

She then turned professional and in her first year reached the final 16 at both Wimbledon and the U.S. Open.

During her professional tennis career that spanned a decade, Kathy won seven Grand Slam titles.

Kathy earned a reputation as a tough and tenacious competitor. And, as she defeated one challenger after another, Kathy proved she was one of the best players in the world and climbed to a ranking of No. 5. In just 1 year, she went from being No. 23 in the world to being No. 5.

During that time, Kathy beat Chris Evert in straight sets at Wimbledon in 1983, reached the finals of the 1983 Australian Open, and then went on to knock off Pam Shriver in the quarter-final of the 1984 Wimbledon singles championship to reach the semifinals.

Kathy would later be described as Chris Evert's top nemesis, beating her three times.

Martina Navratilova, too, felt the sting of Kathy Jordan's passing shots. Not only did Kathy beat her in singles, but it was the team of Kathy Jordan and Liz Smylie that pulled a huge doubles upset and ended the 109-match winning streak of Navratilova and partner Pam Shriver in the Wimbledon final of 1985. Jordan and Smylie won by a score of 5-7, 6-3, 6-4. It was sweet victory for Kathy, who had lost 3 of the last 4 years to Navratilova and Shriver after winning the Wimbledon championship in 1980 with partner Anne Smith.

Looking back on the match, Kathy recounted how she and her partner, Smylie, were serving for the match at 5-4 in the third set. Kathy gambled, lunged across to Smylie's side of the court for a volley. They won the point, with Navratilova and Shriver looking stunned as the shot whipped by.

"Pam and Martina were standing there looking at each other. I'm kinda like a roving linebacker and Liz is like a defensive back who sometimes has to cover behind me in case a ball gets over my head," Kathy said in 1991.

That roving linebacker attitude is exactly what made Kathy Jordan a legend on the tennis courts.

But, in the 1987 Virginia Slims of New England, Kathy's career was jeopardized with one of the most serious injuries an athlete can suffer—a tear of the right anterior cruciate ligament.

"That's the Bernard King injury. The Danny Manning injury. You get scared. You never really know. A lot of people don't make it back," Kathy told the San Francisco Chronicle in 1990.

But, once again Kathy's determination paved the way and she once again became a potent threat in women's tennis. She reunited with her partner, Liz Smylie, and once again knocked off the expected winners to climb their way into the Wimbledon doubles final in 1990.

I've had the pleasure of getting to know Kathy over the course of the last 2 years.

After retiring from women's tennis, Kathy finished her undergraduate work

at Stanford University and chose to direct her talents to public service. She worked on Lynn Yeaker's campaign for the U.S. Senate in her native Pennsylvania and then returned to California, where Palo Alto had become home.

Kathy joined my staff in 1993 as field representative for the northern California region of the State.

She has been one of the most outstanding staff persons I've worked with over the last 2 years.

Kathy assumed her field responsibilities with an incomparable level of compassion, intelligence, and diligence. And just as she did on the tennis court, Kathy has shown a fierce determination to fight for what is right.

She redefined the title "field representative" and was quickly promoted to the role of field director, overseeing projects for me statewide.

As a representative of over 20 counties, she was my eyes and ears for northern California. She identifies a problem and—more importantly—helps figure out how to solve a problem.

She has been a tireless advocate for the issues and concerns of the residents and elected officials in her jurisdiction.

I frequently have county supervisors and others approach and thank me for the work she has done and the results accomplished.

At a time when many feel alienated and are looking to the government's representatives to help them and respond to their needs and problems, I feel proud that I have a staff person who heeds the call and gets things done.

Kathy is a remarkable person whose compassion, respect, and talent for her work serves as a model for others.

I am grateful to have worked with her and benefited from her service to the U.S. Senate.

Madam President, I stand here to congratulate Kathy on all her accomplishments, and for the honor being bestowed her by Stanford University.

For all she has accomplished in both the world of tennis and in government service, it is an honor well deserved.

LANE KIRKLAND

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Madam President, I rise today to salute my friend, Lane Kirkland, who yesterday announced that he would not seek reelection as president of the AFL-CIO. During his 16-year tenure as head of the AFL-CIO and his 50 years of service to organized labor, Mr. Kirkland devoted himself to improving the lives and occupations of unionized workers. He accomplished this mission with skill and determination.

An editorial in today's New York Post remarked:

We've always hailed his stalwart commitment to liberal anti-communism and his fealty to the concept of a global network of genuinely free trade unions. It's safe to say, in fact, that no one in the United States—apart from President Reagan himself—did more to hasten the demise of the Soviet empire than did Lane Kirkland.

Lane Kirkland's presence at the helm of American labor will be sorely missed. As the New York Post concluded:

His retirement marks the departure from the public arena of a larger-than-life figure—an able, courageous and principled individual whose shoes will be difficult to fill.

I extend my thanks to Lane Kirkland for his dedication to working men and women, and I wish him the best of luck in the future.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, one does not have to be a rocket scientist to realize that the U.S. Constitution forbids any President's spending even 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 the Founding Fathers, two centuries before the Reagan and Bush Presidencies, made it very clear that it is the constitutional duty of Congress—a duty Congress cannot escape—to control Federal spending. They have not for the past 50 years.

It is the fiscal irresponsibility of Congress—of Congress!—that ran up the Federal debt that stood at \$4,903,284,242,955.00 as of the close of business Tuesday, June 13. This debt, which will, of course, be passed on to our children and grandchildren, averages out to \$18,612.95 on a per capita basis.

THE 220th ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. ARMY, JUNE 14, 1995

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, exactly 220 years ago today, a proud American institution was born, the U.S. Army. I rise today to not only recognize this important milestone in the history of the Army, but to pay tribute to all soldiers who have served their Nation, both in the past and in the present.

For more than two centuries, America's soldiers have selflessly and successfully protected the freedoms and ideals of the United States, and America's soldiers have stood tall and fast wherever they have been deployed. From the Minuteman at Lexington with his trusty musket who started the fight for the independence of our Nation, to the G.I. equipped with night vision goggles, a Kevlar helmet, and the battle-proven M16A2 rifle on patrol along the DMZ in Korea, our soldiers have always distinguished themselves. The battle streamers of the Army flag stand as testament to the courage, fortitude, and abilities of those who have fought under this banner: Valley

Forge; New Orleans; Mexico City; Gettysburg; Havana; the Philippines; Verdun; Bataan; North Africa; Monte Cassino; Normandy; Arnhem; the "Bulge"; Pusan; Seoul; the Ia Drang Valley; Grenada, Panama; Kuwait, and, Iraq represent just a partial list of the places where ordinary men brought distinction to themselves, the Army, and the United States by their actions.

We must also not forget the many other campaigns and operations the Army has undertaken in its history, which have included: surveying the uncharted west coast; protecting western settlers; guarding our borders; assisting in disaster relief; providing humanitarian aid to other nations; and conducting medical research that benefits soldiers and civilians alike. There is simply no question that the U.S. Army has had a tremendous impact, in many different ways, on the history of our Nation and the world.

Soon we on the Senate Armed Services Committee will begin our mark up of the fiscal year 1996 defense authorization budget, including the money needed to support the Army. Often our focus is on what weapon systems we need to fund, how many new tanks, field guns, or rifles we should purchase, but our chief concern is always providing for the soldier. We work to ensure that the young E-3 has a quality of life that is not beneath him, and that the soldier who dedicated his or her career to the Army and Nation is not forgotten. Each of us on the committee, and I am sure in the Senate as well, understands that it is the people—the newest recruit and the most senior general—who make up the Army and guarantee the security and defense of the United States. We may have an arsenal of smart bombs at our disposal, but it is the soldier who must face and defeat our enemies. Ensuring they have the best equipment, training, and quality of life possible are our highest priorities.

This investment in our men and women in uniform pays a handsome dividend beyond the security of the United States. Countless numbers of people who have served in the Army have gone on to hold important positions in both the public and private sectors. Our first President, George Washington, was a general in the Army, as were Ulysses Grant, Zachary Taylor, and Dwight Eisenhower. Additionally, many former soldiers have gone on to serve in the Halls of Congress. In the House, there are some 87 individuals who served in the Army and in the Senate, 27 of our colleagues have worn the Army green. I know that each of us is proud of our association with the Army and that we have been able to serve our Nation as both soldiers and statesmen.

Madam President, over the past 220 years, more than 42 million of our fellow citizens have raised their right hand and sworn to defend our Nation as soldiers. In each instance we have asked our soldiers to carry out a mis-

sion, they have done so with a sense of purpose, professionalism, and patriotism. We are grateful for the sacrifices these individuals have made and the example they have set for future soldiers. With a heritage as proud as the one established by our Nation's soldiers over the past 220 years, we know that the U.S. Army will always remain the finest fighting force that history has ever known.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, morning business is now closed.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPETITION AND DEREGULATION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 652, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 652) to provide for a procompetitive, deregulatory national policy framework designed to accelerate rapidly private sector deployment of advanced telecommunications and information technologies, and services to all Americans by opening all telecommunications markets to competition, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Feinstein/Kempthorne amendment No. 1270, to strike the authority of the Federal Communications Commission to preempt State or local regulations that establish barriers to entry for interstate or intrastate telecommunications services.

Gorton amendment No. 1277 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1270), to limit, rather than strike, the preemption language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 20 minutes debate on the Feinstein amendment No. 1270, to be equally divided in the usual form, with the vote on or in relation to the amendment to follow immediately.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, the amendment that is the subject of discussion is one presented by Senator KEMPTHORNE and me. There is a section in this bill entitled "Removal of Entry to Barriers." It is a section about which the cities, the counties and the States are very concerned because it is a section that giveth and a section that taketh away.

Why do I say that? I say it because in section 254, the States and local governments are given certain authority to maintain their jurisdiction and their control over what are called rights-of-way.

Rights-of-way are streets and roads under which cable television companies put lines. How they do it, where they do it and with what they do it is all a matter for local jurisdiction. Both sub-

sections (b) and (c) maintain this regulatory authority of local jurisdictions, but subsection (d) preempts that authority, and this is what is of vital concern to the cities, the counties and the States.

Senator KEMPTHORNE and I have a simple amendment. That amendment, quite simply stated, strikes the preemption and takes away the part of this bill that takes away local government and State governments' jurisdiction and authority over the rights-of-way.

We are very grateful to Senator GORTON who has presented a substitute, which will be voted on following our amendment. However, we must, quite frankly, say this substitute is inadequate.

Why is it inadequate? It is inadequate because cities and counties will continue to face preemption if they take actions which a cable operator asserts constitutes a barrier to entry and is prohibited under section (a) of the bill. As city attorneys state, is a city insurance or bonding requirement a barrier to entry? Is a city requirement that a company pay fees prior to installing any facilities to cover the costs of reviewing plans and inspecting excavation work a barrier to entry? Is the city requirement that a company use a particular type of excavation equipment or a different and specific technique suited to certain local circumstances to minimize the risk of major public health and safety hazards a barrier to entry? Is a city requirement that a cable operator move a cable trunk line away from a public park or place cables underground rather than overhead in order to protect public health a barrier to entry?

These are, we contend, intensely local decisions which could be brought before the FCC in Washington. The Gorton substitute continues to permit cable operators to challenge local government decisions before the FCC.

Why is this objectionable to local jurisdictions? It is objectionable to local jurisdictions because they believe if they are a small city, for example, they would be faced with bringing a team back to Washington, going before a highly specialized telecommunications-oriented Federal Communications Commission and plighting their troth. Then they would be forced to go to court in Washington, DC, rather than Federal district court back where they live.

This constitutes a major financial impediment for small cities. For big cities also, they would much prefer to have the issue settled in their district court rather than having to come back to Washington.

The cable operators are big time in this country. They maintain Washington offices, they maintain special staff, they maintain a bevy of skilled telecommunications attorneys. Cities do not. Cities have a city attorney, period. It is a very different subject.

Suppose a city makes a determination in the case that they wish to have