and then sold them back to the Coalition Provisional Authority. That was us, by the way. We were paying for all of that. Custer Battles, this was one of their payments. I expect they have been under criminal investigation now for some while—and if they have not, they should be. That was only \$2 million, but they got \$100 million.

There is so much to say about these issues. The Parsons Corporation is a company that was to build health clinics in Iraq. The Parsons Corporation was provided \$243 million in a contract by us to build or repair 142 health clinics in the country of Iraq. Three years later the \$200 million was gone, but there were only 20 health clinics and those that existed were of shoddy construction. A man who was an Iraqi physician, a doctor, came and talked to me about it. He said he went to the Iraqi health minister because he knew this money was supposed to go to address health issues in Iraq. He said to the Iraqi health minister, I understand an American company got \$200-plus million. I want to tour all these healthcare facilities that were supposed to be built. The Iraqi health minister said you don't understand. Many of these were imaginary clinics.

The money is gone. The American taxpayer got fleeced again. The money is all gone, but the clinics don't exist.

We have shoveled money out the door here in this Congress. This President has said I want to send soldiers to war but I do not intend to pay for it. Not a cent of it has been paid for. Since the war started, every single dollar has been requested as an emergency by the President, emergency spending. It is unbelievable; nearly two-thirds of a trillion dollars emergency spending. A substantial amount of money has been shoveled out the door here for contracting, very big contracts in Iraq—some reconstruction, some replenishment of military accounts, but very large contracts with almost no oversight. The American taxpayer has been stolen blind. This is easy to say, in my judgment, the largest amount of waste, fraud, and abuse in the history of this country.

It has gone on for over 5 years. There is no excuse, none, for this Congress not creating a Truman committee with subpoena power, bipartisan, to investigate and bring justice and provide the oversight necessary on this kind of contract abuse. There is no excuse.

I know some over the years have made excuses. I have offered the amendment three times, perhaps four, but we voted on it three times. I have people stand up in the Senate and say

we are doing the oversight hearings, we are doing hearings. We are not. That is not true. The Appropriations Committee did one a month ago after I pushed and pushed. I appreciate the Appropriations Committee doing it. We will do another one in about a month, a little less than a month. That is fine. That is not a substitute for doing 60 hearings a year for 7 years, as the Truman committee did.

American taxpayers deserve better than they have gotten from this President and from the Congress for the last 5 years.

Senator REID and I have talked about this a great deal. Senator REID has aggressively supported the creation of a special committee, a bipartisan committee to investigate this kind of waste, fraud, and abuse. It is long past the time we do it.

I come back to the point I made originally. When I pick up a New York Times and see that \$300 million of contracts is given to a shell corporation in Miami, FL, with no name on the door of the building, a corporation headed by a 22-year-old as president, a 26-year-old masseur as vice president, I ask the question: Who makes those judgments? Who is responsible? Who is accountable?

From that several hundred million dollars, 50-year-old weaponry is sent to Afghanistan in the name of American taxpayers, in boxes that are not taped up properly, weaponry that comes, in some cases, from the 1960s, in China.

That is unbelievable to me. Some might be able to read the New York Times piece and say that is all right, I have read this before. I have read we were double charged for gasoline for our American troops in Iraq. I have read we were overcharged for meals. I read we paid for health clinics that did not get built. I read all these things. You know what, it is not such a big deal.

It is a big deal with me. It ought to be a big deal with this Congress. The American people, I think, are sick and tired of this and they deserve a Congress that is going to do something about it.

I obviously wish I didn't have to come to the floor to talk about this. I wish instead my energy was devoted to a committee that had subpoena power. The very first thing we should do—and, by the way, I am writing a letter to the appropriate subcommittee saying I want you to subpoena the principals in this contract and I want you to subpoena the general in charge of the Army Sustainment Command and I want them to come to testify and explain to the American people and explain to us how is it during wartime that we seem to blink and turn our head to what is, I believe, war profiteering. Who has allowed us be that immune to the interests of the American troops? This undermines and disservices the American soldiers. It certainly disservices the American taxpayers and does not represent the best interests of this country.

In the coming days I intend to come to the floor a good many times to speak about this and be a general burr under the saddle—which is a term that people are perhaps more acquainted with in my home State because we raise a lot of horses. But it seems to me the only way to get this sort of thing done is to be a problem and to embarrass those who do not want to do it, and I am prepared to do that. I think it is long past the time to say to the American people: You don't have to read it anymore in the newspaper. The newspaper is not going to be required to do oversight for this Congress. The Congress finally, at long last, will do its own oversight and will do a good job and tell the American people you can count on us. That has not been the case earlier when this war started because no one wanted to do the necessary kind of oversight because it was the kind of oversight that would probably raise some hackles and embarrass some folks.

I might also say, there was a piece of legislation passed—in fact, the Presiding Officer, Senator WEBB, and Senator MCCASKILL and others put it together last year, which I supported—which deals with a Truman commission. It is not the equivalent of a Truman committee. A Truman committee is a standing committee with subpoena power, but the Truman Commission is a step forward and I supported it. It will be a commission that operates on a one-time basis to develop recommendations and take a look at what is happening.

The Wartime Contracting Commission has a 2-year sunset, and I commend my colleagues for trying to put together and for successfully putting together a commission, but I do say that we need in this Congress a committee, a bipartisan select committee, with subpoena power and we need it now.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for such time as I might consume.

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

The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, in the Senate, we are surrounded by history. The same can be said of the Capitol itself and, of course, of Washington, DC. It is very humbling to think that when we travel around the Nation's Capital, we

are following the paths that many great statesmen walked before us.

Reflecting on our past can be a source of great pleasure, and it can lead to great insight. Learning about the lives of great Americans—the grand accomplishments and humanizing habits—is both entertaining and educational. Indeed, it is emblazoned in the rotunda in the Library of Congress that “History is the biography of great men.” The accomplishments of great Americans give us heights to which to aspire, and their failures give us guidance for our own pursuits.

Unfortunately, the pleasure of knowing history escapes many younger Americans. Study after study has shown that our students lack even a rudimentary knowledge of American history.

The most recent National Assessment of Education Progress found that elementary, middle, and high school students fall short in terms of what they know about U.S. history. According to the NAEP, the Nation's report card, roughly a third of fourth graders and eighth graders fall below what is deemed a “basic” level of proficiency in U.S. history. Our high schoolers fare much worse. More than half of 12th graders fall below the “basic level.”

The news does not improve as students move on to college. Older students fare poorly as well, even those who attend what are considered our top universities and colleges. A recent survey of college freshmen and seniors revealed that many students are ignorant of what many of us consider basic facts of American history. For instance, only 47 percent of freshmen knew that Yorktown brought the Revolutionary War to an end. Seniors did even worse—only 45 percent knew. Another example: 42 percent of college freshmen could not identify on a multiple-choice test the 25-year period during which Abraham Lincoln was elected President. And another: 15 percent of seniors did not know that the Declaration of Independence denotes the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The results are disappointing, to say the least. They reveal that younger Americans have a poor concept of what is necessary for good citizenship. What is the basis for the social compact of Americans? Many younger Americans do not know that our Government was founded on principles and values of innate equality and liberty. We have known about these deficiencies for a long time. Yet very little progress has occurred. This must change if American voters are to be able to evaluate candidates and issues on the basis of American principles and values.

It was 13 years ago that the Senate debated the national illiteracy of U.S. history. At that time, the Senate was considering controversial national U.S. history standards. These standards were flawed, neglecting important individuals, ideas, and events for the sake