

basis early this year based on agreements reached during the last session between all interested parties.

THE MILITARY RECRUITER
CAMPUS ACCESS ACT

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Military Recruiter Campus Access Act, which would deny all Federal funds to educational institutions that bar or impair military recruiting. As you know, this phenomenon has proliferated across the country in recent years.

This has outraged me for years, Mr. Speaker. Simply justice demands that we not give taxpayer dollars to institutions which are interfering with the Federal Government's constitutionally mandated function of raising a military. Further, with the defense drawdown, recruiting the most highly qualified candidates from around the country has become even more important.

Last year, we began to deal with this injustice with the overwhelming passage of my amendment to the fiscal year 1995 DOD authorization bill which, with the support of Senator NICKLES, became law on October 1. That law, which denies any DOD funds from going to colleges and universities which are discriminating against recruiters, has already begun to have some positive effect. I am told by the Pentagon that schools across the country are getting the message and preparing to accommodate recruiters rather than lose their precious funding.

But to pick up the stragglers who are still not complying, further action is necessary. We have additional leverage, Mr. Speaker. My amendment last year covered only DOD funds, which amount to roughly \$3 billion annually. But the Federal Government provides an additional \$8 billion annually in grant and contract funding to colleges and universities through other departments and agencies such as HHS, Agriculture, and the National Science Foundation.

Barring military recruiters is an intrusion on Federal prerogatives, a slap in the face to our Nation's fine military personnel, and an impediment to sound national security policy. We should draw the line on this in the 104th Congress, Mr. Speaker, I urge bipartisan support for the bill.

INTRODUCTION OF PREPAYMENT
OF LIFE INSURANCE BENEFITS
BILL

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation which has had strong bipartisan support in the past, legislation to provide for the prepayment of death benefits on life insurance contracts for the terminally ill.

I first introduced this legislation in the 101st Congress. It had over 100 bipartisan cospon-

sors in the 102d Congress. I subsequently worked closely with the Bush administration in its attempt to accomplish this important goal by regulation. The regulations, however, were not final when the Clinton administration took office and have not been finalized. The Clinton administration included this provision in the President's Health Care plan and it was subsequently included in both the Ways and Means Committee and Mitchell Health Care bills. A version of this legislation is also included in the Republican contract.

This legislation would allow individuals who are certified by a physician to have a terminal illness or injury which can reasonably be expected to result in death within 12 months, to receive the proceeds of their life insurance contracts on a tax free basis.

I believe that access to these assets will make the lives of the terminally ill significantly easier with little cost to the Federal Government.

Under current law, life insurance proceeds payable on death are generally tax free. This legislation, therefore, should have only a minor revenue impact in that the only change would be one of timing—tax free receipt of life insurance proceeds one year earlier than otherwise would be the case.

In addition, access to these assets is critical to those many terminally ill individuals, who have no health insurance. To the extent that these individuals tap their life insurance policies to pay their final health care costs, Federal dollars will be saved.

ENGLISH IS OUR COMMON THREAD

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, many times before I have taken to the floor to speak about the importance of the English language. For decades, English has been the de facto language of the United States. In recent years, 19 States have designated English as their official language. Support for these efforts has been overwhelming. I strongly believe that English should be the official language of the United States Government. I have been a persistent sponsor of such legislation, and I will again today introduce the Language of Government Act.

At the same time, however, I want to recognize the important contributions of other languages through a sense-of-the-Congress resolution. In an increasingly global world, foreign languages are key to international communication. I strongly encourage those who already speak English to learn foreign languages.

As a nation of immigrants, America is comprised of people of all races, nationalities, and languages. These differences make our Nation the wonderful place it is. While being different, all of these people can find a common means of communication in the English language. English is the common thread that connects every citizen in our great Nation.

MAKING THE POSTAL SERVICE
MORE COMPETITIVE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, remember that lame old excuse, "the check is in the mail." In days gone by, those who heard it hoped and prayed it was true. For if it was, they knew that they would soon be getting their money.

Not so today. As far too many people have found out, putting the check in the mail gives neither the sender nor the would-be recipient any assurance whatsoever that it will actually arrive at its intended destination. Or that it will get there in time to avoid late charges or black marks on one's credit rating.

Over and over this past year, we heard stories about mail being dumped, burned or stashed by mail carriers or hidden away in warehouses by postal managers not wanting to admit how far behind their delivery efforts had fallen. At least a half dozen of these instances occurred in the Chicago area alone.

On top of that, reports of slow mail delivery have been too numerous to mention. As a result, people have lost confidence in the Postal Service and remedies such as a new \$7 million logo or a 3-cent increase in the cost of first class postage have done nothing to restore it.

To be fair, the U.S. Postal Service [USPS] has made repeated efforts in recent months to improve the quality and timeliness of its service. But this is not the first time questions have been raised about the USPS's performance or that attempts to improve it have been made. To the contrary, there has been enough past efforts, the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 being the most prominent, to suggest that a whole new approach is needed.

Generally speaking, most USPS employees are conscientious, hard working individuals who want to do a good job. For the most part, the problem is not so much with them as it is with the system in which they operate. Put simply, that system lacks the incentives necessary to bring about the gains in productivity and customer service that are essential if the USPS is to live up to the public's expectations. For one thing, the USPS is insulated against competition in the delivery of first class mail which means customers need not be won over but can be taken for granted. For another, it is subsidized by the Federal Government, which means there is less pressure to be efficient. For a third, it does not have the bottom line incentives—such as the profit motive and profit-sharing arrangements—which make many private companies so productive.

A quick look at the parcel delivery business bears out this assessment. Thirty years ago, most all parcels were delivered by the Postal Service. Today, competitors like FED-EX, UPS, and DHL handle a vast majority of packages shipped around the country, despite the built-in advantages enjoyed by the USPS. Also, the growing movement towards corporate competition in, or the privatization of, postal services in other countries reinforces that hypothesis. New Zealand, for instance, converted its postal service from a government department to a state owned but decontrolled corporation in the late 1980's and has

watched it flourish ever since. Last year, Holland partially privatized its postal service and Germany is doing the same starting this month. Also, there has been considerable discussion in Great Britain about the possibility of privatizing parts of the Royal Mail and Parcelforce, a move favored by a number of its top managers.

In this country, the objection to privatization has been that it would result—allegedly—in cream skimming by USPS competitors which would leave the USPS with the financially troublesome prospect of being left with only rural and bulk mail to deliver. However, the logic behind such an assumption not only does a disservice to the capabilities of USPS employees but it overlooks the significance of the telecommunications revolution now underway. What with the growing popularity of FAX machines, modems, internet, E-mail and the like, the truth of the matter is that the USPS is more likely to be left with rural and bulk mail to deliver if it doesn't go private than if it does. Only by keeping up with the times and the competition, which can best be done by operating in the same way as the competition, can be USPS hope to thrive in the future.

Understandably, many USPS employees, fearing for their jobs, have certain reservations about going that route. Since change often breeds uncertainty and uncertainty is unsettling, such a reaction is only natural. However, change also brings opportunity and that would certainly be true if the USPS were to be converted into a private corporation. And it would be especially true if that corporation were to be an employee owned one. Not only would the new entity be able to explore new markets and develop new ways of doing business, both of which could benefit postal workers, but making it employee owned would give workers more control over their futures as well as a share of the profits.

For all these reasons, I have decided to introduce once again legislation that would convert the U.S. Postal Service into a totally private, employee-owned corporation. As was the case with my previous bills to this effect, this measure calls for this transition to be implemented over a 5 year period, after which the USPS's current monopoly over the delivery of first class mail would end. However, there is one difference between this bill and my previous legislation. To make the prospects for the success of this new private sector corporation even more likely and attractive, the measure I am introducing today calls for the cost-free transfer of the assets held by the USPS to that corporation. Now only will that make the transition to private status easier to arrange, but it will speed the day when American taxpayers will no longer have to subsidize an operation that has been losing money as well as the mail.

Given the clear need for more than just minor adjustments to our postal delivery system, I hope my colleagues will carefully consider this legislation and then give it their support by signing on as co-sponsors. If America is to be truly competitive in the forthcoming era of computers and telecommunications, we simply cannot afford a correspondence delivery system that is neither prompt nor reliable. Instead, we need a system that is state of the art and the best way to get it is make use of, by making the USPS a part of, the private sector.

ENDING THE FOREIGN AID PIPELINE MESS

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to bring to an end a multibillion-dollar problem with our foreign aid programs: the so-called foreign aid pipeline. The pipeline consists of funds appropriated in prior years, up to a decade ago, but which are not expended and just sit in accounts waiting for some bureaucrat to dream up a way to spend it.

Responding to my request for an investigation in 1991, the General Accounting Office reported that nearly \$9 billion has been sitting in the pipeline, for up to 10 years. GAO recommended that such unneeded funds be canceled after 2 years, with a couple of specific exceptions.

In 1991, the House adopted my amendment to cut off this pipeline, but the underlying bill was not enacted. Again in 1993, a version of my amendment was incorporated into the Foreign Affairs Committee's foreign aid reform bill, but that bill also was not enacted.

Today, I am renewing my initiative to cut off this multibillion waste of taxpayers' funds. GAO estimated that about half of the funds in the pipeline could be recovered by enacting my proposal, as much as \$4.5 billion. My bill was drafted after consulting with experts at the GAO.

At a time when Congress is debating reductions in programs for Americans, foreign aid should be cut first. The place to start cutting is in the foreign aid pipeline, because it has already been determined to be a source of waste.

As the new Congress proceeds to considering legislation to make spending savings, I intend to seek action on this bill and end this misuse of taxpayers' money.

USE OF UNDERUTILIZED BUILDINGS IN ECONOMICALLY DE- PRESSED AREAS

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce legislation that I sponsored in the 103d Congress that would require the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to take advantage of abandoned and underutilized buildings and grounds in economically depressed areas of the country when selecting new site facilities. I invite all Members to co-sponsor this legislation.

I believe that in this age of reinvestment in our large cities, programs such as Enterprise Zone and HUD grants offer economically depressed communities the opportunity to pick themselves up and forge ahead with their recovery. I also believe, however, that Federal agencies, such as NASA, should look at those same communities when looking to expand their facilities. Much like a major sports team, NASA expansion into an economically depressed area would boost the area's financial

status, self-esteem, and morale. Often these last two simply cannot be fixed with a simple Government-sponsored grant.

My legislation would also allow older buildings and underused facilities in decaying cities the chance to be fully utilized, thereby furthering the economic and cosmetic recovery of those cities. And because those facilities would already be in place, NASA would not have to spend a fortune on constructing all new buildings and support infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, NASA's operations should not just be something we see pictures of on television. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation so that all Americans can take advantage of this country's space program.

THE 103D CONGRESS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, October 19, 1994, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE 103D CONGRESS

The 103rd Congress promised to govern. In the end, despite significant achievements, it was unable to deliver on much of the legislative program. But it should not be judged solely on the numerous measures which were defeated in the closing weeks. Among them were the bills dealing with health care, campaign finance, lobbying disclosure, telecommunications, and toxic waste clean-up. There is no doubt it was a bad ending to the Congress.

But the 103rd Congress really did quite a lot. It was reasonably productive even through extraordinarily contentious. In the end I think it was a respectable Congress, not spectacular but at least average.

MEASURES PASSED

Important legislation passed by the 103rd Congress included deficit reduction, the North American Free Trade Agreement, family and medical leave, "motor voter" registration, national service corps, Hatch Act revisions, the crime bill, interstate branch banking, Goals 2000 education reform, and deep cuts in the federal workforce. GATT may be added to this list during a special post-election session. It is easy to imagine another 8 to 12 pieces of major legislation that could have been passed near the end but were not. In judging the Congress it is important to think in terms of not only what it did but also what groundwork it laid. My guess is that basic agreements were reached in several areas in preparation for passage next year. That includes a telecommunications bill and superfund reform.

The central achievement of the 103rd Congress was passage last year of one of the largest deficit reduction packages in history—reducing the projected deficits over five years by some \$430 billion. The deficit will fall three years in a row—the first time that has happened since the Truman Administration. This has helped boost the economy—raising the overall growth rate, boosting productivity, and reducing the unemployment rate. Some 4.6 million new jobs have been created since January 1993, compared to 2.4 million over the previous four years. Passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement abolishing trade barriers between the United States, Mexico, and Canada has led to a sharp increase in U.S. exports to our NAFTA partners.