

commitment, not only through the newspapers he owned, but also through his efforts to launch a variety of other publications, including one of today's most successful law journals, the Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy, which he helped to initiate through personal investments.

Mostly, I think John McGoff would want to be remembered as a man who loved his family. Indeed, I can remember how, on virtually every occasion in which we were together I would receive a detailed account of every one of his children, what they were doing and what their most recent achievements and challenges were. When we paid him tribute last Saturday, each of those children was there to help remember their father and to pay great testament to his wonderful life.

So, on behalf, I know, of many people in our State who certainly will miss John McGoff and regret his passing, I want to say his was a full life, one of great success; the life of a person who loved his community, loved his country, loved his family—truly loved America and everything for which she stands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 1295

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request with regard to S. 1295, which is the naming of the National Airport the Ronald Reagan Airport. But before I propound that request, let me say I want to make some comments after we have this request, about why we are doing this, and put in the RECORD some of the history about what is involved. I have been talking to the principal sponsor, Senator COVERDELL. I know he has been talking to Members on both sides of the aisle. Senator DASCHLE and I have talked about it. I don't think we have, it would appear, an agreement worked out as to how this is to be considered, but I hope we can continue to talk about why this is important, why we want to do it, and see if an agreement can be worked out. I think it is the right thing to do.

One week from Friday is the birthday of former President Ronald Reagan. I think it would be a very good and a magnanimous gesture by the Congress and by the President of the United States if he could be able to sign this bill on President Ronald Reagan's birthday. That is why the timing is critical and why we want to go ahead and begin to talk about it. Because Senators on both sides of the aisle had conflicts today, we are not going to be able to vote on it today—or would not have been able to vote on it, probably, today, anyway. But it is my hope, my intent, that we could get it done next Tuesday and then complete the process so we could do this in recognition of this great President.

I ask unanimous consent the Commerce Committee be discharged from

further consideration of S. 1297 and further the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration, and further, that there be one amendment in order relative to the modification of the original bill, with total time for debate limited to 2 hours equally divided between Senators MCCAIN and HOLLINGS or their designees, and, following the debate, the Senate proceed to a vote on or in relation to the amendment, to be followed by third reading and final passage. I further ask that if a rollcall vote is requested in relation to the amendment or passage, the votes be postponed to occur on Tuesday, February 3, at a time to be determined by the majority leader after notification of the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Reserving the right to object, and I will be compelled to object at this time, for several reasons.

First, there are a number of Democratic Senators who want the opportunity—to have a right to offer perhaps more than one amendment. There may or may not be opposition to this legislation, but there certainly is cause for some consideration of aspects to this issue that may not be as evident as we consider the prospect of a bill of this nature today: The costs associated with it; the process that we use in naming national or important public facilities; people have raised the question of whether it is appropriate for us to take the name Washington off of the name of this particular airport—ironically, the same month that we celebrate President Washington's birthday. So we celebrate not only one but two birthdays in February. The name Washington is very prominent in February, as is President Reagan's of course. Some have even asked whether the Reagan family wants this to be done.

So, Mr. President, there are a lot of very legitimate questions. As I say, there are a number of Democratic Senators who may or may not be in support of this legislation, following the exploration of many of these issues. So I do not think it would be in our best interests to proceed today. I have had some discussions with the distinguished majority leader about the matter, and will continue to do so in an effort to resolve these questions and try to find a way with which to assure that this issue is fully explored and debated without unnecessary delay.

So, on the basis of all of those relevant issues, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I yield to the chairman of the committee that has jurisdiction in this area.

RENAMING WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT "RONALD REAGAN NATIONAL AIRPORT"

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for bringing this

issue forward in an expeditious fashion. I do believe President's Reagan's upcoming birthday is an important time for us to mark this occasion. I thank Senator COVERDELL, whose original thought I believe this was, along with the encouragement of millions of Americans all across the country. I have a longer statement, I would say to the majority leader, that I would like to give after his remarks, but let me just say, briefly, I find this—I find this astounding, that we would block this. There have been many fallen leaders. There are many former Presidents we have had, and living Presidents, that—there has never been any problem with the naming of things. I have been told that there may be an effort to name the Justice Department after the late Robert F. Kennedy. I would strongly support such a thing and I believe most of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would also. But for us to block this at this time, given President Reagan's condition—which we all are very well aware of—I think is unfortunate and, even worse, if this blocks this well-intentioned proposal to honor one of the most decent and nonpartisan and kindly people that I have ever had the privilege of knowing in politics, I think it would be a terrible mistake.

I yield back to the majority leader. I will have further remarks later on. I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the chairman of the committee, Senator MCCAIN, for his comments. I know we will be interested in hearing the balance of his comments. I thank him for allowing me to explain a little bit about what is going on here, if I could.

First of all I want to emphasize that the proposal is to name National Airport, which is commonly referred to as Washington National Airport, the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. Washington National Airport was not named after George Washington. It was named after the District of Columbia, to denote a location, a physical location. I think everybody would understand that that would be appropriate, the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

This idea, as I understand it, originally came from the immediately-past Governor of Virginia, the State where this airport is located. That was the first time I ever heard it was from former Governor George Allen.

The principal sponsor, Senator COVERDELL, has worked in previous Republican administrations, has been committed to this and has been doing very good work in the preparation for this to happen. As for my personal situation, I had the clear impression that this was something that was supported by the family and friends of the President.

But I also want to emphasize again something I noted earlier. The reason why we want to do it early is not just because we are looking for work, not

just because we want to ram it through—I really thought it would go through, you know, on a shouted unanimous vote. It's because it is a special time in the life of a man who has meant so much to this country and to so many of us.

In my 29 years in political life, this man, former President Ronald Reagan, has meant more than any other single person. I think history will show clearly he is one of the two greatest Presidents of this century, and in my opinion, the greatest by far. So I was very comfortable with moving it quickly, because of the birthday consideration. Keep in mind, now, this is a President, as you would expect from Ronald Reagan, who is sort of riding off into the sunset. He has been a credit to our country in so many ways, and since he has been President he has gone back to his beloved California and he has been battling a terrible disease that millions of Americans have to deal with, Alzheimer's disease. It is one of the programs, one of the diseases where we really don't fund adequate research. We hear all of these other things that are really looked into at NIH, all these other research programs, all these other problems, yet this one probably gets the short end of the stick.

So I have been proud, and saddened, by the fact that he is afflicted, now in an advancing way, with this terrible disease. So I want, in any way we can, to say to him how much we appreciate him, what he has done for our country, and to his family and the sacrifices they made. Every President makes sacrifices to be President, and their families probably even more. So that is what is the driving force here. Who he is, what he is going through, what he has meant to this country, what he has meant to so many of us, and the fact that it is a special time in his life.

The point is made, this is not an appropriate edifice. It is really not that pretty. It is new.

Or that, "Gee, it may not even be here in 25 or 50 years. We need something, a monument, that will be there for 100 years, 200 years or 1,000 years." I think there is some merit to that.

Some people say, "We have this building down on Pennsylvania Avenue that is going to be named after him," and that is fine. It is not as if we can only name one facility. I don't know how many Roosevelt monuments and memorials we have. That's OK, and I voted for memorials and monuments to a lot of Democrats. I don't think we vote on these things because they are Democrat or Republican. Once they become a former Secretary of State, like John Foster Dulles, or former President Kennedy, they are a former President or a former Secretary, and, in many instances, we owe them an awful lot.

I even think somebody said, "Usually we wait until they have passed on." I think it is a ridiculous idea. What good is it to them then? Do they have any idea how much they meant to us then?

I don't think we ought to make it a practice to do it immediately or while they are still in office. But for special people and special occasions, I think it makes us a greater people.

I would like to include some examples of memorials and monuments that in the past have been named for U.S. Presidents: John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, 1963; James Madison Building, 1965; Lyndon B. Johnson National Historic Site, 1969; Harry S. Truman Dam and Reservoir, 1970; Lyndon B. Johnson Memorial Grove, 1973; Lyndon B. Johnson Manned Spacecraft Center, 1973; Lyndon B. Johnson Civilian Conservation Corps Center, 1974; Gerald Ford Building, 1977; Herbert Hoover Building, 1981; Dwight D. Eisenhower Interstate System, 1990; Theodore Roosevelt Building, 1992; Ronald Reagan United States Courthouse, 1992; Woodrow Wilson Plaza, 1994; Ronald Reagan Federal Building and International Trade Center, 1995.

I do believe that we want to do this in a bipartisan way. I know there are some in both parties in this country who are not all that excited about this—with good reason, I understand that. But I also know there are people on both sides of the aisle and all over the country who don't care about partisan politics who feel like this should be done.

Maybe I am influenced in bringing this up by a speech I read just a couple weeks ago by Margaret Thatcher, another great leader in this century, a speech she made on December 10, 1997, at the Sheraton Washington Hotel.

I ask unanimous consent that her entire speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Human Events, Jan. 16, 1998]

HOW REAGAN'S COURAGE CHANGED THE WORLD

The following is the text of the speech delivered by former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher at the Heritage Foundation's gala 25th anniversary dinner at the Sheraton Washington Hotel, Dec. 10, 1997:

It is a great honor to be asked to be the inaugural speaker of this series of lectures on "The Principles of Conservatism" organized to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Heritage Foundation. Heritage has flown the flag for conservatism over this last quarter-century with pride and distinction.

I've always considered America fortunate in having an apparently inexhaustible supply of conservative thinkers prepared to challenge the fashionable liberal consensus. That is a tribute to the intellectual energy and the taste for debate which are so characteristic of this great country and which sometimes seem distressingly absent in contemporary Europe. But it is also a tribute to Heritage (and in particular to Ed Feulner) that these conservative thinkers have been motivated and sustained in their mission.

It is no less an honor—and, dare I say, still more of a pleasure—to be invited here on the occasion of the presentation of the Clare Booth Luce award to my old friend Ronald Reagan.

President Reagan is one of the greatest men of our time, and one of the greatest American Presidents of all time. If that is not fully appreciated today, and sadly it is

not, it isn't really surprising. After all, so many people have been proved wrong by Ronald Reagan that they simply aren't acknowledge his achievement.

Forests have already been pulped to print the revisionist analyses of the '80s. Those who were once so confident of the superiority of the Soviet system that they advocated appeasement of it now pretend to believe that it was doomed to inevitable collapse. Tell that to the Russians! The former Soviet ministers didn't, and don't, doubt the seriousness of the struggle, even if Western liberal commentators do.

No one in the West appreciates all this better—and no one served the President and this country more loyally—than Cap Weinberger, here to receive the award on Ronald Reagan's behalf. He was also a great friend to Britain, above all during the Falklands War. It's nice to be among conservatives. It's still nicer to be among friends.

When the Heritage Foundation asked me to make the virtue of courage the centerpiece of this lecture, I was not displeased. Of the four cardinal virtues (courage, temperance, justice and prudence) it is the last (prudence) that the ancient philosophers traditionally placed at the moral apex. They did so because they understood, quite rightly, that without that practical, seemingly rather dull virtue, none of the others could be correctly applied. You have to know when and how to be brave, or self-controlled or fair-minded, in particular situations. Prudence—or what I would prefer to call a good, hearty helping of common sense—shows the way.

COURAGE AND CHARM OF RONALD REAGAN

But in my political lifetime I believe that it is fortitude or courage that we've most needed and often, I fear, most lacked.

Today we are particularly conscious of the courage of Ronald Reagan. It was easy for his contemporaries to ignore it: He always seemed so calm and relaxed, with natural charm, unstudied self-assurance, and unquenchable good humor. He was always ready with just the right quip—often self-deprecatory, though with a serious purpose—so as to lighten the darkest moments and give all around him heart. The excellent recent study by Dinesh D'Souza refreshed my memory about some of these occasions and told me of others which I didn't previously know.

Right from the beginning, Ronald Reagan set out to challenge everything that the liberal political elite of America accepted and sought to propagate.

They believed that America was doomed to decline. He believed it was destined for further greatness.

They imagined that sooner or later there would be convergence between the free Western system and the socialist Eastern system, and that some kind of social democratic outcome was inevitable. He, by contrast, considered that socialism was a patent failure which should be cast onto the trash heap of history.

They thought that the problem with America was the American people, though they didn't quite put it like that. He thought that the problem with America was the American government, and he did put it just like that.

The political elite were prepared to kowtow to the counterculture that grew up on American campuses, fed by a mixture of high-brow dogma and low-brow self-indulgence. Gov. Reagan would have none of it and expressed his disdain in his own inimitable fashion.

On one occasion students, chanting outside the governor's limousine, held up a placard bearing the modest inscription. "We Are the Future." The governor scribbled down his

reply and held it up to the car window. It read: "I'll sell my bonds."

In those days, of course, there were not many people buying bonds in Ronald Reagan. But from the very first time I met him I felt that I had to invest. I was leader of the Opposition—one of the most tricky posts in British politics—when Gov. Reagan paid me a visit. The impression is still vivid in my mind—not so vivid that I can remember exactly what he said, only the clarity with which he set forth his beliefs and the way he put large truths and complex ideas into simple language.

As soon as I met Gov. Reagan, I knew that we were of like mind, and manifestly so did he. We shared a rather unusual philosophy, and we shared something else rather unusual as well: We were in politics because we wanted to put our philosophy into practice.

RONALD REAGAN'S ACHIEVEMENT

Ronald Reagan has changed America and the world, but the changes he made were to restore historic conservative values, not to impose artificially constructed ones.

Take his economic policy, for example. It was certainly a very radical thing to do when he removed regulations and cut taxes and left the Fed to squeeze out inflation by monetary means. Supply-side economics, Reaganomics, Voodoo economics—all these descriptions and mis-descriptions testified to the perception of what was proposed as something outlandish. But it really wasn't and Ronald Reagan knew it wasn't.

After all, if you believe that it's business success that creates prosperity and jobs, you leave business as free as you possibly can to succeed. If you think that it's governments—taxing, spending, regulating, and printing money—that distort the business environment and penalize success, you stop government doing these things.

If, at the deepest level, you have confidence in the talent and enterprise of your own people you express that confidence, you give them faith and hope. Ronald Reagan did all these things—and it worked.

Today's American prosperity in the late 1990s is the result, above all, of the fundamental shift of direction President Reagan promoted in the 1980s.

Perhaps it's something of an irony that it's an administration of instinctive spenders and regulators that now is reaping much of the political reward. But we conservatives shouldn't really be that surprised, for it was the departure from some of those conservative principles, after Ronald Reagan and I left office, that left conservative politicians in both our countries out in the cold. One of Thatcher's iron laws is that conservative governments that put up taxes lose elections.

It is, however, for fighting and winning the Cold War that Ronald Reagan deserves the most credit—and credit not just from Americans, but from the rest of what we called in those days the Free World, and from those in the former Communist states who can now breathe the air of liberty.

President Reagan's "expert critics" used to complain that he didn't really understand communism. But he understood it a great deal better than they did. He had seen at first hand its malevolent influence, under various guises and through various fronts, working by stealth for the West's destruction.

He had understood that it thrived on the fear, weakness and spinelessness of the West's political class. Because that class itself had so little belief in Western values, it could hardly conceal a sneaking admiration for those of the Soviet Union. For these people, the retreat of Western power—from Asia, from Africa, from South America—was the natural way of the world.

Of course, there were always some honest men struggling to arrest the decline, or at least to ameliorate its consequences. The doctrine of "containment" was envisaged as a way of conducting a strategic resistance to Communist incursion. Similarly, the doctrine of "détente" also had its honorable Western advocates—none more so than Henry Kissinger. But the fact remains that it meant different things to different sides.

For the West, détente signified—as the word itself literally means—an easing in tension between the two superpowers and two blocs. This made a certain sense at the time, because it reduced the risk of a nuclear confrontation which Western unpreparedness had brought closer because we had allowed our conventional defenses to run down.

But it also threatened to lead us into a fatal trap. For to the Soviets, détente signified merely the promotion of their goal of world domination while minimizing the risk of direct military confrontation.

So under the cloak of wordy communiqués about peace and understanding, the Soviet Union expanded its nuclear arsenal and its navy, engaged in continual doctrinal warfare, and subverted states around the globe by means of its own advisers and the armed forces of its surrogates. There was only one destination to which this path could lead—that of Western defeat. And that's where we were heading.

This was a message which few newspapers and commentators wanted to hear. It was at this time—the mid-1970s—that after one such speech I was generously awarded by the Soviet military newspaper *Red Star* the sobriquet of the "Iron Lady."

You might imagine that it would be easier to call for a return to military strength and national greatness in the United States, a superpower, than in the United Kingdom, a middle-ranking power. But, oddly enough, I doubt it.

America, as I found from my visits in the '70s and early '80s, had suffered a terrible decline of confidence in its role in the world. This was essentially a psychological crisis, not a reflection of realities. We now know that the arms build-up by the Soviets at that time was an act of desperation. The Soviet Union was dangerous—deadly dangerous—but the danger was that from a wounded predator, not some proud beast of the jungle.

The more intelligent Soviet apparatchiks had grasped that the economic and social system of the USSR was crumbling. The only chance for the state that had so recently pledged to bury the West, but which was now being buried by its own cumulative incompetence, was to win an arms race. It would have to rely for its survival on the ability to terrify its opponents with the same success as it had terrified its own citizens.

A totally planned society and economy has the ability to concentrate productive capacity on some fixed objective with a reasonable degree of success, and do it better than liberal democracies. But totalitarianism can work like this only for a relatively short time, after which the waste, distortions and corruption increase intolerably.

So the Soviet Union had to aim at global dominance, and achieve it quickly, because given a free competition between systems, no one would wish to choose that of the Soviets. Their problem was that even though they diverted the best of their talent and a huge share of their GDP to the military complex, they lacked the moral and material resources to achieve superiority. That would be apparent as soon as the West found leaders determined to face them down.

This was what Ronald Reagan, with my enthusiastic support and that of a number of other leaders, set out as President to do. And he did it on the basis of a well-considered and elaborated doctrine.

The world has, of course, seen many international doctrines—Monroe, Truman, and Brezhnev have all made their contributions, some more positive than others. But for my money it is the Reagan doctrine, spelt out very clearly in the speech he gave to British parliamentarians in the Palace of Westminster in 1982, that has had the best and greatest impact.

This was a rejection of both containment and détente. It proclaimed that the truce with communism was over. The West would henceforth regard no area of the world as destined to forgo its liberty simply because the Soviets claimed it to be within their sphere of influence. We would fight a battle of ideas against communism, and we would give material support to those who fought to recover their nations from tyranny.

President Reagan could have no illusion about the opposition he would face at home in embarking on this course: He had, after all, seen these forces weaken the West throughout the '70s.

But he used his inimitable ability to speak to the hearts of the American people and to appeal over the heads of the cynical, can't-do elite. He and Cap Weinberger made no secret of the objective: military superiority. The Soviets understood more quickly than his domestic critics the seriousness of what was at stake. The Russian rhetoric grew more violent; but an understanding that the game was up gradually dawned in the recesses of the Politburo.

It is well-known that I encouraged President Reagan to "do business" with President Gorbachev. I also still give credit to Mr. Gorbachev for introducing freedom of speech and of religion into the Soviet Union.

But let's be clear: The Soviet power brokers knew that they had to choose a reformer because they understood that the old strategy of intimidating and subverting would not work with Ronald Reagan in the White House and—who knows?—even Margaret Thatcher in 10 Downing Street.

The final straw for the Evil Empire was the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). President Reagan was, I believe, deliberately and cunningly tempted by the Soviets at Reykjavik. They made ever more alluring offers to cut their nuclear arsenals, and the President, who was a genuine believer in a nuclear-weapons-free world (it was one of the few things we disagreed about), thought he was making progress.

There was no mention of SDI, and it appeared that the Soviets had tacitly accepted that its future was not for negotiation. Then, at the very last moment, they insisted that SDI be effectively abandoned. The President immediately refused, the talks ended in acrimony, and in the media he was heavily criticized.

But it was on that day, when a lesser man would have compromised, that he showed his mettle.

As a result of his courage, work on the SDI program continued and the Soviets understood that their last gambit had failed. Three years later, when Mr. Gorbachev peacefully allowed Eastern Europe to slide out of Soviet control, Ronald Reagan's earlier decision to stand firm was vindicated. The Soviets at last understood that the best they could hope for was to be allowed to reform their system, not to impose it on the rest of the world.

And, of course, as soon as they embarked upon serious reform, the artificial construct of the USSR, sustained by lies and violence for more than half a century, imploded with a whimper.

The idea that such achievements were a matter of luck is frankly laughable. Yes, the President had luck. But he deserved the luck he enjoyed. Fortune favors the brave, the saying runs.

As this hero of our times faces his final and most merciless enemy, he shows the same quiet courage which allowed him to break the world free of a monstrous creed without a shot being fired. President Reagan: Your friends salute you!

NEW CHALLENGES FACE THE WEST

Democracies, like human beings, have a tendency to relax when the worst is over. Our Western democracies accordingly relaxed—both at home and abroad—in the period after the fall of the Berlin Wall.

It was, of course, right that in this period there should be a new look at priorities. The threat from the Soviet Union was much diminished—both directly in Europe and indirectly in regional conflicts that they had once exploited.

At least the worst errors of the past were avoided—America stayed militarily committed to Europe, NATO remained the linchpin of Western security and, in spite of the protectionist instincts of the European Union, progress continued with reducing barriers to trade.

These elements of continuity were crucial to the relative security and (in spite of the turbulence in the Far East) the considerable prosperity we enjoy today. These were the positive aspects.

But there are also worrying negative ones. Each will require new acts of political courage to overcome.

First, lower defense spending in America, Britain and elsewhere was used not to cut taxes and so boost prosperity, but rather the so-called Peace Dividend went principally to pay for welfare. This in turn has harmed our countries both socially and economically, worsening trends which had already become manifest.

Welfare dependency is bad for families and bad for the taxpayer. It makes it less necessary and less worthwhile to work. The promotion of idleness leads, as it always does, to the growth of vice, irresponsibility and crime.

The bonds which hold society together are weakened. The bill—for single mothers, for delinquency, for vandalism—mounts. In some areas a generation grows up without solid roots or sound role models, without self-esteem or hope.

It is extraordinary what damage is sometimes done in the name of compassion. The risk of reversing the growth of welfare dependency and repairing the structure of the traditional family is one of the most difficult we in the West face.

Secondly, the post-Cold War slackening of resolve has led to a lack of military preparedness. Understandably, with the end of the Cold War the sense of omnipresent danger receded. Less excusably, the fact that the Soviet Union and its successor states no longer challenged the West's very survival led Western countries to behave as if other, new threats could be ignored.

Yet the truth is so obvious that surely only an expert could miss it: There is never a lack of potential aggressors.

We now have to reassess our defense spending, which has been cut back too far. Still more significant has been the failure to grasp the vital importance of investment in the very latest defense technology. The crucial importance of keeping up research and development in defense is the great lesson of SDI. It is also the lesson—in two respects—of today's confrontation with Iraq.

The original defeat of Saddam's forces was so swift—though sadly not complete—because of our overwhelming technical superiority. The fact that we are still having to apply constant pressure and the closest scrutiny to Iraq also bears witness to the lethal capability which science and technology can

place in a dictator's hands and the enormous difficulty of removing it. Chemical and biological weapons and the components for nuclear weapons can be all too easily concealed.

The proliferation of ballistic missile technology also greatly adds to the menace. According to the Defense Studies Center at Lancaster University in Britain, 35 non-NATO countries now have ballistic missiles. Of these, the five "rogue states"—Iraq, Iran, Libya, Syria and North Korea—are a particular worry.

North Korea has been supplying ballistic missiles to those who can afford them, and it continues to develop more advanced long-range missiles, with a range of 2,500 to 4,000 miles. According to U.S. sources, all of Northeast Asia, Southeast Asia, much of the Pacific, and most of Russia could soon be threatened by these latest North Korean missiles.

Once they are available in the Middle East and North Africa, all the capitals of Europe will be within target range. And on present trends a direct threat to American shores is likely to mature early in the next century.

Diplomatic pressure to restrict proliferation, though it may be useful, can never be a sufficient instrument in itself. It is important that the West remain able and willing—and is known to be able and willing—to take preemptive action if that should ultimately become necessary.

But it is also vital that progress be made towards the construction of an effective global defense against missile attack. This would be a large and costly venture to which America's allies must be prepared to contribute. It would require a rare degree of courageous statesmanship to carry it through.

But it is also difficult to overstate the terrible consequences if we were to fail to take measures to protect our populations while there is still time to do so.

Thirdly, political courage will be required constantly to restate the case for Western unity under American leadership. America was left by the end of the Cold War as the effective global power of last resort, the only superpower. But there was also a widespread reluctance to face up to this reality.

The same mentality which Ronald Reagan had had to overcome was at work. Large numbers of intellectuals and commentators, uneasy at the consequences of a victory whose causes they had never properly understood, sought to submerge America and the West in a new, muddled multilateralism.

I suppose it's not surprising. As Irving Kristol once noted, "No modern nation has ever constructed a foreign policy that was acceptable to its intellectuals."

In fact, it is as if some people take a perverse delight in learning the wrong lessons from events. It was Western unity, under inspiring American leadership, which changed the world. But now that unity is at risk as the European Union, with apparent encouragement from the United States, seems bent on becoming a single state with a single defense—a fledgling superpower. Such a development would not relieve America of obligations; it would merely increase the obstacles to American policy.

POLICYMAKERS SUCCEMBED TO LIBERAL CONTAGION

Today's international policymakers have succumbed to a liberal contagion whose most alarming symptom is to view any new and artificial structure as preferable to a traditional and tested one. So they forget that it was powerful nation states, drawing on national loyalties and national armies, which enforced UN Security Council Resolutions and defeated Iraq in 1991. Their short-term

goal is to subordinate American and other national sovereignties to multilateral authorities; their long-term goal, one suspects, is to establish the UN as a kind of embryo world government.

Surely the crisis in the former Yugoslavia should have shown the folly of these illusions. There the tragic farce of European Union meddling only prolonged the aggression and the United Nations proved incapable of agreeing on effective action. We are still trying to make the flawed Dayton Settlement—which neither the EU nor the UN could have brought about—the basis of a lasting peace in that troubled region.

The future there is unpredictable, but one thing I do venture to predict: The less America leads, and the more authority slips back to unwieldy international committees and their officials, the more difficulties will arise.

International relations today are in a kind of limbo. Few politicians and diplomats really believe that any power other than the United States can guarantee the peace or punish aggression. But neither is there sufficient cohesion in the West to give America the moral and material support she must have to fulfill that role.

This has to change. America's duty is to lead. The other Western countries' duty is to support its leadership.

Different countries will contribute in different ways. Britain is closer to the United States by culture, language and history than is any other European country. British public opinion is therefore readier to back American initiatives. Moreover, Britain's highly professional armed forces allow us to make a unique practical contribution when the necessity arises.

But the fundamental equation holds good for all of us: Provided Western countries unite under American leadership, the West will remain the dominant global influence. If we do not, the opportunity for rogue states and new tyrannical powers to exploit our divisions will increase, and so will the danger to all.

So the task for conservatives today is to revive a sense of Western identity, unity and resolve. The West is after all not just some ephemeral Cold War construct. It is the core of a civilization which has carried all before it, transforming the outlook and pattern of life of every continent.

It is time to proclaim our beliefs in the wonderful creativity of the human spirit, in the rights of property and the rule of law, in the extraordinary fecundity of enterprise and trade, and in the Western cultural heritage, without which our liberty would long ago have degenerated into license or collapsed into tyranny.

These are as much the tasks of today as they were of yesterday, as much the duty of conservative believers now as they were when Ronald Reagan and I refused to accept the decline of the West as our ineluctable destiny.

As the poet said:
"That which thy fathers bequeathed thee
Earn it anew if thou would'st possess it."

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I just want to read some brief, selective passages from what Margaret Thatcher, the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, had to say:

President Reagan is one of the greatest men of our time, and one of the greatest American Presidents of all time. If that is not fully appreciated today, and sadly it is not, it isn't really surprising. After all, so many people have been proved wrong by Ronald Reagan that they simply daren't acknowledge his achievement. . .

But in my political lifetime I believe that it is fortitude or courage that we've most needed and often, I fear, most lacked.

Today we are particularly conscious of the courage of Ronald Reagan. It was easy for his contemporaries to ignore it: He always seemed so calm and relaxed, with natural charm, unstudied self-assurance, and unquenchable good humor. He was always ready with just the right quip—often self-deprecatory, though with a serious purpose—so as to lighten the darkest moments and give all around him heart. . . .

Right from the beginning, Ronald Reagan set out to challenge everything that the liberal political elite of America accepted and sought [as gospel].

They believed that America was doomed to decline. He believed it was destined for further greatness.

They imagined that sooner or later there would be convergence between the free Western system and the socialist Eastern system, and that some kind of social democratic outcome was inevitable. He, by contrast, considered that socialism was a patent failure which should be cast onto the trash heap of history.

They thought that the problem with America was the American people, though they didn't quite put it [that way.] He thought that the problem with America was the American government, and he did put it just [that way.]

In conclusion, and what I think is so beautiful a statement about our country and our world and about Ronald Reagan, she summed it up perfectly. She said:

It is time to proclaim our beliefs in the wonderful creativity of the human spirit, in the rights of property and the rule of law, in the extraordinary fecundity of enterprise and trade, and in the Western cultural heritage, without which our liberty would long ago have degenerated into license or collapsed into tyranny.

These are as much the tasks of today as they were of yesterday, as much the duty of our conservative believers now as they were when Ronald Reagan and I refused to accept the decline of the West as our ineluctable destiny.

As the poet said: "That which thy fathers bequeathed thee Earn it anew if thou would'st possess it."

A great speech. I have just taken some portions from it. It meant a great deal to me.

I hope we will honor former President Ronald Reagan in this way. I can think of a lot of Democrats I would be perfectly willing to name some building or some facility for. I think President Jimmy Carter has really been an example since he has been President. I don't know that we have named anything after him. I don't know that he sought it, or his family. I am not saying we should do it now. This is not partisan with me, but it is very emotional, and I hope that we will find a way, working together, to get this bill through in time for his birthday. I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I commend the majority leader for his remarks just now. No one, or few, I suppose, can match the eloquence of Margaret Thatcher, especially as she talks about one of those partners in leadership that she shared so much with in the time that she led Britain to the

heights that it achieved during her tenure as Prime Minister.

I am quite sure that with unanimity, this Senate wishes to honor our former President. So the majority leader's wish will come true; we will honor President Reagan. In fact, as he noted, we will honor him quite certainly, regardless of what happens to the airport. We will honor him by naming after him the largest nondefense building in the country, a Government building, a beautiful building, a building that will last for centuries, a building dedicated to permanence and a building with great meaning, I think, to all of us as we pass down Pennsylvania Avenue today.

It is an extraordinary new accomplishment, architecturally and in many other ways. We have already made the decision to name that superior piece of architecture after our former President, Ronald Reagan.

So let no one be misguided by the remarks today. We honor President Reagan. No one should also be misled with regard to our intentions. There was comment made that we are blocking this legislation. If we were blocking it, Mr. President, we would not have agreed for it to pass out of committee unanimously. If we were blocking it, we would have demanded hearings and we would have used whatever procedural devices at our disposal in the committee. We have not chosen to do that. We are not blocking it today. We have no reservations about bringing it up. We are simply not willing to support a unanimous consent request that limits us to one amendment.

Finally, let me say the majority leader noted that we are not taking Washington's name off the airport. The only amendment our Republican colleagues wish to offer has as its stated purpose, and I will quote, "to rename the Washington National Airport located in the District of Columbia and Virginia as 'Ronald Reagan National Airport.'"

So if that doesn't take Washington's name off the airport, I don't know what does. That is exactly what it does on line 5, page 1. It says:

From here on after approved June 29, 1940, the airport known as Washington National Airport shall hereafter be known and designated as "Ronald Reagan National Airport."

So, quite clearly, let no one, regardless of what one may think about honoring our former President Ronald Reagan, quite clearly we are doing it by removing the name of the first President of the United States, George Washington. Now, we may want to do that, but that clearly is the design, that is the intent of this legislation, and that is why we think it is in our interest to explore it, to talk about it.

It isn't mutually exclusive. We can find ways to honor our former President, and we can find ways to ensure that we do it correctly and do it with all of the facts on the table. That is all we are asking. Let's do it with eyes

wide open, knowing the ramifications, knowing exactly what it is we are doing and then pursuing the best course after that. I think we can do that. I pledge my assistance in working with the majority leader and our Republican colleagues to do it. But we are not ready yet. I am sure at some point soon we will be, but let's proceed in a positive way, not criticizing one another as we start out this effort, but finding the best way with which to resolve these questions. I am sure that can be done, and with that optimism, I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield in a couple minutes to the Senator from Georgia, but I first feel compelled to answer a couple of comments the distinguished Democratic leader and good friend of mine made.

First of all, I don't think any American identifies Washington National Airport with George Washington. They identify it with Washington, DC. So let's really be clear about that. To take the word "Washington" out of it is not in any way demeaning or lessening the reputation of George Washington; it is because it was identified with Washington, DC.

We named Idlewild Airport "Kennedy Airport." I am sure whoever Idlewild was, or whatever location it was, didn't feel aggrieved when it wasn't called Kennedy-Idlewild Airport.

Second of all, let's talk about the cost here one second. The bulk of the costs associated with the name change at National Airport are related to changing the signs and logos for the airport.

I would like to enter into the RECORD a copy of a letter from a group, Americans for Tax Reform, which created and promoted the Reagan legacy project. The letter states:

In order to ensure no expenses will be incurred by the Federal Government as a result of this bill, we are willing to coordinate fundraising efforts to fund the creation of appropriate signs and logos for the Ronald Reagan National Airport.

The letter goes on to estimate these costs at \$60,000. Let's put that in context. We just spent well over \$1 billion in modernizing Washington National Airport. The cost of this would be \$60,000. If there is a deep and abiding concern on the other side of the aisle about the costs associated with changing the name, I can assure you that Senator COVERDELL, Senator LOTT and I and everybody else will lead a fundraising effort and pay for this. I am deeply moved about their concern about the taxpayers' dollars.

I don't like to start out the year this way, Mr. President. I really don't. We have enough problems. We have enough difficulties around here without our getting hung up on doing what is the right thing for one of the greatest men in the history of this Nation.

The interesting thing is, he doesn't want to be honored in any way because he doesn't think he deserves it, which is the mark of the greatness and humility of the man. But for us to somehow get hung up on cost, on logos, on whether the name "Washington" is out of it, this is not an appropriate way to start out this year.

I want to tell my friends on the other side of the aisle, we feel very strongly about this issue—very strongly—and if we get hung up on this thing and we are not able to go ahead and honor Ronald Reagan on his birthday, it is going to start things off on a very bad note.

I also want to point out, yes, thanks to Senator HOLLINGS and the bipartisan spirit in which we run the Commerce Committee, it was discharged from the Commerce Committee, but we also had a markup scheduled today, and we would have marked up that bill and reported it out of committee today as well. So I appreciate the cooperation of my friends on the Commerce Committee, but we would have reported it out of the Commerce Committee today, I have no doubt about that.

Again, I don't want to be repetitive, but I am astounded—I am astounded—that when Americans from all over this country would like to have this opportunity to honor Ronald Reagan on his birthday as he goes through this very difficult period, that we should somehow raise a straw man about costs and logos and Washington, DC.

Mr. President, I would like to conclude by saying I first came to know Ronald Reagan during my years in Vietnam when President Reagan was Governor of California. The North Vietnamese had orchestrated an effort to demoralize their American prisoners by convincing us that our country opposed the war and that we had been forgotten and left behind.

As new American prisoners were brought to Hanoi, however, they took advantage of our primitive communications abilities. They made sure that we knew about this Governor in California who was helping lead efforts to secure our release and take care of our families in the meantime. This Governor, Ronald Reagan, served as a very welcome reminder that our country had not forgotten us. I and many others will forever be indebted to him for that and for the friendship we developed after the war.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOND). The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I see there are some other speakers. I have some extended remarks, but I will be brief now in deference to other people if they have a comment to make. But Mr. President, this is the definition of "pettiness." This is demeaning. The concept that we would honor a former President, but we have to extract a price.

A memorandum went out to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that wanted an IRS reformation amendment tacked to this legislation. The idea that "You can have this memorial, but only if we extract something from it, too." Maybe this is an indication of just how cynical this city has become from top to bottom.

I have great respect for the minority leader. I consider him a very good friend. But who would counsel him to suggest "We haven't heard from the Reagan family"? What are they supposed to do, buy tickets and fly over here and lobby outside the Chamber? Is that what you would ask of them to do?

The other gentlemen on the list that I have heard that you perhaps would choose to honor, so be it. Honor them. Come forward with these ideas, but not as a quid pro quo to a memorial to this former President.

Do you remember the memorial to the late President Franklin Roosevelt? Was there some skirmish over there? Did there have to be some ratification or some affidavit from their family as to whether or not it ought to be built and how? I, like Senator McCAIN, would not have been able to envision that we would be discussing Ronald Reagan in this manner.

Are we removing the name of the airport? Has their family appropriately petitioned this Congress that only awards things to those that are on their knees asking?

Can there not be an acceptance of fact that we are dealing with a great American figure who is wounded—who is wounded—who is near the end? And here we are piddling around with, was it named after the President or after the city or have we heard from them, the family, and how much will it cost, when everybody knows it is minimal?

The only word that characterizes it is "demeaning."

Mr. President, I will ask for time later on, but I yield the floor in deference to my colleague from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank my friend from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise for the simple purpose of simply informing the Senate of a very happy occasion in the very near future. It will be the dedication of the Ronald Reagan International Trade Building at 16th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, the largest Federal building, as it happens, in the city and the completion, after 60 or 70 years—70 years of the Federal Triangle proposal which was begun by Andrew Mellon under the Presidency of Herbert Hoover for whom the Commerce Building across from 16th Street is named.

The Ronald Reagan Building was—it should be noted that he signed the bill on August 21, 1987, the Federal Triangle Development Act. I had offered the measure here. It passed, very happily, and authorized the construction of an

international, cultural and trade center on that site—a billion dollars worth of real estate. The site was cleared in 1928 and remained a parking lot until now. I remember writing a proposal for President Kennedy on the redevelopment of Pennsylvania Avenue—a parking lot of surpassing ugliness.

But then in 1995, with the building up and about to be running, Congresswoman Andrea Seastrand, who represented the District in which the President lives, introduced a bill to name it for him. Senator Dole cosponsored it here. It was passed unanimously, I should think, in both bodies. And on December 22, 1995, in a very fine ceremony in the Oval Office, President Clinton signed that bill. Speaker GINGRICH, Mr. Dole, Mr. DASCHLE, the Vice President, and the Senator from New York were there. Alas, Representative Seastrand had a vote and could not come.

The building is a 2-century building. It will be there for a very long while. We own the land. It will save money because we will move people from rented space to Government space in the same manner that the Judiciary Building now flanks Union Station but it is a congressional building. It is on Federal land. It is a lease-to-own project. In about 25 years we will have it. We are already paying less rent than we were paying in rented space because we own the land. It is a handsome building. It is a triumphal building.

The architectural critic of the Washington Post, Benjamin Forgey, has given it his very warm endorsement. It has a great atrium. As you walk in it, you see the names, Ronald Reagan and International Trade Organization Building—the Ronald Reagan Building, and in it the National Trade Center. You know you are at a special place designed for, authorized, and built by a very special man, and now to be named for that man in a ceremony that I hope will be joyous, celebratory, and on the edge sad as we consider the condition of our former President, but proud that he was just that.

I thank the Chair.

I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to thank the Senator from New York for calling our attention to this extraordinary event.

Could you share with us again, one, what the timing is of the ceremony?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. April 28 or May 5.

Mr. JOHNSON. What will be involved in this ceremony?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Well, there will be the formal dedication. There will be, I believe, the National Symphony. There will be a musical. It will be a day-long event. And I hope people will find time for it. There is nothing like it that will have happened in our city—well, for those who do not know the history, the Federal Triangle was moving along very well. The crash came, and they stopped—boom—they just stopped. Now

we have finished it. President Kennedy envisioned it. President Reagan made it possible. And we are naming it for President Reagan.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wonder if it isn't fair to say—there has been some harsh rhetoric here and knocking down of straw men as we have gone about discussions this afternoon in the United States Senate relative to memorializing former President Reagan. And I wonder if it isn't fair to say that the issues that have been raised are not questioning whether to suitably and appropriately memorialize President Reagan's administration. The questions are not partisan in nature. We have memorialized Presidents of both political parties, as we always will and always should. There is no opposition, certainly, to the largest building I believe on all of Pennsylvania Avenue, America's main street, the avenue that is used for our inaugural parades, the largest building, a very prominently located building—and it has yet even to have the ceremony for its opening, but it passed by unanimous vote, the Senator tells us, in both the House and Senate; bipartisan on both sides of the aisle—but there was no resistance to memorializing in a very prominent and very focal, high focal point of our Nation's most important street an enormous building named for President Reagan.

So it would seem that the issues that have been raised here are not petty, are not meant to demean or in any way undermine the recognition of the contributions that President Reagan made—and he made very significant contributions to this Nation—but that there are legitimate points being raised, one, about the process, rather than the politics, of naming and especially renaming where the name George Washington has always been tied to National Airport—in fact National Airport, I believe, was designed with the terminal intended to be evocative of Mount Vernon and located in a community very near Mount Vernon and where he is very closely associated with the Arlington and Alexandria communities—and whether there ought to be a more systematic process for especially renaming institutions that have been previously named for other great Americans.

Mr. COVERDELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. So the question is not one of whether President Reagan should be memorialized. Certainly he should be.

Mr. COVERDELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. COVERDELL. I believe the time is on your side.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Senator from New York controls the time.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I yield the floor and say I spent 35 years getting this building built. I leave it to others to describe how it should be named.

Mr. COVERDELL. I assume you are yielding?

Mr. JOHNSON. I certainly yield.

Mr. COVERDELL. Is the Senator aware of the fact that your side has offered a proposal that, yes, go ahead; we can proceed with this, comma, but we have to have something for it. We have somebody else we want to have another building named after. I mean, I am getting confused signals here. Are we really getting into a discussion about changing the name of the Washington, DC, airport? We are going to invoke all this intellectual analysis of how that building was built. I mean, that is not what was being sent to us all morning long.

We were not arguing over, you know, the dynamics of the process, whether or not we are going to name another building. I do not object to you all naming another building for somebody that you want to honor, but it ought to be done on its own. This should not be held up in this manner as a negotiating tool. And that is what has been going on all day.

Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. JOHNSON. If the Senator will yield back.

Mr. COVERDELL. I certainly will.

Mr. JOHNSON. Obviously, I do not speak for my colleagues on either side of the aisle. I speak only as this Senator, expressing, one, my conviction that there ought to be a very significant memorial to Ronald Reagan. There is one that has been built. The doors, the ribbons have not yet been cut. They soon will be. And this is an extraordinary memorial in one of the most prominent locations of all of Washington. I applaud that.

The only other question I raise is whether there ought to be yet another memorial before the ribbon has even been cut on the first large one, which would have an effect on the airport that memorialized George Washington and which has not gone through what seems to me, from this Senator's point of view, an orderly, thoughtful process.

The Board of Trade in the Washington area, other groups think this is a poor idea, that perhaps there ought to be other memorials to Ronald Reagan. I would say probably that is true. The suggestion is there ought to be one in every State. Perhaps there ought to be. Perhaps there ought to be more in Washington, DC.

However, I simply raise as this Senator's point of view that I think we are getting carried away in a nonsystematic and not terribly thoughtful process about how we name and pull names off of memorials to great Americans. So I have nothing but great respect to express for President Reagan and his family, and I regret that any of this debate that has been caught up in exactly how best to memorialize great Americans would by anyone be perceived as somehow negative or otherwise undermining respect for this past President.

However, I think there are legitimate concerns expressed by some that have

nothing to do with partisan politics, that have nothing to do with respect or lack of respect for past Presidents, particularly this past President. I simply want to raise that issue, that there are concerns among those who I think in good faith are expressing some concern not about memorialization but about a specific renaming. The issue, I think, in that sense is narrow.

I personally feel that there is room for improvement in the process that we use for the naming of institutions. That isn't to say, however, that the naming of any particular institution wouldn't be approved by what I think ought to be a nonpartisan commission of some sort, which I think would greatly strengthen our current rather hodgepodge way of naming institutions and buildings and facilities that will be that way for hundreds of years—unless, of course, there are changes in power in Congress and we develop this precedent that whoever is in the majority comes in and changes the names of buildings. That would be a terrible mistake.

I hope the Reagan building downtown stays that way virtually forever and that there is never a thought of renaming that. I simply raise this point to hopefully lend a bit of thoughtfulness and recognition that at stake here is not the honor of the Reagan family or President Reagan nor is it necessarily partisan politics.

I do not necessarily join in with others who may see other political agendas here. This is an institution of 100 individuals, and there are probably 100 agendas on this floor on a given day, but I do want to share those observations with my friend and my colleague about the concerns that came to my mind on this issue.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I accept the convictions of my good colleague and his wish that this would not have the taint that it does. Unfortunately, that is what has happened here.

Nor is there anything unique here. Just last year I voted for legislation to honor a colleague on your side of the aisle, one in my own State, a legislative process just like this, a fellow Congressman who is retired, John Rowland. We named a courthouse in our State for him and we were very glad to have been part of it. He deserves it.

Mr. JOHNSON. And I add that I joined in the unanimous consent on the naming of the Reagan building downtown as a Member of the other body during that time, and I am proud of that.

Mr. COVERDELL. I accept the statement of the Senator.

Unfortunately, during the course of the last several hours, this has turned into a quid pro quo. From my own view, I would rather that it not be accepted than we get into, "Well, we will do this if you do that," and we will name this that and this something else. I can only speak for myself. That is my view of it.

I mentioned a little earlier, Mr. President, that there are some unique

circumstances that we are confronting in this particular case with former President Reagan. I have been going through some of his legacy of late, and I will share one of the most profound letters an American leader has ever written to his country. It came to us on November 5, 1994.

My fellow Americans, I have recently been told that I am one of the millions of Americans who will be afflicted with Alzheimer's disease.

Upon learning this news, Nancy and I had to decide whether as private citizens we would keep this a private matter or whether we would make this news known in a public way. In the past, Nancy suffered from breast cancer and I had my cancer surgeries. We found through our open disclosures we were able to raise public awareness. We were happy that as a result, many more people underwent testing. There were treated in early stages and able to return to normal, healthy lives.

So now we feel it is important to share it with you. In opening our hearts, we hope this might promote greater awareness of this condition. Perhaps it will encourage a clearer understanding of the individuals and families who are affected by it.

At the moment I feel just fine. I intend to live the remainder of the years God gives me on this Earth doing the things I have always done. I will continue to share life's journey with my beloved Nancy and my family. I plan to enjoy the great outdoors and stay in touch with my friends and supporters.

Unfortunately, as Alzheimer's disease progresses, the family often bears a heavy burden. I only wish there was some way I could spare Nancy from this painful experience. When the time comes, I am confident that with your help she will face it with faith and courage.

In closing, let me thank you, the American people, for giving me the great honor of allowing me to serve as your president. When the Lord calls me home, whenever that day may be, I will leave with the greatest love for this country of ours and eternal optimism for its future.

I now begin the journey that will lead me into the sunset of my life. I know that for America there will always be a bright dawn ahead.

Thank you, my friends. May God always bless you.

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN.

Now, Ronald Reagan's birthday is next February 6, and we ought to do this. This ought to be a part of the sunset journey.

I again say, it is absolutely beyond comprehension that a suggestion was made here this afternoon that somehow his family ought to have been more pronounced and more explicit about their desires with regard to this legislation. To have done so would have been entirely—I repeat, entirely—uncharacteristic for the man that wrote this letter to do. Nor would he in any way have condoned any member of his family making such a suggestion. The only way that something like this could happen on the eve of these final moments would be for it to be a spontaneous gesture from the American people.

So, Mr. President, just for clarity, you never know what will happen in an institution like this, but again I would

be prouder that this legislation suffered a defeat over the nuances from the other side than for there to be an asterisk on the legislation that suggested the only way that this body and this Congress could reach out at this moment was if we made some tradeoff; there have been others that got a little something here or there, like you do every day in this town. My own view is it would be diminishing and demeaning of what is being attempted and endeavored to be done here today in the name of a great American President, among others. But this one was a great American President who, as I said earlier, is wounded.

There are moments in our lives and in the history of our country that require a spontaneous response and not some methodical appointing of a commission to measure and weigh every balance. Thank heavens nature doesn't function that way.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, to the subject that we have been debating, which is legislation to rename Washington National Airport "Ronald Reagan National Airport," we have had quite a discussion here this afternoon. As I said a little earlier, I have been going through, during the course of this exercise, the various things, of course, that have been said about our former President. I got to thinking, well, who knows him best? And, of course, that is the former First Lady, Nancy Reagan. I was reminded that I had the opportunity to hear her in one of the most heartfelt speeches I believe I have ever heard in San Diego at the national convention in that beautiful city. It was quite a task that she had to perform, to come forward before the Nation, given the situation that the Reagans had been facing, and try to bring a message to those gathered and to the American people.

I think this is an appropriate time to revisit what she said about her husband, President Reagan, at that time. I will skip the introduction, the acknowledgement of the crowd, and move to the heart of the speech, which was undoubtedly difficult for her to deal with because she was moving to the moment in which she felt she had the responsibility to convey to the Nation a feeling about her husband's Presidency and her husband's views of America.

She said this:

Just 4 years ago, Ronnie stood before you and spoke for what he said might be his last speech at a Republican Convention. Sadly, his words were too prophetic. When we learned of his illness, Alzheimer's, he made

the decision to write his letter to the American people.

This is the letter I read a moment ago from the President himself.

She says:

And the people responded, as they always do. I can't tell you what your cards and letters have meant to both of us. The love and affection from thousands of Americans has been, and continues to be, a strengthening force for Ronnie and me each and every day.

I want to reread that sentence because the other side has evoked that there is some family responsibility here that they should have fulfilled as a precedent before moving for congressional action on this, which as I have said repeatedly is just beyond my understanding. But I will read for them what she said to America:

I cannot tell you what your cards and letters have meant to both of us. The love and affection from thousands of Americans has been, and continues to be, a strengthening force for Ronnie and me each and every day.

In other words, it was a source of encouragement and strength for them at that time to hear from our fellow countrymen about his work. That's what that means.

We have learned, as too many other families have learned, of the terrible pain and the loneliness that must be endured as each day brings another reminder of this very long goodbye. But Ronnie's spirit, his optimism, his never-failing belief in the strength and goodness of America is still very strong. If he were able to be here tonight, he would once again remind us of the power of each individual—

How many times had we heard that from President Reagan, about the power of each American?

Urging us once again to fly as high as our wings will take us and to never give up on America.

The majority leader was here earlier and was talking about Margaret Thatcher and what she had said about the former President. I might revisit that in just a little bit. But that's the point that Margaret Thatcher always focused on—the never give up on America or never give up on Western civilization, and what she so admired in the former President. Here it is documented by Nancy Reagan when she said.

... remind us of the power of each individual, urging us once again to fly as high as our wings will take us and to never give up on America. I can tell you with certainty that he still sees the "shining city on a hill," a place full of hope and a promise for us all.

As you all know, I am not the speechmaker in the family. So let me close with Ronnie's words, not mine. In that last speech 4 years ago, he said, "Whatever else history may say about me when I am gone, I hope it will report that I appealed to your best hopes, not your worst fears, to your confidence rather than your doubts, and may all of you as Americans never forget your heroic origins, never fail to seek divine guidance, and never, never lose your natural God-given optimism."

Ronnie's optimism, like America's, still shines very brightly. May God bless him and, from both of us, God bless America.

You know, several weeks ago, I was in a discussion about American liberty.

I was talking about the fact that free people behave completely differently than people who are not free or oppressed. One of the key components of a free people is their optimism—optimism, the belief that they can accomplish, the belief that they can build, the belief that they cannot be vanquished. And there is no American in contemporary history who so fueled and energized that key component of American liberty as did President Ronald Reagan. He was the epitome of optimism.

I see we have just been joined by my good friend and colleague and neighbor, the Senator from Alabama, and in deference to his time I am going to withhold these other remarks for a moment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I have the honor to speak on this legislation sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I so greatly admire him. I admire his principle, integrity, ability, and passion for this issue. I think it is an important issue, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution. We ought to recognize people who have made great differences in this Nation's history. I think President Reagan is one of those people.

I thought I would take a very few minutes to tell a story that illustrates how deeply and how important President Reagan's life is to the American people and to the people of the world.

In 1993, I went on a church trip to Russia and spent a week there. Our group went to a small city of 40,000 people that is located 5 hours east of Moscow in an area where very few Americans were allowed in over the years because it was a security area in the Soviet Union. We went to the town of Sovetsk. I was able to stay with another American in the home of a Russian businessman who was beginning to develop a business in Sovetsk. The first night we arrived they were going to celebrate the baptism of their daughter. A Russian Orthodox priest appeared in his great robes. The mother, father, and the grandparents had come in from the Ural Mountains, and it was a goodly group of people there. It was a marvelous ceremony as the priest performed that baptism.

As we had dinner afterwards the priest told us that since perestroika, since the fall of the wall, he had baptized 18,000 people in that town of 40,000. He told us that before the wall fell he was not allowed to baptize people. He said he was not allowed to wear his robes, and that the Soviet Communist authorities moved him around 6 months or so at a time so that he could not really get to know his congregation and so he would be unable to build the kind of rapport that is necessary. He discussed how he could now wear his robes, how he could now walk about town, how he could now meet with the

mayor, and how he was now respected in the city in public affairs. For this priest and his congregation, it was now a great time.

At the conclusion of that discussion my host proposed a toast to Ronald Reagan "who made us believe in God again."

Mr. President, I don't know if they missed the translation. But the heart of that was very, very real.

President Ronald Reagan helped shape this world. He helped free millions of people from a totalitarian state. He called the Soviet empire an "evil empire," and evil it was.

Before we went to Russia, we spent time with a college professor who had spent 6 months there. He said, "I used to teach that the United States and Russia were just like scorpions in a bottle. There is no difference between us." Now, however, he says that after having been there and after having met with young Russian people he has changed his mind. In the words of that professor, "when I would talk in that fashion, the Russians looked at me like I was crazy. They said, 'What are you talking about? You had all kinds of freedom. We had none. There was a great distinction between Russia, the Soviet Union, and the United States of America and the democracy that you have.'" Today that professor has come to believe that those young people had it right.

Ronald Reagan personified that. He personified the collapse of the totalitarian empire. He gave his life to it. He articulated it better than any man that ever lived. His was a Presidency both in terms of domestic policy and foreign policy that ranks among the highest order of American Presidents.

I think he deserves this recognition. I think it is very fitting that it be done on his birthday. I think it is very fitting that we recognize him while we are still blessed with his presence.

I want to congratulate the Senator from Georgia for his articulate explanation and promotion of this legislation. I am delighted and honored just to have this moment to share this story with the people in this body and the people in the United States because I think it says in a very real way that this man symbolized the American democratic free enterprise victory over the totalitarian atheistic Communist government.

I appreciate the leadership of Senator COVERDELL and thank him for yielding me this time.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, it is interesting to hear the good Senator from Alabama, and I appreciate the personal experience he had confronting these people that were being made free for the first time.

I had the opportunity to do that as well. I will never forget the faces of those people who had never been free or

had not been for so long they couldn't remember. If you will bear with me one second, I am going to yield. One afternoon I was in Soviet Bulgaria. It was on the eve of this epic realignment of all Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. I decided to break away, and I did and walked about 5 miles back through the neighborhoods. Do you know what struck me? This is before the freedom had hit. I never saw a single adult ever smile. Never, not one, not one person smiled because of the weight of the oppression. Fortunately, the children were smiling. So you could say, "There is hope here." But it had been beaten out of them—the natural nature of human mind.

The man that brought the wall down—the Senator from Alabama said it and we will never be able to say it enough—how many people he freed through that show of force. He didn't do it alone. He would be the first one to say so. In fact, he would deny it. He would put somebody else far ahead of him in terms of having created that freedom. But when you walk through those streets today and you talk to those people and in all of those countries, they know the force of President Ronald Reagan and they know when he said, "Gorbachev, you tear this wall down" that that was not just rhetoric. That wall came down.

I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I think the Senator from Georgia is so correct. I think back on that example and I think that it really sort of symbolizes the difference between a totalitarian government where freedom is denied, where people are not allowed to worship, and are not allowed to be baptized, and the wonder of the democracy that we are blessed with having.

I think also that it is fitting for us to recognize him in this manner. I have on my desk a plaque which is imprinted with one of President Reagan's quotes, a quote which I think is most appropriate especially as we discuss naming National Airport after him at this late point in his life. It says, "There is no limit what a man can do or where he can go if he doesn't mind who gets the credit."

I think it is time to give Ronald Reagan credit. This is a fitting tribute to him. I salute the Senator from Georgia for his efforts, and I support his steadfastness in that.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, of course, during the course of the afternoon we have been talking about very personal praise for his family and the First Lady. But for Ronald Reagan there is a lot of unlikely praise that needs to be acknowledged here today from Republicans and Democrats alike. While my friends on the other side of the aisle may disagree with him on certain policies, I hope they will agree

that he stood fast on conviction and provided leadership for America at a very critical time. Ronald Reagan did after all begin his career as a Democrat. He truly was a man of both sides of the aisle. He cast his first vote for Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whose name has been evoked in this debate because when we were talking about the need to have an appropriate not designation but memorial for President Roosevelt, we did not enter into any of this kind of bickering. It was done. It should be done. Now citizens from all across the country can be reminded of that era of our Nation's history.

Here are some words of tribute from some unlikely sources.

Former California Governor and Presidential candidate, Jerry Brown, said, "He was not just the guy across the table. He had a presence. He had the quality of being able to tell a story. . . ." And, as Senator SESSIONS just said, " . . . and then smile and laugh. There was a sort of magic there, and I could see it at work."

Or former majority whip of the House, Representative Coehlo, "Ronald Reagan believed a few things and he really stood for them. He was Presidential. He did not get down in the gutter."

I want to repeat that. "He did not get down in the gutter. Indeed, he would let people accuse him of anything. We did. But these things never got a response."

Even Sam Donaldson has good things to say about President Reagan. He said, "I don't think we have ever had a President who used the bully pulpit better than he did. He was its master. Reagan's most outstanding leadership quality was that you knew where he stood on a matter. You didn't have to agree with him. He got into some of the most contentious issues for our country. I never had to figure out what kind of a speech he would give tomorrow or worry that he would change his mind from the views he expressed today."

That is Sam Donaldson talking about Ronald Reagan.

Donaldson, further quoting, "Reagan is the most dynamic President I have seen."

So, as I said, whether you agreed with him or not, Ronald Reagan defined leadership in our time.

Mr. President, I am going to suggest the absence of a quorum. I think Senator HUTCHINSON is here from Arkansas. I will determine whether that is so.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUTCHINSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator already has that right.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, as I listened to the speeches and the various tributes to Ronald Reagan and the speeches that are in favor of this legislation to name the Washington National Airport after former President Ronald Reagan, I had not intended to speak today. But I was moved by some of the tributes that I have heard. I was dismayed by noticing the opposition to this legislation—surprised and dismayed. And I thought there was little I could add to some of the glowing tributes that we have heard except my own personal experience because I think in many ways I like many of my generation owe to Ronald Reagan the inspiration and the motivation to go into the whole sphere of the political arena.

In 1964 I was in junior high school living in the northwest corner of Arkansas. My parents were not particularly political. But I watched the news and followed closely the political events that year and the election campaign between Lyndon Johnson and Barry Goldwater. I remember—I think it was about 10 days before the election that year—watching on our black-and-white television in Arkansas a speech by an actor by the name of Ronald Reagan. I remember sitting on the floor in front of the black-and-white television mesmerized as I listened to what later became known to a whole generation of young people as "The Speech"—"A time for choosing," it was called—in which Ronald Reagan so eloquently laid out for the Nation the choice that faced America in that campaign and a philosophic choice that faced Americans down through the ages.

And there is a junior high schooler listening to Ronald Reagan make that speech, a speech that historians say was the launching pad, if you will, for his political career, a speech that propelled him to a meteoric rise in politics, from the Governorship of California to the Presidency of the United States. I think it also propelled a whole generation of young people to look at politics as something noble, as something of a great adventure, as an arena in which truly a difference could be made in the lives of our fellow citizens and the future of our Nation.

And so when young people write me today, and I so frequently get asked by elementary students and high school students: Senator, how did you get started in politics and who is your favorite President? I answer it in reverse order. I say, "My favorite President is Ronald Reagan, and let me tell you how I got started in politics." And then we enclose in that letter a copy of the speech, the 1964 address by Ronald Reagan that started his political career and that started the political careers of a host of other individuals as well and

made a great difference in America. I will not take time to read all of the speech, "A Time for Choosing." I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

A TIME FOR CHOOSING

(By Ronald Reagan)

[Given as a stump speech, at speaking engagements, and on a memorable night in 1964 in support of Barry Goldwater's presidential campaign. This version is from that broadcast.]

I am going to talk of controversial things. I make no apology for this.

It's time we asked ourselves if we still know the freedoms intended for us by the Founding Fathers. James Madison said, "We base all our experiments on the capacity of mankind for self government."

This idea that government was beholden to the people, that it had no other source of power is still the newest, most unique idea in all the long history of man's relation to man. This is the issue of this election: Whether we believe in our capacity for self-government or whether we abandon the American Revolution and confess that a little intellectual elite in a far-distant capital can plan our lives for us better than we can plan them ourselves.

You and I are told we must choose between a left or right, but I suggest there is no such thing as a left or right. There is only an up or down. Up to man's age-old dream—the maximum of individual freedom consistent with order or down to the ant heap of totalitarianism. Regardless of their sincerity, their humanitarian motives, those who would sacrifice freedom for security have embarked on this downward path. Plutarch warned, "The real destroyer of the liberties of the people is he who spreads among them bounties, donations and benefits."

The Founding Fathers knew a government can't control the economy without controlling people. And they knew when a government sets out to do that, it must use force and coercion to achieve its purpose. So we have come to a time for choosing.

Public servants say, always with the best of intentions, "What greater service we could render if only we had a little more money and a little more power." But the truth is that outside of its legitimate function, government does nothing as well or as economically as the private sector.

Yet any time you and I question the schemes of the do-gooders, we're denounced as being opposed to their humanitarian goals. It seems impossible to legitimately debate their solutions with the assumption that all of us share the desire to help the less fortunate. They tell us we're always "against," never "for" anything.

We are for a provision that destitution should not follow unemployment by reason of old age, and to that end we have accepted Social Security as a step toward meeting the problem. However, we are against those entrusted with this program when they practice deception regarding its fiscal shortcomings, when they charge that any criticism of the program means that we want to end payments. . . .

We are for aiding our allies by sharing our material blessings with nations which share our fundamental beliefs, but we are against doling out money government to government, creating bureaucracy, if not socialism, all over the world.

We need true tax reform that will at least make a start toward restoring for our children the American Dream that wealth is denied to no one, that each individual has the

right to fly as high as his strength and ability will take him. . . . But we can not have such reform while our tax policy is engineered by people who view the tax as a means of achieving changes in our social structure. . . .

Have we the courage and the will to face up to the immorality and discrimination of the progressive tax, and demand a return to traditional proportionate taxation? . . . Today in our country the tax collector's share is 37 cents of every dollar earned. Freedom has never been so fragile, so close to slipping from our grasp.

Are you willing to spend time studying the issues, making yourself aware, and then conveying that information to family and friends? Will you resist the temptation to get a government handout for your community? Realize that the doctor's fight against socialized medicine is your fight. We can't socialize the doctors without socializing the patients. Recognize that government invasion of public power is eventually an assault upon your own business. If some among you fear taking a stand because you are afraid of reprisals from customers, clients, or even government, recognize that you are just feeding the crocodile hoping he'll eat you last.

If all of this seems like a great deal of trouble, think what's at stake. We are faced with the most evil enemy mankind has known in his long climb from the swamp to the stars. There can be no security anywhere in the free world if there is no fiscal and economic stability within the United States. Those who ask us to trade our freedom for the soup kitchen of the welfare state are architects of a policy of accommodation.

They say the world has become too complex for simple answers. They are wrong. There are no easy answers, but there are simple answers. We must have the courage to do what we know is morally right. Winston Churchill said that "the destiny of man is not measured by material computation. When great forces are on the move in the world, we learn we are spirits-not animals." And he said, "There is something going on in time and space, and beyond time and space, which, whether we like it or not, spells duty."

You and I have a rendezvous with destiny. We will preserve for our children this, the last best hope of man on earth, or we will sentence them to take the first step into a thousand years of darkness. If we fail, at least let our children and our children's children say of us we justified our brief moment here. We did all that could be done.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I would like to read just the closing two paragraphs of Ronald Reagan's speech in 1964 on behalf of Barry Goldwater, a speech that obviously did not turn the tide in that election but a speech that started his political career, a speech that inspired me to become involved in the political process. He concluded that speech, the speech in 1964 with these words:

They say the world has become too complex for simple answers. They are wrong. There are no easy answers, but there are simple answers. We must have the courage to do what we know is morally right.

You and I have a rendezvous with destiny. We will preserve for our children this, the last best hope on Earth, or we will sentence them to take the first step into a thousand years of darkness. If we fail, at least let our children and our children's children say of us we justified our brief moment here. We did all that could be done.

I cannot say it as Ronald Reagan said it, but his words still have the power of

great meaning, and what an inspiration it was to a Nation. And so when he became President of the United States, this great communicator and great optimist infused in us again the feeling that America can be and is a great Nation.

With the Reagan tax cuts, the economic recovery that it spawned, with his repair of our neglected defenses, with his courageous and bold stand to say the words that everybody criticized him for when he called communism, "The Evil Empire," as a result of that and his willingness to stand at the Berlin wall and say to Mr. Gorbachev, "Tear this wall down," it sewed the seeds for what became the collapse of the old Soviet Union and most of communism in the world.

And then perhaps no incident I think reflects the greatness of this man and his impact upon us and how he buoyed us as a people: Republicans, Democrats, and Independents, all Americans how he raised our spirits, inspired us and inspired a Nation than when on January 28, 1986, the space shuttle Challenger exploded just after takeoff, disintegrating into a ball of flame before a world television audience. The disaster understandably stunned America. Never before had the dangers of space exploration been brought home as graphically and as visibly as they were that day. The intensive prelaunch media attention had caused the world to know these seven crew members as we knew few other astronauts. We knew them with an unusual intimacy, and now they were gone. The Nation was staggered.

Then Ronald Reagan took to the airwaves. The President of the United States delivered a 5-minute speech, and he concluded his 5-minute speech by quoting the words written by a Royal Air Force pilot shortly before his death in the battle of Britain, those words that we will remember:

For I have slipped the surly bonds of Earth and touched the face of God.

President Reagan's short speech of 5 minutes, concluding with those words, unified and uplifted and encouraged a heartbroken America.

Tip O'Neill, who was Reagan's political adversary, tough political adversary, with whom he had many fierce arguments and disagreements, later that very day described the moment in which Reagan made that inspiring speech to America. He said, and I quote Tip O'Neill, "Reagan at his best." It was a trying day for all Americans and Ronald Reagan spoke to our highest ideals.

May I say, Tip O'Neill said it right because Ronald Reagan always spoke to our highest ideals. This is a very small tribute but a very fitting and appropriate tribute that we name this airport after one of our greatest Presidents and one of our greatest living Americans, Ronald Reagan.

I thank Senator COVERDELL for his leadership and his willingness to take on this project, and I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. The Senator from Arkansas was here yesterday and gave a very inspiring commentary on his legislation to improve American education, but he has matched yesterday. Those were remarkable words, and the personal feeling in connection with the former President is obvious. I watched the same speech and remember just being stunned by it. I didn't really know that much about him, but I remember turning to my mother and saying, "You ought to have heard that speech." Anybody who heard it I think was moved by it. But I really do believe the Senator has captured his optimism, and I commend the Senator for it.

Mr. President, we have been joined by my good colleague from Nevada, who has other matters to talk about. I am going to yield the floor so that he might proceed with his piece of business.

Mr. BRYAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for a period of time not to exceed 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRYAN. Let me preface my comments by thanking the senior Senator from Georgia. I am delighted to have a chance to be down here today to talk on an issue. And his willingness to accommodate me is something I appreciate very much.

NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, in the Chamber this week and I am sure in the next week a number of my colleagues will be talking about a January 31, 1998, deadline under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. And as I am sure my colleagues will know, there has been a recent flurry of newspaper ads and radio commercials indicating that was the deadline under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act for high-level nuclear waste to be accepted by the Department of Energy. I want to put those comments and those ads in some perspective so that no one should be misled by the assertions of the nuclear utility industry.

The genesis of our current policy with respect to disposal of high-level waste traces its origins to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982. It is true that in that piece of legislation it was contemplated the Department of Energy would be in a position to accept high-level nuclear waste, that a period of characterization and study would ultimately send three sites to the President of the United States and the President would select one of those sites.

I think it is important to mention at the outset that even in 1982 a number of Department of Energy experts were