

To me, another kind of reconciliation has always been the wonder of this place. How to effect peaceful social change? How to reconcile the views of a Paul Wellstone with those of a John McCain, giving each a fair hearing and then moving to decide what is best for democracy, best for America. That is the Senate I revere.

It is of surpassing importance that the Senate recruit, reward, and recognize its staff. We must have the best; we must pay them competitive wages; we must acknowledge their contribution to the legislative process.

All of this talk about limited terms—if they are enacted, power will flow to the staff as the source of memory and knowledge; if staff is cut too far; special interest groups will become the source of information and power. We can and should reduce staff; but we must be careful; they have become a key part of the process.

I am not too worried about all of this. Staff has been a part of Government for thousands of years. I know, because just the other day I read in the Bible, "And Joseph leaned on his staff, and he died."

My friends, I have gone on too long. I could have spared you all of this by reading a few lines of poetry. I have found poetry—the distillation of human emotion and experience—to be a great source of comfort, insight, and inspiration over the years. The poem which best sums up who I am—at this stage in my life—is Tennyson's "Ulysses." I will leave you with a few fragments from this great work.

Much have I seen and known; cities of men  
And manners, climates, councils,  
governments \* \* \*

I am a part of all that I have met;  
Yet all experience is an arch wherethrough  
Gleams that untravelled world, whose margin  
fades

For ever and for ever when I move.  
How dull it is to pause, to make an end,  
To rust unburnished, not to shine in use!  
Some work of noble note, may yet be done  
Tis not too late to seek a newer world  
Though much is taken, much abides; and  
though

We are not now that strength which in old  
days  
Moved earth and heaven; that which we are,  
we are;

One equal temper of heroic hearts,  
Made weak by time and fate, but strong in  
will

To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.

Thank you my friends. Thank you for your friendship, your counsel, your encouragement. Thank you for your work, which made mine worthy.

#### THE RETIREMENT OF PHILIP A. HOLMAN, DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF POLICY AND ANALYSIS IN THE OFFICE OF REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a most distinguished public servant who is retiring this month after nearly 33 years of Federal service. Phil Holman, the Director of the Division of Policy and Analysis in the Office of Refugee Resettlement is a man that I and my fine staff on the Immigration Subcommittee have worked with for many years.

Phil Holman joined the Cuban Refugees Program in 1962, shortly after it

was established by President Kennedy. He spent virtually his entire Federal career in the refugee resettlement program: from the early 1960's Cuban refugee flow beginnings to the 1975 Indo-Chinese Refugee Assistance Program to the current domestic program established under the Refugee Act of 1980. Phil Holman's career has certainly come full circle as we struggle today with the current Cuban migration crisis.

Millions of refugees admitted to the United States in the past 33 years have had their new lives touched in some way by Phil Holman's work. His decades of service are deeply appreciated, and I would urge my colleagues to join me in expressing our gratitude for a fine job well done.

#### FATHER WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM AND FOCUS: HOPE

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, recently the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, on which I serve, held 3 days of hearings on reforming the Federal Government's system of job training programs.

Over the course of the hearings, the committee heard testimony from a wide array of interested parties: Clients of training programs; experts from academia and think tanks; businessmen, organized labor, and the General Accounting Office. Wisconsin Gov. Tommy Thompson appeared and testified about the laboratory the various States provide, where some of the most innovative reform ideas are already at work. In addition, Secretary of Labor Robert Reich and OMB Director Alice Rivlin presented the administration's perspective on what shape reform of the system should take.

However, this Senator thought the most interesting testimony came from the last panel to appear on the hearing's final day. Chairman KASSEBAUM wished to supplement the testimony of the usual array of witnesses with perhaps less conventional viewpoints. She selected individuals from around the country who have personally been involved in starting and administering innovative, community-based training and education programs. One of the individuals she invited to participate was Father Bill Cunningham, the executive director of the Focus: Hope Program in Detroit, MI.

Focus: Hope and Father Cunningham are certainly not strangers to the Labor Committee. Just last September, Father Cunningham appeared before the Labor Committee to testify about the Focus: Hope Program and its work in educating and training people. It is a testament to his dedication and success that Father Cunningham would be invited to testify by both Democrats and Republicans when each had control of the Labor Committee.

Mr. President, Focus: Hope is often described as unorthodox in its methodology. It is certainly unorthodox in one respect: Unlike the vast majority of

Federal job training programs, Focus: Hope actually works. It produces real and lasting results; of course, that might seem unorthodox in this town, which sometimes appears immune to outrage over wasted tax dollars and obsolete or ineffectual social programs.

Let me offer a glimpse of the mindset which makes "Focus: Hope so unique and—I believe—so successful. An article appearing in the March 1994 issue of "Ward's Auto World" noted that father Cunningham saw Focus: Hope's mission this way:

Focus: Hope remains at its core a civil rights organization, but [father Cunningham] cites [their] machinist training effort as simply a new approach. Father Cunningham says of 200 machine shops that hired graduates from the [Focus: Hope] machinists institute, all except two were hiring their first African-American or woman. We could have been suing them, he shrugs.

Mr. President, while some groups are obsessed with talking about expanding opportunities, Father Cunningham's approach is a breath of fresh air. He believes the best method for truly empowering people is to educate them, teach them a marketable skill, develop in them responsibility, motivation, and maturity—not simply to file a lawsuit on their behalf.

For the benefit of any of my colleagues who are not familiar with father Cunningham's work, let me offer a few quotes from his testimony:

I would emphasize advanced job skills representing new technologies, future technologies. In that vein, I would require that defense and commerce play a larger role in establishing national skills priorities \* \* \* We must understand and balance the difference between providing jobs for the people—and everybody's hearts ought to be in that—and keep attention on providing capable and skilled persons for job demands. That is an entirely different picture.

The industry was changing so rapidly that the machinist of 1981 was completely inadequate for the machine tools of 1988, the computer and numerically controlled machines. \* \* \* In 1993, the state of the art is already catapulting so rapidly in technology that—well, I will just give you one figure. A lathe in 1981 with 3,000 RPM is replaced by Ingersol, by a machining center, with 60,000 RPM.

The universities are still dealing with the engineering code of 1970. So what we are doing is very expensively putting all these kids through college, getting them engineering degrees, and then when they go to work for Ford Motor Co., they have to spend another 6 years training them.

Finally, let me highlight one observation that was agreed to by everyone on Father Cunningham's panel. Chairman KASSEBAUM inquired about the efficacy of requiring people to obtain employment first before receiving a voucher for further job training. It was noted that often the most effective training and education programs are those in which people both work and go to school either for education or to learn a particular skill. On that point, Father Cunningham offered his insight based on his work at Focus: Hope:

I am in total agreement with my colleagues up here. The masters program we

have in engineering at Focus: Hope requires a 40-hour workweek, and that is not work-study. It is not work-study \* \* \*. The work they do and the skills they are developing dictate the knowledge they need to draw down. And if the university cannot provide that knowledge, the university is irrelevant. So the knowledge drawdown assimilates knowledge at, as I said earlier, geometric proportions. So the young people there are learning four and five and six times faster than the normal engineering candidate at a major university, simply because they are seeing the relevance of what they are learning in terms of the demands of the workplace.

Mr. President, judging by the testimony provided to the committee during the 3 days of the hearing, Focus: Hope is precisely the type of program we should be attempting to replicate around the country. However, the lesson is not that the Government should dictate that all recipients of Federal dollars exactly mirror Focus: Hope in concept and design, but that the Government seek out programs with a proven track record of success and a proven base of support in their community or region.

This Senator believes the best method for accomplishing this is to get the money into the hands of State and local officials who have a better idea as to which programs are working and where our limited resources are best utilized, that certainly has been the experience in my State of Michigan, where our citizens have had tremendous success under the leadership of Gov. John Engler, in forging a statewide partnership to enact real reform in such areas as job training and welfare.

Once again, let me congratulate Father Cunningham on his appearance before the Senate's Labor and Human Resources Committee and commend him for his fine work at Focus: Hope. It is individuals like Father Cunningham and organizations like Focus: Hope which have made this country great and stand to make a positive difference in our future. We would be wise to offer them our assistance and follow their example.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, anyone even remotely familiar with the U.S. Constitution knows that no President can spend a dime of Federal tax money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by Congress—both the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate.

So when you hear a politician or an editor or a commentator declare that "Reagan ran up the Federal debt" or that "Bush ran it up," bear in mind that it was, and is, the constitutional duty of Congress to control Federal spending. We'd better get busy correcting this because Congress has failed miserably to do it for about 50 years.

The fiscal irresponsibility of Congress has created a Federal debt which stood at \$4,810,859,576,867.71 as of the close of business Wednesday, February 1. Averaged out, every man, woman, and child in America owes a share of this massive debt, and that per capita share is \$18,262.11.

#### THE CLINTON BAILOUT OF MEXICO

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, our offices in Washington and North Carolina have been inundated with calls protesting President Clinton's decision to bypass Congress and, more importantly, Mr. Clinton's willingness to ignore the emphatic will of the American people. In any event, that is what Mr. Clinton has done with his unilateral \$20 billion bailout of Mexico.

I have opposed this scheme from the very beginning because it will do nothing to remedy Mexico's internal problem and it is unfair to American taxpayers. Last week, I presided over in-depth hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee. Witness after witness warned the President not to violate the will of the American people in this matter.

Mr. President, if this were as important as the President would have us believe, then Congress should debate the bailout and vote on it, up or down, for or against. Before the taxpayers' money is put at risk, however, the people being forced to foot the bill should have a say. The \$20 billion in question is an enormous amount of money. It is more than the annual budget of the State of North Carolina; it is larger than the annual budgets of 16 of the 18 States represented on the Foreign Relations Committee.

I am not convinced that refusal to bailout Mexico would be the disaster that the administration has described. Many topflight economists say the same. The Mexican people are already suffering, a condition that will improve only with solid political and economic reform, not as the result of a bailout.

Mr. President, on several occasions between 1980 and 1994, Mexico used dollars drawn from a special line of credit at the United States Treasury. The United States has also aided Mexico with bridge loans, bank credits, currency swaps, and guarantees, all to shore up confidence in Mexico. Assistance from Uncle Sam usually has come right around election time in Mexico. Credit lines from the United States and other countries, amounting to as much as \$12 billion, were negotiated twice in the past 15 months alone.

With the exception of last week's hearings narrowly focused on the peso crisis, the Senate has not held hearings on the situation in Mexico since 1986. Since the President is obviously willing to risk saddling the taxpayers with \$20 billion of debt, I believe Congress has a fundamental obligation to examine carefully the political and economic situation in Mexico and the administration's policy toward Mexico.

Mr. President, the Mexican Government has a credibility gap, and for obvious reasons. Just one example: There are some 2,000 United States claimants protesting Mexico's refusal to pay about \$19 billion owed under a little-known 1941 treaty—the Treaty on Final Settlement of Certain Claims—which provided for settlement of longstanding disputed property claims. The United States fully met its obligations by 1948, but Mexico broke its promise. The Mexicans signed the treaty on the dotted line knowing full well that it was never intended that Mexico would compensate these Americans. To this day, not a dime nor a peso has ever been paid to an American claimant.

Mexico doesn't hesitate to break its promises to the United States, much less to violate United States policies. For example: Mexico is giving aid and comfort to Fidel Castro by investing in Cuba's economy, notwithstanding the United States trade embargo. According to Cuba Report, published by the Miami Herald, the Mexicans are financing Cuba's telephone company to the tune of \$1.5 billion. And, by the way, the Cuban phone company is a confiscated United States business. Also, a Mexican-Cuba joint venture will invest \$100 million in a Cuban oil refinery. The dominant member of this venture will be Pemex, the Mexican's Government-owned oil company.

The Mexican Foreign Minister was quoted by the January 27 Financial Times as saying that "the typical U.S. politician is not necessarily someone who is very conscious of international subjects. Even suggesting they know where Mexico is \* \* \* they lack information about what happens in Mexico."

Mr. President, this is the same fellow who came to Washington with an outstretched hand pleading for cash.

Mexico's international debt stands at \$180 billion. According to the United States Treasury Department's own estimate, the Mexican debt coming due in 1995 alone—both public and private sector debt—is more than \$80 billion. What Mexico sorely needs is to get at the root causes of its problems so that it will cease to require emergency intervention by the United States taxpayers.

Mr. President, Mexican President Zedillo has a tough road to travel: He must solve the short term economic crisis; provide for a long-term economic stability; end a civil uprising; address corruption; stop drug trafficking, and initiate political reforms. Properly addressing these issues is what's needed to shore-up investor confidence.

Mexico would be better off letting the markets set the value of the peso and Mexican stocks and bonds. The U.S. Government has no business bailing-out private or public investors who lose money on highly speculative investments.

In testimony last week before the Foreign Relations Committee, experts