

for his leadership on this bill. His tireless devotion to the safety and health of the nation's workers has resulted today in passage of significant improvements for employees of the United States Postal Service. I am pleased to have worked with him on the passage of this important legislation, which will extend coverage of the Occupational Safety and Health Act to employees of the United States Postal Service. The bill has broad bipartisan support, and it is supported by the Administration as well.

Few issues are more important to working families than health and safety on the job. For the past 28 years, OSHA has performed a critical role—protecting American workers from on-the-job injuries and illnesses.

In carrying out this mission, OSHA has made an extraordinary difference in people's lives. Death rates from on-the-job accidents have dropped by over 60% since 1970—much faster than before the law was enacted. More than 140,000 lives have been saved.

Occupational illnesses and injuries have dropped by one-third since OSHA's enactment—to a record low rate of 7.4 per 100 workers in 1996.

These numbers are still unacceptably high, but they demonstrate that OSHA is a success by any reasonable measure.

Even more lives have been saved in the past two places where OSHA has concentrated its efforts. Death rates have fallen by 61% in construction and 67% in manufacturing. Injury rates have dropped by half in construction, and nearly one-third in manufacturing. Clearly, OSHA works best where it works hardest.

Unfortunately, these efforts do not apply to federal agencies. The original OSHA statute required only that federal agencies provide "safe and healthful places and conditions of employment" to their employees. Specific OSHA safety and health rules did not apply.

In 1980, President Carter issued an Executive Order that solved this problem in part. It directed federal agencies to comply with all OSHA safety standards, and it authorized OSHA to inspect workplaces and issue citations for violations.

President Carter's action was an important step, but more needs to be done. When OSHA inspects a federal workplace and finds a safety violation, OSHA can direct the agency to eliminate the hazard. But OSHA has no authority to seek enforcement of its order in court, and it cannot assess a financial penalty on the agency to obtain compliance.

The situation is especially serious in the Postal Service. Postal employees suffer one of the highest injury rates in the federal government. In 1996 alone, 78,761 postal employees were injured on the job—more than nine injuries and illnesses for every hundred workers. The total injury and illness rate among Postal Service workers represents almost half of the rate for the entire fed-

eral government, even though less than one-third of all federal workers are employed by the Postal Service. Fourteen postal employees were killed on the job in 1996—one-sixth of the federal total. Workers' compensation charges at the Postal Service are also high—\$538 million in 1997.

This legislation will bring down these unacceptably high rates. It permits OSHA to issue citations for safety hazards, and back them up with penalties. This credible enforcement threat will encourage the Postal Service to comply with the law. It will save taxpayer dollars currently spent on workers' compensation costs.

Most important, it will reduce the extraordinarily high rate of injuries among postal employees. Every worker deserves a safe and healthy place to work, and this bill will help achieve that goal for the 860,000 employees of the Postal Service. They deserve it, and I am pleased to join my colleagues in providing it.

ROBERT C. WEAVER FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 486, S. 1700.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1700) to designate the headquarters of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in Washington, the District of Columbia, as the "Robert C. Weaver Federal Building."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the unanimous passage of S. 1700, a bill to designate the headquarters of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, located at 451 Seventh Street, SW, as the "Robert C. Weaver Federal Building." I am proud to offer my tribute to a brilliant and committed public servant the late Dr. Robert C. Weaver, advisor to three Presidents, director of the NAACP, and the first African-American Cabinet Secretary. He was also a dear friend, dating back some 40 years.

A native Washingtonian, Bob Weaver spent his entire life broadening opportunities for minorities in America and working to dismantle America's deeply entrenched system of racial segregation. He first made his mark as a member of President Roosevelt's "Black Cabinet," an informal advisory group promoting educational and economic opportunities for blacks.

I first met Bob in the 1950s when we worked for Governor Averell Harriman. He served as Deputy Commissioner of Housing for New York State in 1955, and later became State Rent Commissioner with full Cabinet rank. Our friendship and collaboration would

continue through the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations. By 1960, Bob was serving as President of the NAACP. President Kennedy, impressed with Bob's insights and advice, soon appointed him to head the Housing and Home Finance Agency in 1961—the highest Federal post ever occupied by an African-American.

When President Johnson succeeded in elevating HHFA to Cabinet level status in 1966, he didn't need to look far for the right man to head the new Department of Housing and Urban Development—Bob Weaver became the nation's first African-American Cabinet Secretary. Later, he and I served together on the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission.

Following his government service, Dr. Weaver was, among various other academic pursuits, a professor at Hunter College, a member of the School of Urban and Public Affairs at Carnegie-Mellon, a visiting professor at Columbia Teacher's College and New York University's School of Education, and the president of Baruch College in Manhattan. When I became director of the Joint Center for Urban Studies at MIT and Harvard, he generously agreed to be a member of the Board of Directors.

Dr. Weaver had earned his undergraduate, master's, and doctoral degrees in economics from Harvard; he wrote four books on urban affairs; and he was one of the original directors of the Municipal Assistance Corporation, which designed the plan to rescue New York City during its tumultuous financial crisis in the 1970s.

After a long and remarkable career, Bob passed away last July at his home in New York City. The nation has lost one of its innovators, one of its creators, one of its true leaders. For Bob led not only with his words but with his deeds. I was privileged to know him as a friend. I think it is a fitting tribute to name the HUD Building after this great man.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statement relating to the bill appear at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1700) was considered read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1700

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF ROBERT C. WEAVER FEDERAL BUILDING.

In honor of the first Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the headquarters building of the Department of Housing and Urban Development located at 451 Seventh Street, SW., in Washington, District of Columbia, shall be known and designated as the "Robert C. Weaver Federal Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the

United States to the building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Robert C. Weaver Federal Building".

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. What is the order of business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a period of morning business with a 5-minute limitation.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to address the Senate for 25 minutes in morning business.

Mr. BYRD. Reserving the right to object, I do not intend to, I think that I addressed the Chair ahead of the other Senator, but I wouldn't challenge the Chair on that point. I know the Chair has the discretion to recognize whomever he hears first, but I would like to make a statement.

Mr. ALLARD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. ALLARD. How much time does the Senator need for his morning business remarks?

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator. I will require 20 or 25 minutes. But I will await my turn. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. No objection.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding. I was in the Chair, and I had the podium put up much earlier this morning, but because a colleague next to me was going to speak, he wanted it removed.

Mr. BYRD. I didn't understand the Senator.

Mr. ALLARD. I had requested that my podium be put up on the Senate floor at 10 o'clock this morning when I was presiding so that I could be in proper order to be recognized as soon as I got out of the Chair. I certainly didn't intend to create a problem for the Senator from West Virginia. I apologize for any inconvenience.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will yield, I have no problem. The Senator is not creating a problem for me. I just call attention to the rules, that the Presiding Officer recognize the first person who addresses the Chair seeking recognition. I have no quarrel with the Chair. I have been in the Chair many times, and sometimes it is a little difficult to really determine which Senator spoke first. I just wanted to establish again—and once in awhile we have to do this—that it is a matter of following the rules of recognition, and that it doesn't matter what Senator came before or what Senator is seen standing first, or what Senator may have his name on a list at the desk. I do not recognize a list at the desk. Never have. I try to stick to the rules. I thank the Senator. I know I have delayed his speech.

Mr. ALLARD. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his comments, and I respect the Senator.

COMMENDING SENATOR KYL ON HIS SPEECH ON THE RUMSFELD REPORT

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, first of all, I want to recognize and commend the Senator from Arizona, who spoke earlier today in morning business, for his good comments regarding the Rumsfeld report. Senator JOHN KYL has taken a particular interest in that report. I wanted to take a moment to recognize how important I think that report is. I think he was right-on in his comments. I think this Congress and this administration ought to look very seriously at the contents of that report. I serve on the Intelligence Committee with the Senator from Arizona and am privy to the same information to which he is privy.

EMPLOYEES OF THE 21ST CENTURY

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, during the 105th Session of Congress, my colleagues and I are addressing a broad range of high tech issues, including military, civilian, and commercial space issues. The industry supporting high technology products and services has become extremely important to our nation, and particularly in my home state of Colorado.

Today I would like to take a look at the high-tech industry through global, national, state, and local perspectives, and relate the broader examples to Colorado. Colorado is a microcosm of the nation when you look at high-tech and the future of the industry. The prosperity, trends, and needs within the Colorado community are prime examples of what the entire nation is faced with.

The growth-inducing power of technology at the industry level has been astonishing. In the United States, research-intensive industries, such as aerospace, chemicals, communications, computers, pharmaceuticals, scientific instruments, semiconductors, and software have been growing approximately twice the rate of the U.S. economy as a whole the past two decades. The high-tech world has also become extremely competitive. High-tech firms are now facing global competition, regional competition, and competition for jobs. There is every reason to believe that this trend will continue for at least the next decade.

As competition increases locally and globally, we must field an educated workforce that can also be competitive. America's future economy depends on sustaining a competitive edge through greater development and knowledge. But there is growing concern that America is not prepared for this new economy.

I would like to share some startling statistics revealing the serious lack of education in this country.

Forty percent of our 8 year-olds cannot read.

A Department of Education study concludes that 90 million adult Ameri-

cans have limited information and quantitative skills. According to the American Society for Training and Development's 1997 "State of the Industry Report," 50 percent of organizations now have to provide employee training in basic skills.

U.S. students do not perform well in comparison with students in other countries. According to the Third International Mathematics and Science Study—a study of half a million children in 41 countries—U.S. eighth-graders had average mathematics scores that were well below those of 20 other countries. Although U.S. eighth-graders performed better in science, they were still outperformed by students in nine other countries.

We are experiencing phenomenal growth in jobs for highly skilled information technology workers, yet there are mounting reports that industry is having great difficulty recruiting adequate numbers of workers with the skills in demand.

We, as a society, need to find ways to counter these serious problems and work towards filling all of our employment needs.

Due to increasing global competitiveness, our economy is creating millions of new jobs—more than 15 million new jobs since 1993. Employees are in demand due to this increased competitiveness, and of the 10 industries with the fastest employment growth from 1996–2006, computer and data processing services are number one on the list, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics Report of December 1997. In this field alone, there were 1.2 million jobs in the United States in 1996. This number is projected to rise to 2.5 million jobs in 2006. That represents a 108 percent increase in the next 8 years.

Of the 10 occupations with the fastest employment growth from 1996–2006, the top three occupations have some connection to the high tech industry. Database administrators, computer support specialists, and computer scientists had a population of 212,000 jobs in 1996, and are projected to be needed in 461,000 jobs in 2006, a 118 percent change. Computer engineers will see a 109 percent increase in jobs and systems analysts a 103 percent increase by the year 2006.

This trend is representative of the high-tech employment needs of Colorado. We are facing a problem as the need for technical bachelors' degrees rises, because the number of students entering this field is not increasing at a rate to meet this need. In addition, the science and math scores needed to pursue technical degrees at higher education institutions are not being met by more and more students every year.

If the trend continues as we expect it to, we will see an increasing lack of skilled employees to meet the industry's demand. The consequences of not filling these jobs could mean several things. One being that high-tech industry in the United States will not be globally competitive. Another being