only be met by a spirit of learning. But tragically as we all know today, there is a movement afoot in state capitals, and the nation's capital, to retreat on America's historic commitment to education funding. It is a retreat marked by a rather unusual argument. One that says, slashing education funding is for the good of our children. Under this skewed logic, cutting back on education will enable us, in some miraculous way, to provide more and better opportunities than we now enjoy. Nothing could be further from the truth. If we sound the retreat on education in America, we deny the opportunity of preschool and Head Start to thousands of children. We deny tens of thousands of elementary school students the resources they need to improve their reading and math schools. We deny summer jobs and learning opportunities to young people. And most cruelly of all, we deny the opportunity for college to millions of Americans by decreasing the availability of loans, making them less flexible, and raising interest payments and tuition beyond the reach of many working families.

It is particularly ironic that those who profess to worry most about values in America are on a crusade to diminish federal support for education and obliterate the National Service program known as Americorps, that the President launched last year. It is a false debate to pit a discussion about values against the real economic concerns of the American people. It is not either/or. It is both/and. We need both a strong economy that protects jobs and values that we want our children to be raised by. And what better example than National Service of what we mean by taking economic and educational opportunity and marrying it with values. The values you get from tutoring children, building homes for the elderly, working with police officers, cleaning up the environment, immunizing children. National Service is built on very old-fashioned values of hard work, discipline, and community service. The men and women who serve do so because they want to help people. And in return they get some small assistance with their education that not only helps them, but helps us as a country.

So whether we belong to Generation X, Y, or Z, each of us has the opportunity in our own way to make clear what values really matter. And we also can make a difference with those values in the lives of people we love and care about. Education matters. Kindness matters. Truth matters. Patience, hard work, tolerance, empathy, discipline—all of these matter. Forgiveness matters, and gratitude matters, especially on a day like today.

## TRIBUTE TO GEORGE WEBSTER

### HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 6, 1995*

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a legend of the Washington, DC, legal community, as well as a very dear friend of mine, George Webster, who is stepping down as general counsel for the American Society of Association Executives after 30 years of exemplary service to that body.

Although he has made his living in the District of Columbia for 45 years, he remains a constituent of mine by maintaining his beautiful farm in Hawkins County, TN, the region where his family originated and where he was born 74 years ago. He served in the U.S. Navy during World War II and attended Harvard Law School on the GI bill.

Upon his arrival in Washington, Mr. Webster established himself at a respected DC law firm where he developed his interest in the laws governing associations. This interest led to his being named general counsel of the American Society of Association Executives in 1965. In turn, his work with ASAE led to his writing the definitive book on association law, ''The Law of Associations,'' in 1971. This book has been in print ever since and has provided crucial guidance for legions of associations as they sought to work toward their members' best interest. It has also proven invaluable to all association leaders.

Mr. Webster founded his own Washington, law firm in 1968, currently known as Webster, Chamberlain, and Bean, of which his son Hugh is a partner. As one might expect, Webster, Chamberlain, and Bean does an excellent business in representing associations as well as corporate entities, and it remains one of the most respected Washington law.

In addition to knowing George Webster by his professional reputation and as a fellow Tennessean in Washington, he also has been extremely active in Republican politics at the State and national levels. He was the head of Lawyers for Nixon during President Nixon's reelection campaign, and has been heavily involved in fundraising for several national Republican candidates since then. In east Tennessee, there are few better ways for a Republican to raise money and meet people than to have him entertain at the Webster farm near Rogersville.

Although George feels that 30 years as general counsel to ASAE is enough, he will continue to remain active at Webster, Chamberlain, and Bean, and I know that he will enjoy spending more time with his lovely wife, Tuttie, and his children, Hugh, George, and Aen. I know that while ASAE will surely miss his guidance, he will continue to be available to advise associations, other attorneys, and friends for a long time to come.

It is a great honor to pay tribute to such a valued and longtime friend who richly deserves the highest praise for his contributions, loyalty, and dedication to his profession, to the State of Tennessee and to the Nation over the years. His achievements have done so much for so many during his lifetime.

## TRIBUTE TO HARRY AND GERALDINE DUBEL

### HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 6, 1995*

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 65th wedding anniversary of Harry and Geraldine Dubel. Harry and the former Geraldine Solomon, who were both born in 1909, were married on September 10, 1930, at St. Stephen's Roman Catholic Church.

Parents of 3 wonderful children, Rita, Henry Jr., and Robert, their family now proudly includes 13 grandchildren and 21 great grandchildren.

Harry initially worked as a delivery man for the Bond Bread Co. and then worked in the grocery business. After 10 years, during which he studied the business, he and Geraldine opened their own family-owned and operated market. Their small market grew and prospered and became Buffalo's well-known ''Dubel's Supermarket.''

After 54 years of hard work, Harry went into semiretirement: now he works only 6 days a week at the store with his sons who took over the family business years ago.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to join with Harry and Geraldine's family, colleagues, and innumerable friends throughout western New York to recognize and celebrate with them their 65-year commitment based on mutual love, faith, and respect. Harry and Geraldine Dubel are in inspiration to us all.

## MAKES ME WANNA WHINE

### HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 6, 1995*

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring a recent column by Paul Taylor of The Washington Post to the attention of my colleagues. As we in Congress continue about our task of reducing the power, reach and expense of the Federal Government, we might do well also to lower some unrealistic expectations.

In a free society, there are limits to what government can do to guarantee financial success for its citizens, prepare for their retirement, or preserve their families. The U.S. Government can not compel people to make intelligent career choices, invest wisely, or take their kids to the ball game. The Government can not make you go to church—it is in the Constitution.

Our first goal should be to see to it that government interference does not restrain citizens from realizing their dreams. Beyond that, we should limit ourselves to those relatively few activities which are performed best by a National Government. To that end, it would be helpful if politicians, pundits and the press would take a break from over-indulging the malcontents (and searching for scapegoats) and instead focus on efficiently executing the basic functions of government.

The at once sad and glorious truth is that much of what ails the people of the United States today is beyond the domain of government. Americanism is about individual initiative personal responsibility, private acts of charity, and above all else, freedom. With the freedom to pursue your ambitions comes the risk of falling short. With that in mind, I commend the following column by Paul Taylor to the attention of all interested parties.

MAKES ME WANNA WHINE

(By Paul Taylor)

''Politics,'' says Bill Bradley, ''is broken.'' His fix is to quit the Senate and ''focus on the lives of the people who are disconnected from the political process.'' And just maybe run for president.

Three suggestions, senator. Start by telling all those disconnected people to stop whining. Then tell the politicians to stop pandering to the whining. Then tell the media to stop exploiting the whining.

Can anyone really believe the problem with American politics is that the folks who claim to be alienated from it—most inclusively defined, the nearly three-quarters of

Americans who now routinely tell pollsters they don't trust their government—aren't being hear?

The problem is that they're running the show. They own the radio talk circuit, the catch-a-scoundrel television newsmagazines, the late-night comedy monologues, the prime-time sitcoms and the afternoon Oprah-and-Phil whine-alongs, to say nothing of Madison Avenue and Hollywood.

Their grievances have become our national entertainment—neatly packaged, voraciously consumed. Their everybody's-out-to-screw-me take on life is ground zero of the popular culture.

The political press lavishes attention on their rumblings about the need for a third party or another independent presidential run by the likes of Ross Perot or Colin Powell, and never mind that the central truth about the ''radical middle'' of our political spectrum is that its members have no common ideology.

Some are liberal, some conservative, some libertarian. What grieves them doesn't start with politics and, in the main, can't be fixed by politics. It is spiritual, social, moral and economic. That's why, at Perot's whinerama in Dallas earlier this month, the best audience responses went to empathetic speakers from distant poles of the ideological map—Jesse Jackson on the left and House Budget Committee Chairman John Kasich on the right.

Here's a radical notion: When the whiners insist the problem is rooted in politics, their delusions become self-fulfilling. Their media-stoked anger creates the dysfunctional foundation upon which the nation's political conversation is held, its candidates elected and its public policy made. They do at least as much damage to politics as politics does to them.

In 1992, the whiners achieved the latest in a string of dubious political victories by electing a president who is forever reassuring them: ''I feel your pain.'' Naturally, this makes then whine even louder.

But their impact on politics didn't begin with President Clinton. For a generation now, the angry middle class has systematically put into office politicians of both parties who over-indulge them, to everyone's eventual grief. What is the hated national debt but the cumulative choice by one cowed Congress and president after another to give the American people all the goodies they demand, then flinch at charging them at 100 cents on the dollar?

When the angry populists get angrier still about the way this shell game has mortgaged their children's future, they scour the landscape for scapegoats. Is it the big money boys, the corporate lobbyists, the PAC men, the NAFTA brigade? Or is it the lily-livered politicians? Welfare cheats? Illegal immigrants? Single mothers? Blacks? Whites? Japanese? Mexicans? Detective Fuhrman? All the usual suspects get trashed, except of course the perps themselves, who just get more angry.

Before I push this curmudgeonly screed any further, let me put my own suspect credentials on the table: I write with some complicity and, at least for another moment or two, some distance.

I'm recently back from a three-year stint as The Post's correspondent in South Africa, where I covered the brave transformation from apartheid to democracy. Before that, I covered American politics for two decades.

During the 1980s, I wrote my share of sympathetic articles about the set-upon, anxiety-prone, economically stagnant middle class. Perhaps I caught the virus. Eventually, like the subjects of these pieces, I grew jaded with American politics. I decided to cast my lot elsewhere.

In South Africa, I had the chance to observe political leadership at its most sublime. Had Nelson Mandela and Frederik W. de Klerk been guided by the angry voices in their respective constituencies, South Africa probably would have been plunged into a race war. Instead, using moral suasion and pragmatic statesmanship, they persuaded nervous supporters to accept a scary racial compromise. Mandela and de Klerk each succeeded precisely to the degree that an element of their message to the people was: Stick you pain where the moon don't shine; one day you'll thank me.

During those three years abroad I also kept half an eye trained homeward. From 8,000 miles away, American society looked impossibly rich, breathtakingly dynamic and pathologically whiny.

Poor, bedraggled Africa probably isn't the clearest vantage point from which to observe anything in the First World. Nonetheless, here's what I saw from there: An America that had colonized the planet with democracy, language, currency, computers, movies, music, bluejeans and fast food. An America whose inflation and unemployment was low, whose stock market was booming. An America at peace. An America that had slain communism in the second half of the century, just as it had slain fascism in the first.

Job well done! Let's party! Yet everyone in America I saw on CNN seemed to want to shoot, shout or sue.

Plainly, some of this dyspepsia is a morning-after phenomenon. After wars, hot or cold, nations lose their sense of mission. And some is the stress on everyday lives caused by a shift in economic epochs, from the Industrial Age to the Information Age. And some is a winner-takes-all dynamic that keeps driving American income distribution toward more distant poles of inequality. And some is the frustrating wage stagnation of the middle class. And some is the confusing change in gender roles and relationships. Together, all of these forces have undermined the nuclear family, society's most reliable incubator of values and morals.

Let's stipulate that life is tough. It's tough to live in the inner city; to lose a job to corporate ''downsizing''; to graduate from college suspecting you'll never live as well as your parents.

But really! Can it be tougher to be a single mother working at McDonald's in 1995 than it was to be a immigrant wife working in a Chicago slaughterhouse in 1915? Tougher to be an insecure factory worker now than an Oklahoma farmer during the Dust Bowl years? A 22-year-old cab driver now than a 22-year old GI in 1917? Or 1943? Or 1952? Or 1969?

Hey, we've got air conditioning, ESPN, Dove Bars and lots of other good stuff. But Americans still seem to have convinced themselves that life in the past few decades keeps getting worse.

Part of the delusion is sustained by my craft. In a complex world, the culture of complaint makes journalism less difficult. There's a grievance, there's a victim, there's a bad guy. Whining (and O.J.) has become the touchstone that connects us all. It bridges our diversity. It moves product.

Sometimes journalism can take all this to silly extremes. Last week's Time magazine cover story, ''20th Century Blues,'' turns to psychobabble in seeking to establish a ''mismatch between our genetic makeup and the modern world.'' The piece begins: ''There's a little bit of the Unabomber in most of us.'' Two weeks ago, a New Yorker essay started the same way. Memo to colleagues: That guy's a crackpot. Most Americans aren't.

In fact, I've made an important discovery after returning from three years of worrying from afar about America's angst. I'm amazed by . . . how normal everybody is! In office elevators, at fast-food joints, in airport lobbies, the folks I encounter are the same busy, sensible, good-humored, can-do Americans I've always known. They don't look crazed; they don't even look stressed.

At the hollow core of this culture of complaint, there's an element of hype—a kind of tacit conspiracy between the media and the whiners. The latter have grown savvy about which sound-bites will get them into the national conversation. The former, if they're so inclined, can extract a fuming quote from just about anyone. I've found that if you talk to most Americans long enough, they turn out to have nuanced, common-sense views (if not always quotable quotes) about almost everything, including their government. They may not be especially well-informed, but they're smart.

They're certainly right that the political system isn't responsive to their anxieties. But they're wrong that their anxieties can be reduced to neat public policy solutions. Or that the sky is somehow falling.

When all these people loudly proclaim that politics is broken, it reminds me of an observation sometimes made about academic politics: the smaller the stakes, the nastier the fights.

Freed from cosmic worries, spared of wars or depressions, bereaved of global enemies, Americans in the 1990s are gazing at their navels and grousing about the lint. It's human nature.

Both the politicians and the media have a professional interest in pretending the stakes are huge. So the 1994 Republican takeover of Congress gets blown up as a ''historic'' realignment, and already the '96 presidential contenders are talking about a ''once-in-a-lifetime'' chance to reconfigure the size and scope of government.

The voters are pretty wise to this poppycock, but it feeds their frustration with politics. They keep hearing about all the upheavals that are supposed to be coming out of Washington; then they check their own lives and discover nothing's changed. They feel jerked around. They switch channels, or turn off the set altogether.

The absence of big change from Washington can be seen another way: as a testament to a stable, non-ideological, centrist political system, where public policy is fought out between the 45-yard lines. That's not a bad thing.

The problem is that the real source of what ails America lies beyond the reach of government. Nobody, for example, wants to live in a society where a third of all children are born out of wedlock and half grow up in homes without their biological father. Everyone understands how that tears apart the social fabric.

Yet politicians indulge the conceit that they can change these behaviors. Right now they're debating welfare policy, a useful debate to have. But the personal behavior of the poor (or anyone else) is substantially beyond the reach of policy; always has been.

New Jersey recently adopted a new welfare policy that cuts off additional benefits to welfare mothers if they have more kids. The preliminary findings? They keep right on having more kids. In matters of the heart and matters of the loins, government doesn't have enough carrots and it doesn't have enough sticks.

If there was a little more honesty from on high about what government can do, maybe there'd be a little less anger from below about what it cannot.

But maybe not. I often wondered these past three years how Mandela or de Klerk would have fared in the cynical pit of American politics. They're both gifted politicians, but part of their success was based on the respect that Africans have for their leaders

and institutions. It is a continent full of willing followers (often too willing); in this instance they were served by exceptional leaders.

In America at the moment, that relationship has gone awry. Our leaders won't lead and our followers won't follow.

It's hard to imagine how the logjam gets broken from below. The laws of human nature can't be repealed. Cynicism begets cynicism.

Still, each of us can make a start. I hereby vow as a returning political journalist not to report at face value all the whining I'm sure to hear between now and November 1996. But the real burden, I'm afraid, lies with politicians like you, Sen. Bradley. By all means, go out and listen to the voices of the disconnected. But not too long. What they really need is a good talking to.

## H.R. 1854, THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT CONFERENCE REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

### HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 6, 1995*

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this member rises in support of the conference report on H.R. 1854 and is pleased that this measure includes a reduction of $75 million for the General Accounting Office [GAO] below the fiscal year 1996 funding level. This Member is particularly pleased that the House and Senate conferees further reduced the funding level for GAO by $19 million below the House-approved fiscal year 1996 level.

Mr. Speaker, during the first days of the 104th Congress, this Member wrote to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, as well as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman of the Budget Committee, to express this Member's strong support for reduced funding levels for GAO. This Member is pleased with the action taken which confers with this Member's request for reducing funding for GAO.

For some time, this Member supported a reduction in funding for GAO. In fact, during consideration of the fiscal year 1995 legislative branch appropriations bill, this Member offered an amendment to cut funding for GAO by 5 percent below the fiscal year 1994 level. Unfortunately, this amendment failed by a close vote.

The $374 million fiscal year 1996 funding level for GAO included in the conference report represents a decrease of $75 million below the fiscal year 1995 level. During last year's deliberation of the legislative branch appropriations bill, the House approved a funding level of $439.5 billion, an increase of $9.4 million. In addition, the fiscal year 1995 conference report then included $449 million for GAO, $10 million more than the House bill. This Member commends the conferees for reversing this outrageous trend in funding for GAO.

This Member strongly believes that GAO is an agency where growth has been out of control, and that it is an agency which has not been responsive to individual Members, especially to the requests of Republican Members during our long tenure in the minority. This Member also believes that the quality of work produced by the GAO is shoddy. While the quality of the work varies dramatically, all products are given the same kind of credibility simply because they are GAO products. The level of resources provided to produce these products has been excessive and has grown disproportionately when compared with other congressional support agencies. In addition, GAO resources have also been used for consultants, training, and other unnecessary expenses. Concern has also been expressed that GAO is more interested in getting headlines than in supporting the Congress with the required information. This Member has also been concerned by the funds that have been spent to lavishly renovate GAO's offices. This renovated space includes plush conference and meeting rooms which seem excessive for the scope of work performed at GAO. The leadership and staff of the GAO ought to visit the staff here on Capitol Hill to understand something about crowded staff office conditions and about the absence of required conference rooms for meetings with constituents.

Now let's examine the GAO workload. From 1985 to 1993, GAO investigations doubled from 457 per year to 915. In addition, GAO's budget jumped from $46.9 million in 1965 to our current spending level of $449 million, a nearly 1,000-percent increase in unadjusted dollars.

While the number of full-time equivalent positions at GAO has been reduced additional cuts are still needed to account for the past growth at this agency, which this Member will outline. In 1980, funding for GAO staff cost $204 million. By 1985 that had grown to $299 million. In 1988 it was $330 million, and in 1989, $346 million. The average increase between 1980 and 1990 was 8 percent per year. Then, in 1991, GAO was increased by 14 percent, to a total of $409 million. In 1992, GAO received another 8 percent increase to $443 million.

According to a Democratic study group [DSG] special report issued on May 24, 1994, January 1994 personnel totals for GAO were 4,597. This level was nearly as large as the staffing level of 4,617 for the entire Library of Congress—the largest library in the world—which also includes the staff of the Congressional Research Service.

According to this same study, in 1994, GAO's staffing level was nearly 2½ times as large as the 1,849 House committee staff members during the 103d Congress, and more than one-half as large as the 7,340 individuals employed by Members of the House. The DSG study also compared funding levels for the legislative branch from 1979 to 1994, in inflation-adjusted dollars. According to the DSG, the General Accounting Office received one of the largest increases in funding for the entire legislative branch at an inflation-adjusted 13.5 percent during this time period.

Funding for other areas of the legislative branch have actually declined since 1979, according to this study. For example, the Library of Congress received a 17.6 percent reduction, CBO was reduced by 3.8 percent, and Members' staff was reduced by 6.4 percent in inflation-adjusted dollars since 1979.

Again, this Member would like to thank the conferees for their good judgment in facing the long-term reality of GAO and reducing funding for that agency. This Member urges his colleagues to support this funding level included in this conference report.

## TRIBUTE TO RUDY JORDAN ON HIS RETIREMENT

### HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 6, 1995*

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to recognize Mr. Rudy Jordan on the occasion of his retirement from over 30 years of dedicated community service and employment as supervisor of child welfare and attendance with the Montebello Unified School District.

Over the years, Rudy accumulated a long list of accomplishments while working with youth. Starting out as a junior camp counselor at the All Nations Camp in 1948, Rudy worked his way up the ranks to become a senior camp counselor and finally, in 1954, served as All National Boys Club supervisor for 5 years. Rudy later worked as a special education teacher and after 6 years of addressing the needs of special education students, began his employment with the Montebello Unified School District.

Rudy also has an impressive record of involvement in civic organizations, especially those which aim to enrich the lives of youth. He has been a voluntary Big Brother for over 32 years, serving as a mentor to young men who might not otherwise have positive role model to seek guidance and counsel. In addition, he has served as a counselor for the Youth Opportunity Board, an advisory member of the Eastmont Teen Post, co-founder of the Association for the Advancement of Mexican-American Students, co-founder of the Eastmont Parents Guild, co-founder of the committees for both the Reggie Rodriguez Park and Saybrook Park, co-founder of the International Youth Boxing Club and the Hollenbeck Police Athletic League Program. Rudy's involvement in such programs exemplify his strong dedication to helping youth.

Rudy, a Golden Glove boxing champion and former professional boxer, also used his athletic expertise to add fulfilling experiences to the lives of many youth. He is currently a boxing trainer for the Santa Fe Springs Parks and Recreation Program, as well as for the Sierra High School Night Program. He also has been a trainer for the Montebello Police Athletic League Boxing Program. In addition to his civic and youth sports efforts, Rudy has donated his time as an usher at his local parish. Rudy's lovely wife of over 40 years, Gloria, and his five children are proud to have such an active husband and father dedicated to serving his community. Indeed, I have had the distinct honor of knowing Rudy and his family for many years, and I am proud to count him among my friends.

Mr. Speaker, it is with profound pride that I rise to recognize Mr. Rudy Jordan on the occasion of his retirement from the Montebello Unified School District, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending best wishes and congratulations to Rudy, a fine citizen whose involvement in our community serves as an example to all.