

regional peace and worldwide nuclear nonproliferation; undermine the tremendous economic progress that has occurred in South Asia; launch a nuclear arms buildup in South Asia; and perhaps most frightening, increase the likelihood of nuclear weapons falling into the hands of terrorists. Indeed, any individual who has an interest in the future economic development of South Asia should have serious concerns with the Clinton administration's proposal.

I recognize that a number of U.S. aerospace firms have a strong interest in this issue. The transfer of F-16's would mean new business, new contracts, and new jobs here at home. I suspect these firms are putting tremendous pressure on the Clinton administration to push for military aid to Pakistan.

Mr. President, the aid package may mean more jobs at home, but it would come at a heavy price on a global scale. I do not believe any issue is more important to the security of all free people than nuclear nonproliferation, particularly in potential hot spots such as South Asia. I am concerned that the transfer of F-16's would spark a nuclear arms race in South Asia.

The Clinton administration has traveled this same road before. The catalyst for the nuclear tightrope walk that occurred in North Korea was the perception by officials in Pyongyang that the United States was not serious about nuclear nonproliferation. I would have thought that after North Korea, the Clinton administration would have learned an important lesson. It does not appear they have learned.

Once again, the administration is willing to be the catalyst for destabilization. The wrong signals are there. I fear India will be forced to rethink its current military force structure if Pakistan takes delivery of the F-16's, including resumption of their nuclear program, deployment of short-range weapons, and even development of long-range options.

Further, Mr. President, we must consider not just the instability between India and Pakistan, but instability within Pakistan itself. With all due respect to Prime Minister Bhutto, I have very serious concerns about the ability of her civilian government to hold its military leaders accountable to civilian-based policies. I urge my colleagues to examine closely this military-civilian chain-of-command issue.

We also must examine the inability of Mrs. Bhutto's government to respond effectively to the shocking wave of violence sweeping her country. Terrorist groups, such as the Harkatul Ansar—the Movement of Friends—are based in Pakistan, but have links to similar groups in Iran. The New York Times recently reported that a massive worldwide network of Islamic terrorism was traced to a university in Peshawar—the University of Dawat and Jihad. This is not a run-of-the-mill institution of higher learning. Stu-

dents go there to seek advanced degrees in worldwide terrorism. Graduates of this university have applied their lessons of death in North Africa, the Middle East, and Asia.

Terrorist violence is a mortal plague within Pakistan, leaving more than 1,000 people dead since the beginning of last year. This wave of terror recently claimed the lives of two American diplomats, who were tracked down and killed in cold blood. Even Prime Minister Bhutto questioned whether or not she had the resources necessary to crack down on the militant organizations operating within her country. Others question whether or not Prime Minister Bhutto has enough political capital to take the tough action needed to restore stability.

Therefore, I shudder at the thought of a nuclear capable government in South Asia that is incapable of controlling its own military command or restoring order at home. This internal instability increases the possibility that nuclear weapons could fall into the hands of a terrorist state or organization. It boggles my mind that President Clinton would propose an aid package that would add both to the Government's nuclear capability and to the region's instability.

This fact raises yet another problem, which gets to the very essence of the Pressler amendment. Mr. President, the Pressler amendment was meant to be a strong warning to an ally: If you go nuclear, it will come at the expense of U.S. aid. The United States cannot condone—through taxpayer assistance—the Government of Pakistan becoming a nuclear power.

This policy has worked to a large degree. Pakistan has at least frozen the development of its nuclear program. A number of states that pursued active nuclear weapons research programs in the 1980's have abandoned them, including Argentina, Brazil, South Korea, Taiwan, and South Africa. They responded to American diplomacy and their own good common sense. It is worth noting that both South Korea and Taiwan have antidemocratic neighbors and the temptation to hide behind a nuclear shield is undoubtedly high.

In one of the worst ways imaginable, the Clinton administration's proposed military aid package would be seen as a certification and acceptance of Pakistan as a full-fledged nuclear power—a signal that runs counter to our own support and insistence for the ratification of the NPT. Pakistan is not a signatory of the NPT. It does not allow inspections. Yet, these facts do not seem to be important to the Clinton administration. Just as ominous, the proposed military aid package tells other countries that there are no long-term penalties for going nuclear.

Mr. President, I have made this point: The administration's proposal to change the Pressler Amendment is a bad policy. I urge my colleagues to review it carefully, but skeptically. Let me reiterate: I want to see Pakistan

succeed economically. I want to see peace achieved both within and beyond Pakistan's borders. I want to see our nuclear nonproliferation goals achieved. The administration can achieve all those policies by withdrawing its proposed aid package and standing firmly behind the Pressler amendment.

THE REAL MEANING OF THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, for almost 100 days now, we have been hearing about the Contract With America—here in Washington and in my home State of South Dakota.

This week we get their contact with America. Every time you open a newspaper or turn on your TV or your radio—or even your computer—some Republican is speaking in superlatives about what is happening in Congress. Not everyone shares that enthusiasm.

One of the most astute assessments I have heard of the Republicans' 100 days was offered last week by a Capitol tour guide. When someone asked him what had passed so far in this Congress, he said, "About 12 weeks."

I can tell you a lot more has happened in South Dakota during those 12 weeks. Farmers and ranchers, who have been gearing up for the spring planting and helping their livestock through the calving season, are grappling with the harsh realities of low commodity and livestock prices, hoping there will be enough to support their families.

On Main Streets in cities and towns across South Dakota, small business owners and employees are working longer and harder just to maintain their incomes.

In other words, life is going on in South Dakota, and people are trying to move forward, looking toward change in Washington to help them realize their dreams.

The tradition of scrutinizing the first 100 days really began, as you know, with President Franklin Roosevelt. Most students of government still consider the first 100 days of the New Deal to be the most successful in the history of the Federal Government. And no wonder. By the end of President Roosevelt's first 100 days, Congress had passed an extraordinary package of 15 bills that fundamentally changed the relationship between business and Government, and individuals and Government.

It was an agenda that was firmly rooted in FDR's belief, as he said, that "the future lies with those wise political leaders who realize that the great public is interested more in good government than in politics." That is a sentiment you won't find in the Republicans' Contract With America. For it was politics pure and simple—the 1994 election and a mountain of polling data—that gave us the so-called contract.

Franklin Roosevelt knew to be skeptical of people, like so many in this new Republican majority, who promise easy solutions to hard problems. He could easily be speaking of today's Republican majority when he commented on their predecessors more than 60 years ago.

"Let me warn you and let me warn the Nation," he said, "against the smooth evasions of those who say, 'Of course we agree with all these things.

"We believe in Social Security. We believe in work for the unemployed. We believe in saving homes. Cross our hearts and hope to die, we believe in all these things. But we do not like the way the present administration is doing them. Just turn them over to us. We will do all of them. We will do more of them. We will do them better. And most of all, the doing of them will not cost anybody anything.'"

Does this sound familiar? It should. That is the Big Lie on which the contract is constructed: "We can balance the budget. We can increase military spending. We can give more tax breaks to the rich. And it will not cost anybody anything. In fact, you and your family are going to get money back."

Clearly, the promise to fundamentally change the Federal Government sounded very good to some people last November. But were they voting for the Republican contract? The fact is, they were not. Less than 5 percent of Americans had even heard of the contract on Election Day. Even now, polls show that the more people hear about the contract, the more nervous they get. And with good reason. To paraphrase Pogo, we have met the enemy in the Republicans' contract, and it is us.

It is not big-money special interests the Contract targets—Republicans have invited the lobbyists into their offices to rewrite the laws. The enemy in the Republican contract is not even the infamous waste, fraud, and abuse.

It is working families and their children in South Dakota and across the Nation.

They can wrap it up in new spinmeister packaging, but the struggle at the center of the contract is the same struggle that has defined the difference between the Republican and Democratic Parties for generations.

It is the struggle between the rich and the rest of us.

We do not have any billionaires in South Dakota who will benefit from the tax loophole Republicans are fighting to protect that allow billionaires to renounce their citizenship to avoid paying taxes on the fortunes they have made in our country.

We do not have a lot of powerful corporate lobbyists who have gained unprecedented access to the Congress.

What we do have in South Dakota are hard-working families who want change, who want more opportunities for themselves, and a better future for their children.

Republicans were on the wrong side of this struggle before, and they are on

the wrong side now. We have heard a lot about the casualties of the contract, but the biggest casualty is not a person or a group. It is Americans' sense of values—our sense of fairness. Most of all, it is our fragile but essential belief that if we work hard, we can make a better life for ourselves and our kids.

This ethic, this belief, was ingrained in all South Dakotans. This belief, this value, is essential to our survival as a democracy.

De Tocqueville wrote that it is our values, even more than our laws, that enable Americans to maintain this democracy, and that fundamental insight into our character remains true to this day.

If people do not know the difference between right and wrong, all the prisons in the world will not keep us safe. If children come to school with no sense of discipline, no respect for authority, the best teachers and, the best computers in the world will not make a difference. And if young people grow up in a society that does not reward honest work, no welfare reform plan in the world will work.

We cannot solve our problems with a law or a check—or even the threat of no check. If we want to restore the American dream, we have got to restore American values. And that means strengthening America's families. Families are where values are taught and learned. But teaching values takes time. It takes time.

And time is something that most families have less of every year. I hear this every time I go home.

One story this year that didn't get perhaps quite as much attention as it deserved was a series of strikes by autoworkers who were protesting mandatory 50- and 60-hour workweeks.

The workers said the extra pay just wasn't worth the price they were paying in burnout and in time spent away from their families.

The conflict many workers feel between trying to be both good providers and good parents was best summed up by a single mother at a GM factory in Michigan who had just put her son in counseling and just learned that her 18-year-old daughter was pregnant.

You know what she said? She said, "I keep thinking that maybe if I'd been able to spend more time with them this wouldn't have happened."

That is a conflict more parents live with each year. From the late 1960's to the late 1980's, the average workyear for American workers increased by 163 hours. You know what that is? That's an extra month each year.

Today, fewer than one-third of American families have time to eat even one meal a day together. And nearly 7 million children—including half a million pre-school kids—spend at least part of each day all alone.

Why are parents spending less time with their kids? The answer is simple: In spite of an unprecedented effort by the Clinton administration to create

more than 6 million new jobs, the real income of most Americans is declining.

Each year, it takes more people working more hours in a family just to afford the basic. Eighty percent of America's families have not seen their incomes rise since the 1970's. Eighty percent. And this is true despite huge increases in two-income and even three-income families.

Even in the 1990's, the richest one-third of Americans are getting richer, while incomes for everyone else keep falling. And let me tell you, that is fundamentally wrong. And Democrats must fight it.

Not long ago I had a young father tell me, "Either I can spend time with my family or support them—but not both." Those are not conditions for teaching moral values. They are an invitation to moral anarchy. And the extreme agenda of the new majority—despite all its pious and populist rhetoric—is almost certain to make matters worse.

Because it is designed to reward the rich and the well-connected at the expense of America's middle-class families. That is wrong and Democrats must fight it, make no mistake: The new Republican agenda is worse than indifferent to the needs of working families. It is downright hostile to them. It is trickle-down economics with a vengeance. And if it is enacted, it will destroy much of the middle class.

If you doubt it, just look at some of the tax changes Republicans are proposing:

One of the more moderate members of the Republican party is proposing that we repeal income taxes on stock profits. In other words, let's tax only wages. And some Republicans want to protect the tax loophole that allows billionaires to renounce their U.S. citizenship to avoid paying taxes on the fortunes they have made in this country.

You know, when George Washington found out that Benedict Arnold was a traitor he probably thought about a lot of things. He probably thought about flogging him. He probably thought about hanging him. He probably thought about taking everything he owned. But I guarantee you one thing he never thought about was giving him a tax break.

What kind of contract is that?

Of course, many of us feel that the contract is more noteworthy for what it leaves out than for what little it actually does. The contract offers no blueprint to create more jobs or better-paying jobs. And, it offers no plan to fix any of the other problems that are undermining Americans' economic security.

Quite the opposite, the Republican agenda makes it harder for people to climb the economic ladder by gutting worker training programs and college loans.

Under the Republican contract, 27,165 South Dakota college students will pay

more for their student loans. Who knows how many who cannot afford the higher priced loans will simply drop out.

It makes it harder for poor families to escape welfare by blocking any increase in the minimum wage.

The Republican agenda leaves virtually every American family at risk of financial ruin by refusing to reform health care. For some, the past 100 days simply means that more people are without health insurance in South Dakota and a lot of people—and hoping they do not end up like some of their neighbors—the 1,200 retirees of the Morrell meatpacking company in Sioux Falls, who suddenly lost their health benefits 2 months ago.

And, the contract undermines our effort to enforce laws protecting Americans from polluted air and water, from spoiled meat and killer toys and a whole host of other dangers.

The big winners in the contract are the lobbyists and special interests, who Republicans have invited—quite literally—into committee rooms to write the laws as they choose.

The big losers, of course, are working families, who are going to end up picking up the tab for the special interests—the same as they did in the 1980's. That is wrong, too, and Democrats will fight it.

The biggest problem with the contract is not simply that it threatens to bankrupt working families economically. It is also morally bankrupt. Democrats have a responsibility to challenge not just the details of the contract, but the underlying values as well. We need to raise our voices, particularly in the face of the extreme new agenda of the Republican Party.

We need to find new ways, new technologies, to communicate our basic beliefs, and, we need to expand the debate to include values that matter to working families. Values like fairness and tolerance, genuine opportunity, and generational progress.

More important, we need to make sure that our values shape our public policy. Too often, government policies do not reflect our nation's values. Sometimes they have actually exacerbate the conditions they were created to eliminate.

No matter how noble their original purpose, when we try to protect failed programs, we undermine the credibility of government and thus the ability of government to help the people who deserve help.

So, making sure our values shape our public policies mean, first of all, acknowledging when something is not working. Making sure our values shape our public policies also means reforming our welfare system so that it rewards work. It means encouraging families to be strong and to stay strong. Making sure our values shape our public policies means we need truth-in-sentencing laws. We need to hold people responsible for their actions. And we need to protect people from crime in the first place.

President Clinton and a Democratic Congress last year passed a tough new crime bill that puts 100,000 more police on the street, including 77 in my home State. Now Republicans want to gut that bill. That is dead wrong. And Democrats will fight it.

Making sure our values shape our public policies means we need to listen to average people, not campaign contributors. In Washington and in every State capitol in this country, holy wars are being waged with unholy amounts of money. People don't know where the buck stops anymore. They only know it stops the debate.

And this is wrong. And Democrats will fight it—by pushing for real campaign finance reform—in this session of Congress.

Making sure our values shape our public policies means helping workers learn new skills so they can keep their job or get a new one. Not long ago, Speaker GINGRICH called unemployment insurance “vacation pay for freeloaders.” Republicans may think that makes a good sound bite, but it's small and insensitive. If we value work, then let us treat workers with dignity. Give them the tools and training they need to earn their own way, and they will not need unemployment insurance or anything else from government.

Finally, making sure our values shape our public policies means helping middle-class pay for college with affordable loans or the sweat equity that comes from national service.

In asking Congress to do these things, Democrats are only asking the Republican majority to do what the American people expect them to do: to lead. Their refusal to even discuss our proposals makes it clear that Republicans do not oppose the way we Democrats have done the job of fighting for working families and children. They are fundamentally opposed to the job being done at all.

I said at the beginning of my remarks that the American people did not vote for the Republican contract because most had not even heard of it. Instead, they were voting to continue the original Contract With America. They voted to make America a place, once again, where people still believe in values like tolerance and fairness, and parents still have the time to teach those values to their children.

America can be what America was, a place where you can get ahead if you work hard. We can make America that kind of place again. But it's going to take more than angry demagoguery and more than the mad dash of 100 days.

Americans understand that. Because leaders like Franklin Roosevelt taught us. President Roosevelt led this Nation through a depression and a world war. He knew that good government is government which unites this country, not divides it. It is government that offers hope, not fear—that proposes real solutions where there are real problems. He led, so others were willing to follow.

As a former history professor, NEWT GINGRICH should remember the words of his favorite President who said that “the only limit to our realization will be our doubts of today.”

While Democrats do not advocate going back to the programs of the New Deal, we believe that the values that shaped that agenda are as valid today as they have ever been. The realization of tomorrow must be built from the realization of strong national leadership today, the kind of leadership the American people have turned to throughout our history, and to which future generations must turn, not just for 100 days, but for that many years, and more.

SCHOOL-TO-WORK: A LARGER VISION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in November of last year, Mr. Sam Halperin of the American youth policy forum addressed a statewide conference in Rhode Island on implementation of the new School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994. His thoughts bear careful consideration not only as we move this act from legislative provision to program but also as we approach reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act.

Mr. Halperin is a distinguished educator whose views merit careful consideration. He has served as Deputy Commissioner in the old Office of Education, Deputy Assistant Secretary at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the director and first president of the Institute for Educational Leadership.

I would ask that the full text of Mr. Halperin's remarks be placed in the RECORD.

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

SCHOOL-TO-WORK: A LARGER VISION

(By Dr. Samuel Halperin)

Thank you for your invitation to help develop Rhode Island's plans for implementation of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 (hereafter STWOA). I have no doubt that you will soon win one of the federal implementation grants, grants already awarded to eight other states.

My only doubt is whether your vision will be as large-spirited and as bold as the federal Act itself. Will you seize the opportunity to rethink the essential nature of schooling at the dawn of the 21st Century? Will you construct a total quality system in which each of the parts supports and advances the welfare of all the other parts? That is the challenge. That is the opportunity.

SCHOOL-TO-WORK OPPORTUNITIES ACT: “HISTORIC, LANDMARK” LEGISLATION

Five features of the new Act qualify it for designation as “historic,” even “landmark,” legislation:

One, previous federal legislation focussed mostly on the disadvantaged (Job Training Partnership Act, Job Corps, ESEA Title I). STWOA is the most universal, non-means-tested effort to date. It is intended to help all students who have not yet completed