

Meritorious Executive Presidential Rank Award (twice);

Secretary of Defense Meritorious Civilian Service Awards;

Secretary of Defense Award for Excellence;

Distinguished Executive Presidential Rank Award;

American Defense Preparedness Association Firepower Award;

University of Delaware College Distinguished Engineering Alumnus;

Exceptional Civilian Service Award;

Meritorious Civilian Service (twice);

Department of Army Staff Badge; and

American Helicopter Society Grover S. Bell Award for Rotorcraft Research;

He has more than 20 technical publications and numerous technical articles to credit.

I know that Mr. Singley's wife Maxine, and his children, George, Kristine, and Dean, and the Department of Defense are proud of his accomplishments. My colleagues join me in wishing George 'fair winds and following seas' as he pursues many new and exciting challenges in the private sector. The Nation and our military are indebted to you for your many years of distinguished service.

#### THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, March 11, 1998, the federal debt stood at \$5,528,971,446,018.69 (Five trillion, five hundred twenty-eight billion, nine hundred seventy-one million, four hundred forty-six thousand, eighteen dollars and sixty-nine cents).

One year ago, March 11, 1997, the federal debt stood at \$5,357,359,000,000 (Five trillion, three hundred fifty-seven billion, three hundred fifty-nine million).

Five years ago, March 11, 1993, the federal debt stood at \$4,211,257,000,000 (Four trillion, two hundred eleven billion, two hundred fifty-seven million).

Ten years ago, March 11, 1988, the federal debt stood at \$2,482,356,000,000 (Two trillion, four hundred eighty-two billion, three hundred fifty-six million).

Fifteen years ago, March 11, 1983, the federal debt stood at \$1,225,057,000,000 (One trillion, two hundred twenty-five billion, fifty-seven million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,303,914,446,018.69 (Four trillion, three hundred three billion, nine hundred fourteen million, four hundred forty-six thousand, eighteen dollars and sixty-nine cents) during the past 15 years.

#### THE CASE FOR INCREASED ACCESS TO SKILLED PERSONNEL

MR. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to share with my colleagues an important article on the severe problems U.S. companies, particularly in the high technology sector, are facing with regards to skilled workers. In the

March 9, 1998 edition of the Wall Street Journal, Dr. T.J. Rodgers the President and Chief Executive Officer of Cypress Semiconductor Corporation, clearly articulated why this country needs increased access to skilled professionals. The author is widely considered to be a leading authority on high-tech issues and recently offered his expertise on the H1-B visa issue in a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing on the shortage of high-tech workers in America. I urge my colleagues to read Dr. Rodger's educated summary of this serious problem and consider a bill I introduced last week with Senators HATCH, MCCAIN, DEWINE, SPECTER and GRAMS, S. 1723, the "American Competitiveness Act," which seeks to address the serious issues raised in Dr. Rodger's article.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Rodger's article be inserted into the RECORD.

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

#### GIVE US YOUR TIRED, YOUR POOR—AND YOUR ENGINEERS

Last year, the U.S. Labor Department interrupted four key projects at my company, Cypress Semiconductor: a memory chip for Internet applications, a microcontroller chip for personal computers, our chip-manufacturing control system and our most advanced CMOS process technology, which permits the design of very low-power integrated circuits.

The reason? U.S. high-tech companies had hit the annual cap of 65,000 H1-B visas, which allow highly skilled foreigners to work in the U.S. As a result, we had to lay off highly skilled technology workers who were waiting for their visas, delaying the sale of millions of new chips and the creation of hundreds of manufacturing jobs.

We have 16 other projects backlogged due to engineering shortages—and that's not surprising when the unemployment rate in electrical engineering is a rock-bottom 0.4%. Although we recruit on 27 college campuses and hire all the immigrants we're allowed, Cypress cannot find enough engineers to grow at its full potential. So it goes across Silicon Valley: The Information Technology Association of America says there are 8346,000 unfilled skilled positions nationwide. In a survey, the association's members say this engineering crunch is the No. 1 factor inhibiting the growth of their companies.

And yet Washington is sending immigrants home, including many new graduates of American colleges. Half of technology doctorates awarded by U.S. universities go to foreign nationals. The president of Taiwan's Winbond Semiconductor, just penalized by the International Trade Commission for dumping in the U.S., has a doctorate from Princeton.

The labor shortage is getting worse. Last year Washington cut off H1-B immigration for one month. This year it will be four months, unless Congress increases the H1-B quota. The administration has opted for the immigration shutdown because it wants to "protect" American workers from "cheap" immigrant labor, a doubly incorrect position. In fact, skilled immigrants create new jobs for native-born Americans, and a Cato Institute study shows that long-term unemployment is lower and wages higher in cities and states with higher immigrant concentrations.

Yet the Clinton-Gore administration, an off-and-on friend of Silicon Valley, has

turned its back on high-tech again, as I recently told the Senate Judiciary Committee, where I was joined by representatives of Intel, Microsoft, Sun Microsystems and Texas Instruments. Commerce Secretary William Daley has said that an increase in H1-B immigration is "not feasible"—Washington-speak for "drop dead." But Sen. Spencer Abraham (R., Mich.), for one, is listening. He introduced legislation last week that would raise the H1-B cap by a modest 25,000.

The claim that skilled H1-B immigrants take jobs from Americans is preposterous. Did Hungarian immigrant and Intel CEO Andy Grove take some "real" American's job, or did he help to create 50,000 high-quality jobs?

Engineers create jobs. Cypress employs 470 engineers out of 2,771 employees. Each engineer thus creates five additional jobs to make, administer and sell the products he develops. A disproportionate number of our research-and-development engineers—37%—are immigrants, typical for Silicon Valley. Had we been prevented from hiring those 172 immigrant engineers, we couldn't have created about 860 other jobs, 70% of which are in the U.S.

Cypress now employs 2,011 U.S. citizens, an accomplishment unachievable without immigrants. Four of our 10 vice presidents are immigrants. Lothar Maler, our vice president of manufacturing, emigrated from Germany as a child. He joined us with an engineering degree and a stint at Intel under his belt, and now manages 1,067 workers in six plants. John Torode, our chief technology officer, came to the U.S. after World War II with his father, a British sailor. After obtaining his doctorate and a computer science professorship at the University of California, Berkeley, John started our computer products division, which makes the clock chips used to synchronize 20 million personal computers a year.

Emmanuel Hernandez, our chief financial officer, was an all-star employee at National Semiconductor, Silicon Valley's second-largest chip company, which transferred him to the U.S. from the Philippines. Tony Alvarez, our vice president of R&D, fled Castro-controlled Cuba, in 1961 and now directs the 113 engineers who develop our most advanced technologies. Tony's chief scientist, Jose Arreola, emigrated from Mexico to get his doctorate and now manages an elite group of 30 engineers, 24 of whom have postgraduate degrees and 20 of whom are legal immigrants. Pat Buchanan derided immigrants during his 1996 presidential campaign, calling them "Jose." Our Jose his made Cypress's 2,011 American employees better off.

Pierre Lamond, our chairman, received an advanced degree in France, and was then recruited to work at Fairchild Semiconductor, which he left to become a founder of National Semiconductor. Today Pierre's venture-capital fund, Sequoia Partners, has provided capital to 200 Silicon Valley companies (including Apple and Genentech) with a total market value of \$175 billion and more than 150,000 employees. Eric Benhamou, another Cypress director, fled with his parents to France during the 1960 Algerian civil war. After his Stanford education, he became CEO of 3Com Corp., the leading Internet infrastructure supplier with 100 million customers and 13,200 employees.

The conclusion is clear: Our immigrant executives, directors and engineers have created thousands of new American jobs. The competition for workers is so intense in Silicon Valley that Cypress's average San Jose employee—excluding the executive staff and me—now earns \$81,860 annually, including benefits. The immigrant executives I have cited all earn six-figure incomes. Whose pay

are they holding down? With 0.4% unemployment in this field, and record-low unemployment in the broader U.S. economy, where are the out-of-work Americans displaced by foreign talent?

America's loss is our foreign competition's gain. Our need for engineers has driven us to start R&D centers anywhere we can find engineers—currently, in England, Ireland and India. We're forced offshore to fill the jobs that we cannot fill here—a fine way to "protect" American jobs.

Legal immigrants currently constitute 8.5% of the U.S. population, well below the 13%-plus levels maintained from 1860 to 1939. Immigrants add less than 0.4% to the population yearly. If this administration ignores Silicon Valley's need for 25,000 to 35,000 more immigrant engineers—a mere 3% or so of the million-plus yearly legal immigrants—the only result will be to drive high-tech hiring offshore. And it will have added the H1-B visa issue—along with litigation reform, encryption export and Internet regulation—to its list of Silicon Valley snubs.

Raising quotas by only 3%, specifically to bring in critical engineers and scientists, would be an obvious benefit to all Americans. Why are we sending the first-round draft choices of the high-tech world to play on other country's teams?

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT OF 1997

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to the consideration of S. 1173, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1173) to authorize funds for construction of highways, for highway safety programs, and for mass transit programs, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill, with a modified committee amendment in the nature of a substitute (Amendment No. 1676).

Pending:

McCain Amendment No. 1726 (to Amendment No. 1676), to provide that demonstration projects shall be subject to any limitation on obligations established by law that applies in Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs.

AMENDMENT 1726

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, it is time we end the practice of earmarking highway projects. This practice continues to disadvantage my state, and most others. Commonly referred to as demonstration projects, these earmarked dollars literally come off the top of the transportation funding available under this legislation.

The rationale behind apportionment formulas and funding allocations is that these transportation funds are distributed according to state's needs. Notwithstanding disagreements over whether these distributions accurately reflect a state's transportation needs, the practice of authorizing demonstra-

tion projects undermines the rationale supporting the use of these formulas. Moreover, this practice literally deprives states of the funding which would otherwise be available for states' highway priorities as established by state and local transportation planners.

While I believe this is a wasteful practice, history has shown there is little chance of its outright elimination. Beginning in 1982 when \$362 million was set-aside for 10 such earmarks, the inclusion of such earmarks has continued to grow as illustrated in the 1991 transportation bill, ISTEA, where over \$6 billion was provided for 538 location specific projects.

While the Senate's Environment and Public Works Committee has shown great restraint in this area, it is well understood that the House of Representatives has been unable to curtail this practice. In fact, the House is fully expected to come forward this year with billions of dollars in transportation earmarks.

Accordingly, the amendment offered by Senator MCCAIN does the next best thing. It requires that any highway demonstration projects come from within a state's total funding and not at the expense of funding otherwise available to all other states.

For all my colleagues who have argued in favor of the formulas contained in the bill and the rationale behind them, support of this provision remains consistent with that position. And, for those of my colleagues who are not as enthusiastic over the distribution of highway dollars in the underlying legislation, this provision will ensure that your states prospective return on their transportation dollar will not be eroded any further.

I look forward to the overwhelming support of my colleagues on this common sense amendment, and I thank Senator MCCAIN for his excellent work in crafting this provision.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the McCain amendment to require that demonstration projects be funded from each state's allocation and be subject to annual limitation.

The current system for designating large construction projects advantages a few states over the majority. It prioritizes construction needs based more on political seniority that it does an impartial evaluation of transportation needs. It creates pressure for Members of Congress to engage in porkbarrel spending rather than to concentrate on prudent national policy. I believe the McCain amendment would help move us away from this system because it would not give states or members an incentive to seek out demonstration or critical needs projects, as securing these projects would not increase the amount of federal funds flowing to a state.

I further support the McCain amendment because it gives states greater say in determining what projects have

the highest priority for their locality. It should be up to cities, counties, and the state Departments of Transportation to prioritize what projects need immediate attention in their state—not the federal government. Too often under the current system, a state has to put aside its own priorities because it must use its own limited funds to provide matching funds for the large federally designated construction projects, or risk losing federal funding. This "Washington knows best" approach to transportation planning needs to end.

Finally, I support this amendment because it would end a system that disadvantages the infrastructure needs of a majority of states to the benefit of a few. In order to maintain a strong, truly national infrastructure system, we must give every state the tools and funding its needs to maintain its share of the system. Ending a system that gives a few states an inordinate amount of construction dollars is one step in the right direction toward that goal.

I applaud the Senator from Arizona for proposing this approach to increase fiscal responsibility in transportation spending and to empower the communities in which the infrastructure lies. I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to amendment No. 1726 offered by Senator MCCAIN. The yeas and nays have been offered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 29 Leg.] YEAS—78

Abraham	Dorgan	Lieberman
Akaka	Enzi	Lott
Allard	Faircloth	Lugar
Ashcroft	Feingold	Mack
Baucus	Frist	McCain
Bennett	Glenn	McConnell
Biden	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Breaux	Grams	Murray
Brownback	Grassley	Nickles
Bumpers	Gregg	Reed
Burns	Hagel	Robb
Chafee	Hatch	Roberts
Cleland	Helms	Rockefeller
Coats	Hutchinson	Roth
Cochran	Hutchison	Sessions
Collins	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Conrad	Inouye	Smith (OR)
Coverdell	Johnson	Snowe
Craig	Kempthorne	Stevens
D'Amato	Kerrey	Thomas
Daschle	Kohl	Thompson
DeWine	Kyl	Thurmond
Dodd	Landrieu	Warner
Domenici	Levin	Wyden

NAYS—22

Boxer	Hollings	Santorum
Bryan	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Byrd	Kennedy	Shelby
Campbell	Kerry	Specter
Durbin	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Feinstein	Leahy	Wellstone
Ford	Mikulski	
Harkin	Reid	

The amendment (No. 1726) was agreed to.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.