

highway funding bill. I know there has been a lot of juggling back and forth about whose fault it is that we haven't considered this bill sooner. But the fact is, the highway bill was supposed to have been done last year by the Senate, and it ought to be done now.

We were told it was going to be one of the first items of business. Now we are told by the budgeteers that it must wait to follow the budget. To me, that approach is a big mistake. Let me tell you why.

If we delay the highway bill until after we have finished the budget this year, we will have delayed the highway bill, which we should have passed last year, until well after the middle of this year.

States like mine, North Dakota, in the Northern region of this country, will be terribly disadvantaged once again if we do not pass this bill soon. Northern states have a short construction season. They need to commit most of their money in the spring in order for necessary work to get done before winter sets in again. The plans for highway building and bridge building, in my state and many other states, are on hold because this Congress has yet to pass this bill. That is why the Congress must act quickly in this matter.

This is a jobs issue. It is an issue about investment in our infrastructure. Highways and bridges are vitally important to economic development in every state. The longer the highway plans are on hold, the longer people have to wait to make their investment decisions.

So I say to the majority leader and others, when the leaders of the Senate are planning what the Senate should do tomorrow, the next day, or the next week, I hope they will decide to bring the highway bill to the Senate floor.

This country needs a highway bill. We have it in our grasp to bring a highway bill to the floor and to debate it and pass it.

Someone said, "Well, gee, there are 100 or 200 amendments to the highway bill." So that means it should have been brought up yesterday or the day before, and maybe we would have gotten rid of 20 of those amendments.

Let us, day by day, make progress on the highway bill so the American people know that this Congress views transportation investment as a high priority.

Madam President, I yield the floor. I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS— S. 1575

Mr. COVERDELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 301, S. 1575, the Ronald Reagan airport legislation.

I further ask unanimous consent that there be one amendment in order to be offered by myself, Senator COVERDELL, relative to a modification of the original bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the total time for debate be limited to 2 hours equally divided between Senator MCCAIN and HOLLINGS, or their designees, and following the debate the Senate proceed to vote on or in relation to the amendment to be followed by third reading and a vote on passage of S. 1575.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, this is very similar of course to the offer made last week.

I guess I will just ask: What is wrong with regular order? What is wrong with bringing a bill to the Senate floor, having a good debate, allowing the opportunity to offer amendments, and proceed under the rules of the Senate? Why do we need this gag rule with regard to this piece of legislation? Many of us are confused about that. And, unfortunately, many of the objections raised are being, in my view, misinterpreted by some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. All we want is an opportunity to offer amendments and to have a good debate.

Some have suggested that this opposition is cynical. I don't know that the opposition expressed in the last several days by local officials including the mayor of Alexandria, Kerry Donley, by the Chairman of the Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority, Chris Zimmerman, by the former Governor of Virginia, Linwood Holton, are cynical in their opposition to this piece of legislation. We are simply raising concerns about whether or not this is the right thing to do.

But that again argues, it seems to me, that we need the opportunity to have a good debate. This should not be done in 2 hours and with just one amendment. I give the distinguished Senator credit for his persistence and his determination to see this legislation through—but as I understand it, the one amendment to be offered by our Republican colleague is the one that literally takes the name "Washington" out of the title and instead puts in the name "Reagan." We ought to have a discussion about that.

I suggest that perhaps there are other airports that should be considered to be renamed rather than Washington National Airport. For instance, it seems to me that Dulles International Airport might be a better candidate. We could have two airports named after two Presidents in the Washington area, "Washington" and "Reagan," without affecting the first President of the United States. But we ought to have an opportunity to debate it. We ought to have an opportunity to

discuss it and consider other amendments.

We have suggested as well that nothing would honor this former Ronald Reagan more than the opportunity to directly address a concern that he raised while he was President: the need to reform the IRS. Legislation to do just that passed 426 to 4 in the House of Representatives last year. We ought to pass it unanimously here in the Senate before more and more Americans are adversely affected by actions taken by IRS. Since we failed to act last November, one and a half million Americans have been adversely affected by actions taken by the IRS.

So let's deal with that legislation. Let's offer that as an amendment in tribute. We could even refer to it as the "Ronald Reagan IRS reform amendment."

I would just hope that we don't proceed as the first order of business imposing a gag rule on the Senate not allowing the opportunity for regular order, not having an opportunity to debate, to listen and respond to local officials.

How ironic that in the name of Ronald Reagan we carelessly demonstrate a lack of sensitivity to the local officials that Ronald Reagan said ought to be paramount in governmental decisionmaking. Unfortunately, we are attempting to override the objections that local decisionmakers have about what name should be placed at Washington National Airport. Do we really want to do that? Again, how ironic it would be if we did.

So, Madam President, for all those reasons I would simply ask unanimous consent that the Senator's request be modified to provide for three first-degree amendments to be in order per side during the consideration of that bill.

Mr. COVERDELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator agree to modifying his request?

Mr. COVERDELL. No. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, regrettably, under those circumstances I would have to object to the distinguished Senator's request as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Madam President, first let me say this to my good friend, my distinguished colleague, the minority leader. It is incorrect to suggest that we are not talking about debate. We want to move to the bill and debate its merits, both for or against it. It is true that perhaps I, more than any other, am objecting to the concept of taking a memorial statement to a former President and turning it into a free-for-all about IRS or other issues. I just do not think that is appropriate. I can understand. And if we have a local official, a former Governor, who is opposed to it, then during the course of

the debate that can be heard and people can make their judgments about whether that is correct or wrong. But I can't accept the idea of taking something in the face of the family and finding ourselves in who knows what.

With regard to the propounding of but one amendment—and that being mine, although I know the minority leader and the majority leader have not had a chance to talk about this—but from my point of view that amendment does not need to be offered. It was an administrative attempt to be in concurrence with the House which removed it and made it Ronald Reagan National Airport. My original legislation is Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport just like it is Washington Dulles Airport. I know this is not the moment to resolve that. But the minority leader is here, and I am here, and I am passing that along.

With regard to the minority leader's suggestion as to other amendments, of course I would not know what those are. And I hope that during the course of the afternoon or tomorrow that the minority leader and the majority leader will have a chance to come to terms on it. But I do say in the strongest way that, while we can debate whether we should or shouldn't, I do not think it is appropriate. I think it would be unseemly to the family and everybody associated to open this up where we are debating other issues—no one wants to modify IRS more than I. But I wouldn't do it on this bill. And that is just a point of disagreement between us.

I agree with the Senator that it is unfortunate. I do think it is—I am the one that used the word "cynical"—I do think it is reflective of the city, that we find ourselves dealing with this effort in this way, approaching a filibuster again. I think that it speaks for what it is.

We can debate it and vote for it or against it depending on whatever the individual Senator's desire would be, no matter their side of the aisle. I did think that the arguments—and the minority leader wasn't the source of all of those arguments—but they were, I thought, derived in an attempt to suggest a debate when in fact it was an attempt to stall or delay the legislation.

I say to the minority leader, I am going to go on and talk a bit about this, and I do not want him to feel impounded by that in that I basically responded to his comments.

Madam President, let me first say this legislation is awfully simple. It doesn't require some of the work such as an overhaul of the IRS or redesignation of Medicare. This is an attempt, a very appropriate attempt, to honor one of the great Presidents of our time.

This past Friday I referred to the process as being cynical. It reminds me of just how many changes have occurred in this Capital City of ours. At first it was suggested last week that to name it Ronald Reagan National Airport was removing the name of a former President, but everybody knows

that the use of the word "Washington" with regard to Washington National is referring to location, although I certainly, as I told the minority leader, have no problem leaving it the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. But I am doing that because I am still certifying where the airport is. It is in Washington, DC.

It was suggested to me a little bit earlier that the Baltimore-Washington International Airport is not named after Lord Baltimore—it is named after a city called Baltimore that is named after Lord Baltimore—any more than the designation "Washington" in Baltimore-Washington International Airport refers to our first President. It refers to the two geographic locations in a very wise marketing attempt on the part of Baltimore to be an auxiliary airport to Washington National, or to the city airport here in Washington. I just do not feel that is a real nor meritorious problem in dealing with this legislation.

Probably the most offensive of the arguments that were offered this past Friday was the argument that the Reagan family is not here asking for this to be done. What an unseemly thing to be saying, "Well, if we are going to honor former President Reagan you all have to come here, kind of crawl through the door and ask us to do this." They will never do that. They will never do that. What are they supposed to do, launch a lobbying effort or buy some public relations firm to come up here and plead with the U.S. Senate that this would be an appropriate gesture?

Madam President, I have already taken issue with the idea that you take a memorial, a memorial to a great American leader, and you use it as a vehicle to handle all the other processes that go on in the Capital City, whether it's IRS or Medicare or some other issue. We all know better than that. Protocol and etiquette simply dismisses that as being inappropriate, related to a memorial designation. As I said last week, this ought to stand or fall on its own merits. You either support the idea of honoring President Reagan in this way or you don't. But the idea of trying to cripple it through a series of amendments is demeaning and inappropriate.

I frankly think this filibuster is inappropriate. It seems to become more and more of the process the other side is using. But if you had to find one area where it just was inappropriate, it would be using it in the context of a memorial statement to a former President. And I want to repeat, we are dealing with a gentleman who was a great American President, who was wounded in the twilight of his years, made one of the most magnanimous statements to his countrymen, one of the finest demonstrations of courage and bravery and ongoing public responsibility, whose birthday is this week. This town is not honoring itself in this debate—both in the context of the way this is

being handled and now we find ourselves in the midst of yet another, in my judgment demeaning characteristic, and that is a filibuster.

In an era where America yearned for a leader, Ronald Reagan answered the call. It is easy to forget that leadership is not doing what is popular based on a poll, it is doing what is right. Time and time again, President Reagan made his decisions on the strength of his convictions, regardless of current polls or popular opinion. How quickly we forget how he was mocked, chided, ridiculed when he called the Soviet Union an evil empire, but history has borne him out.

I remember very vividly the mocking of President Reagan when he characterized the Soviet Union as an evil empire, and I remember wondering in my mind, and aloud, why in the world would anybody mock somebody for describing the Soviet Union in such a way? This was an avowed adversary that had enslaved millions of people in a dictatorship. But he was mocked when he referred to the Soviet Union as an evil empire.

Did it deter him? Was he shaken by this? Did he call another press conference to try to explain what he meant? No. He said it was an evil empire and an avowed adversary and we ought to understand it in that way. As I said, people scoffed at his naivete when he demanded that Mikhail Gorbachev tear down the Berlin Wall. I can still see him standing there: "Tear down this wall." Freedom won. The Berlin wall fell and the world is a completely different place because of the convictions—not only of him. He'd be the first, if he were here, to say, "I didn't do this alone." But he was a giant in the effort.

I remember several years ago, before his illness, he was in Atlanta, GA. It was a Republican Party event that he had agreed to attend. At the end of the meeting, in a very inspiring way, very emotional, the chairman of the dinner walked over and gave him, encased, a piece of the Berlin wall, and said, "I hope you will let this rest on your desk to remind you of the achievement your strength of convictions meant to our country and to the world."

Now that the wall was down—and instead of this forceful edifice of oppression that looked down on people, that enslaved people, that threatened people—it had come to the point that it was but a mere souvenir to be sitting on desks or in libraries around the world.

Originally, the Congress that I am unfortunately dealing with here today balked at the idea that families, not Government, should decide how to spend tax dollars. Under Ronald Reagan, the families won one of the largest single tax cuts in American history. And we certainly have seen the benefit of it—millions of new jobs. The decade of the 1980s was one of unbridled optimism. As we lowered the pressure on our families, left more of the income they produced in their checking

accounts, we saw an unprecedented turnaround from stagflation, from unbelievable interest rates, from high taxes; and you saw the American people come forward with almost boundless optimism.

For some of the people in this city, they called that a decade of greed. I call it a decade of growth and strength and authority for the United States—not only in the context that we were able to stand up and force the Soviet Union to tear the wall down, but that our everyday families from Iowa to Georgia, were better off, and they were optimistic, and they regained—you know—it's "morning in America," as he would say. And it showed. We were a smiling Nation again.

Throughout his Presidency, Ronald Reagan stood on principle, and history has, again, borne him out. In 1981, the office he inherited and the country he was to govern was in grave crisis, both at home and abroad. We forget, inflation was double digits.

What is that versus today? Several times what it is today. Interest rates were over 20 percent. It means if you wanted to buy a house, if you wanted to buy a car, you were going to pay 20 cents on the dollar just to use the money. All of you have seen the ads for automobiles today. Some are as low as 6 percent. So it was dragging our economy down.

Ronald Reagan's most critical opponents would acknowledge that President Reagan's policies reversed our course, bringing prosperity to home and allowing us to stand tall once again abroad.

President Reagan taught us that leadership, as I said, is more than polls and focus groups. Leadership is not doing what is popular and then trying to make it right. It is doing what is right and then making it popular. As Eric Sevareid said of Harry Truman in David McCullough's book "Truman," "Remembering him reminds people of what a man in that office ought to be like. It's character, just character, and he stands like a rock in memory now."

Madam President, Ronald Reagan is a rock of our time, and history is going to demonstrate that again and again.

The Wall Street Journal of Monday, January 5, 1998, talks about Ronald Reagan. "Reagan National Airport" is the headline. I am going to share it with the Senate:

The Republican Governors Association has unanimously endorsed renaming Washington's chief transportation gateway the "Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport."

I might add, that includes the current Governor of Virginia, not a former Governor, the current Governor.

The move gives impetus to a plan by Congressional leaders to pass legislation honoring the former President in time for his 87th birthday on February 6.

This week, which is what is so frustrating about this filibuster. We are running on a short fuse here, Madam President.

A big booster of the idea is Governor George Allen of Virginia, where National Airport is located.

Of course, he is now retired from that governorship.

He notes that many airports are named after famous people, from San Diego's Lindbergh to New York's LaGuardia, Chicago's O'Hare, Washington's Dulles Airport and Orange County's John Wayne Airport. A serious effort is under way to rename Los Angeles' airport after actor and World War II aviator Jimmy Stewart. The late President John F. Kennedy was honored by having the nation's largest international airport named after him in 1964.

Friends of Mr. Reagan say National Airport is a more appropriate memorial than the new \$818 million government office building in Washington that is also named after him.

I know this to be the case. Washington National is a symbol. It is something that millions of passengers see every year, both domestic and foreign. Those of us who share my view think that is the appropriate memorial to designate Ronald Reagan Airport.

To have him identified with [this building]—

And I am going to modify this language, I don't want to read it exactly—"represents everything he was opposed to, is the ultimate irony."

That is the big building.

"He wanted to pare back government," says former Senator Paul Laxalt. In contrast, renaming National Airport would cost almost nothing.

Now we know it costs nothing because we have had letters from people willing to pay for any changes, citizens who are willing to step forward.

"You're talking about a few signs and a logo," says David Ralston, chairman of the airport's authority. Grover Norquist, who came up with the idea as head of the Ronald Reagan Legacy Project, says he will be happy to raise money to pay for any extra costs if Democrats find that a reason to object.

We have already put that to bed. We have another citizen who already stepped forward who said he would see to any financial costs associated with renaming the airport.

A few already are grouching privately. While President Clinton has declined to say if he would sign the name change into law, some Democrats in Congress mutter that Mr. Reagan is an inappropriate choice. Washington, D.C.'s Mayor Marion Barry says "a host of other people" should be considered.

As I have said, if they believe that this memorial is inappropriate, they should speak to it and vote against it. But using specious arguments to somehow cloud the effort I do not think is appropriate.

But the first frontal assault on the idea came from Mary McGrory, the Washington Post's venerable liberal columnist. She says the idea "should be nipped in the bud."

She must have some influence here.

Mr. Reagan "didn't only rail against Washington, he genuinely despised it. . ."

I have to say that is just such an inappropriate characterization of our former President. He didn't like a lot of the ideas. He didn't like the idea that this town thought it ran America, but he did love America, and he was a believer in its optimism and its glory

and understood that this was the capital of the free world for which he gave so much of his life to protect.

She says:

He took no part in its revels or its problems. He was in no way attached to it.

I think most Americans would find not being attached to the Capital City an attribute. If I have one criticism of the city in the brief time I have been here, it is that too many people succumb to this city and the idea that it dominates the Nation.

She concludes by saying "we do not know what Ronald Reagan feels about all this. He is not himself."

That is accurate. He has fallen ill, as we all know.

That may be true, but Nancy Reagan and Mr. Reagan's son Michael are on record as supporting the idea. Governor Allen says a Reagan Airport would gladden the hearts of millions of Americans who don't view Washington as an imperial city.

It is true that President Reagan did not view this as an imperial city.

He says generations of future lawmakers would do well to remember Mr. Reagan as they fly in to pass laws. "Every time they come here, they'll be reminded they're here to serve the people, even though they're far from home," Governor Allen says.

Nothing can restore Ronald Reagan to the inspirational vitality that so inspired Americans during the 1980s, qualities that are vividly recalled in the superb PBS biography of Mr. Reagan that will air nationally on February 23 and 24. Still, we can't help but think the country would benefit from having such a visible national symbol honoring him.

Great last line:

Name this one for the Gipper.

Madam President, I have alluded several times here this afternoon to the fact that our former President has been afflicted with a crippling illness. President Reagan faced personal adversity many times during his Presidency. Being cut down by an assassin's bullet would have been enough to knock the wind out of almost anybody, but not President Reagan. I remember this incident so vividly. I think most Americans would.

I happened to be in London that afternoon. Nancy and I were having dinner. It is very interesting. The waiter came over, and he leaned over, and he said, "Pardon me. Are you Americans?"

I guess we must have looked a little different to him or maybe it was the southern accent. I am not sure. But he said, "Are you Americans?" And I said, "Yes, we are. Thank you." And in the most somber way, he leaned over and he said that he was so sorry to advise me that, "Your President has been shot." He was just stunned. And he said, "We would like to help you, so we have arranged for a television in our living quarters upstairs, if you might like to understand what has happened." We immediately dashed upstairs.

We shared the shock of everyone in the world wondering at that moment,

had we lost this great President. And where was the Vice President? And what was actually happening? But even in that moment you could sense the world's admiration, even in this waiter, even in this community, this restaurant, their admiration for President Reagan, and trying to help the only Americans that were right there in front of them to see them through this situation.

Or do you remember when he was diagnosed with cancer? He bounced back again. Couldn't take the Gipper down.

But now he faces his greatest battle—Alzheimer's disease. And he has not shrunk from the challenge. Ronald Reagan chose to use his personal suffering to bring public focus on the devastation caused by this disease, and in so doing once again took the cards he was given and turned them to another public use.

Last Thursday, Madam President, I shared the unbelievable letter that President Reagan wrote to his fellow countrymen and to the world, for that matter. I am going to share that again this afternoon because it is not long. And I think it speaks to the nature of the individual we are trying to honor on his 87th birthday.

He said, on November 5, 1994—not that long ago:

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. They 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.

Every time I read this I am just struck, as I was with the assassination attempt, with the bout with cancer. I remember when he was first running for President—he had been an actor—and there was no way he possessed the qualifications to be President. And then, of course, he was too old. I think this President defied about everything they could put in front of him. And he turned out to be one of the truly great American Presidents of this century and for all time.

I know that if we are able to accomplish this, and can do so by his birthday this week, we will have made but a small gesture to acknowledge our gratitude for an enormous career and an America for which all time—all time—will be changed, for which millions of people are now free that were not, for thousands upon thousands of men and women in our military and others who did not have to lift up their arms to accomplish the transformation in Europe.

Many of those people probably do not realize how much they are indebted to this great President. Wouldn't it be nice to remind them, and wouldn't it be nice for them to understand, through this gesture, what a great leader can mean to the Nation, our country and our future?

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

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Madam President, one of President Reagan's most ardent supporters, if not the most ardent, oddly enough, is not an American citizen. A moment ago I was talking about an individual—I wish I kept this person's name—that was a British citizen. Oddly enough, it was this individual's Prime Minister who is probably President Reagan's most ardent supporter, Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister of Britain, 1979 to 1990.

Recently, a book has been published of vignettes and remembrances of Ronald Reagan. There is a short one from Margaret Thatcher that I will share with the Senate.

I . . . met Governor Reagan shortly after my becoming conservative leader in 1975. Even before then I knew about Governor Reagan because Denis [her husband] had returned home one evening in the late 1960s full of praise for a remarkable speech Ronald Reagan had just delivered to the Institute of Directors. I read the text myself and quickly saw what Denis meant. When we met in person [she is talking about meeting Governor Reagan] . . . I was immediately won over by his charm, sense of humor, and directness.

These are all very important characteristics of President Reagan. Charm. The other side all referred to him as

Teflon. Sense of humor. It was absolutely captivating to be in his presence because he could so effectively use humor to calm things down, to take the sting out of a confrontation, to move people back to the table. He was the best at using his sense of humor. And then the directness. Directness.

Years ago when he was first running for President, in 1976, I was summoned to a meeting at Atlanta International Airport which is named for Hartsfield, one of our distinguished former mayors. The Governor was going to visit with us. He was reaching out and trying to meet Republicans everywhere. We didn't have many in Georgia at that time, but a few of us gathered together, and he came in the room. I tended to support our sitting President, President Gerald Ford. I thought it made sense the party should stick with the incumbent President. The Governor was making a case for himself.

I asked the very last question. I asked the Governor, "Now, look, if we are going to be in such a tough election, why does it make sense to replace a sitting incumbent with all the assets that that person can bring to the contest?" And that threw Governor Reagan a bit, threw him off. So then the person stood up and said, "Well, that concludes our meeting," and without a heartbeat, Governor Reagan said, "We are not ending this meeting on that question," and he took another question that was on a more optimistic note and completely turned the meeting around. His directness and his ability to take charge in any setting was remarkable.

In the succeeding years I read his speeches, advocating tax cuts as the root to wealth creation and stronger defenses as an alternative to detente. I also read many of his radio broadcasts which his press secretary sent over regularly for me. I agreed with them all. In November 1978 we met again in my room in the House of Commons.

In the early years Ronald Reagan had been dismissed by much of the American political elite though not by the American electorate. . . [they considered him] a right-wing maverick who could not be taken seriously. Now he was seen by many thoughtful Republicans as their best ticket back to the White House. Whatever Ronald Reagan had gained in experience, he had not done so at the expense of his beliefs. I found him stronger than ever. When he left my study, I reflected on how different things might look if such a man were President of the United States. But, in November 1978, such a prospect seemed a long way off.

The so-called Reagan Doctrine, which Ronald Reagan developed in his speech to both Houses of Parliament in 1982, demonstrated just how potent a weapon in international politics human rights can be. His view was that we should fight the battle of ideas for freedom against communism through the world, and refuse to accept the permanent exclusion of the captive nations from the benefits of freedom.

This unashamedly philosophical approach and the armed strength supporting it transformed the political world. President Reagan undermined the Soviet Union at home by giving hope to its citizens, directly assisted rebellions against illegitimate Communist

regimes in Afghanistan and Nicaragua [in our own hemisphere] and facilitated the peaceful transition to democracy in Latin American countries and the Philippines. Of course, previous American governments had extolled human rights, and President Carter had even declared that they were the "soul" of U.S. foreign policy. Where President Reagan went beyond these, however, was in making the Soviets the principal targets of his human rights campaign, and moving from rhetorical to material support for anti-Communist guerrillas in countries where Communist regimes had not securely established themselves. The result was a decisive advance for freedom in the world. . . . In this instance, human rights and wider American purposes were in complete harmony.

Madam President, I will read a letter to the Senate.

JANUARY 2, 1998.

GENTLEMEN: I endorse and support H.R. 2625 and S. 1297. Both would redesignate Washington National Airport as "Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport."

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD.

Madam President, this next Friday, February 6, as President Reagan likes to put it, will be the 48th anniversary of his 39th birthday.

We have been blessed to have had such a great leader, dedicated to principle. Ronald Reagan distinguished himself in several careers in his lifetime. He was a radio sportscaster, announcing Cubs games for WHO in Des Moines, IA; an actor in films, such as "Knut Rockne, All-American;" a union leader—head of the Screen Actors Guild; a two-term Governor of California; and a twice-elected President of the United States.

So today, Madam President, I say to my colleagues, let's pass this one for the Gipper.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. FORD. Madam President, we are developing a position here that I don't particularly like, as it relates to naming an airport after one of our great Presidents. One of the things that concerns me most is what Ronald Reagan did as President. When he wrote his federalist papers, the Executive Order, I believe, 12612, it related to States rights and local authority.

I want to explain my views on this legislation to rename the Washington National Airport. This airport has been named the Washington National Airport since 1941. Franklin Roosevelt laid the cornerstone for the airport. The airport is on property that once belonged to the family of Martha Washington and the stepson of George Washington. What we are about to do is not an appropriate way to honor, in my opinion, one of our Presidents. In fact, in a sense, it dishonors our first President.

Ronald Reagan will have his place in history, having served two terms as President. His name is already etched on the second-largest Government building in this community. And in April, his lovely wife Nancy will be

here to celebrate and dedicate the opening of that building. President Reagan clearly believed that State and local governments should be given the power to act, wherever possible, rather than the Federal Government. In fact, he issued an Executive order so that all Federal agencies made sure that local decisions were respected.

Each of our major airports named after a President was accomplished because of local decisions. In Houston, George Bush's name was added to the name of the airport because of a decision by the mayor and the city council. In New York, the mayor, city council, and port authority honored John F. Kennedy. Here, we have objections, not support, from local communities. We may all agree that it should be renamed, but should we run roughshod over the views of the local citizenry? That would be contrary to President Reagan's papers, the Executive Order 12612.

One year prior to signing the executive order on federalism, Congress enacted legislation, championed by President Reagan's Secretary of Transportation, that created a multi-State airport authority to run and operate the two Washington-area airports. We turned over the keys to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, which we refer to as MWAA. On March 1, 1987, Secretary of Transportation Elizabeth Dole signed a 50-year lease with MWAA. Lock, stock and barrel, subject to certain limitations, we gave them the keys to the Washington National Airport.

Section after section of the 1986 act recognizes the independence of MWAA from the Federal Government for the purposes of running the airport. The lease also has similar language.

It is not clear to me that we can clearly usurp the local airport authority's power and merely rename the airport. Yet, this bill does just that. In 1990—just think back a few short years ago—Senator Dole appropriately introduced a resolution to rename the Dulles Airport after former President Eisenhower. Now, Eisenhower was a very good President. He was a very good military leader; World War II was won by his genius. The Dole bill, however, recognized the local operating authority, and rather than usurping that authority, it urged the airport authority to make the name change. That was done appropriately and by the law and by President Reagan's federalist papers, where he said local authority should be the uppermost.

If we had worked this issue properly, Madam President, I suspect we would have come to a similar conclusion and found a way to recognize our former President. Instead, we will rename the airport by fiat and let the lawyers have their day in court. The legality may be challenged and, in my view, the lawyers may have an excellent chance of winning. We are running over local authority with this piece of legislation.

They say that closer to the runway are those who are associated with this area, and those who operate the airport would prefer that the 56-year-old airport stay Washington National. And joining officials from Alexandria, who are opposed, and Arlington, who have previously said they oppose the change, the Greater Washington Board of Trade weighed in against this change last week. "With all due respect to President Reagan, we believe that renaming the airport would be very confusing to air travelers, visitors, and local residents alike," the chairman of the Board's Transportation and Environment Committee said.

Let me quote the first Republican Governor of Virginia this century—and I served with him—A. Linwood Holton, Jr.:

I also urge Congress not to impose the change on the Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority, which oversees National and Dulles International Airport under this 50-year lease from the Federal Government.

Linwood Holton says:

I hate to see even something as politically popular as this begin to chip away at the independence of local authority.

It's not easy to stand up here and be opposed to having the name of a famous and well-liked President on an airport. But someone, somehow has to understand that we are usurping local authority and the local people do not want it, and we would be giving them something they don't want, and that is typically Federal Government.

My colleague from Georgia, Mr. COVERDELL, read a letter from the former President announcing his problems with having Alzheimer's and his wife having a problem as it relates to breast cancer. And if the Gipper could tell us today what he would rather have, I believe he would rather have something named on behalf of his wife as it relates to the fight against breast cancer in this country today. That would be meaningful. That would be helpful. And it would be something that I think you would find 100-percent support for.

So, Madam President, I regret that I must oppose this piece of legislation. You can go across the country. I named Houston for President George Bush, New York for President Kennedy, Denver—they decided to name the airport after a former mayor. And Las Vegas named it after a former Senator.

So it is on and on, and all of the decisions were made by the people of those communities. President Reagan would not want us to violate his principles in the process of naming something in his honor.

Let's think about that just a minute. President Reagan would not want us to violate his principles in the process of naming something in his honor.

The law states that the airport assumes all rights and obligations as an airport. And it should be treated like all other airports. Can we mandate a renaming of any other airport? I don't think so.

So, Madam President, I hope that something can be worked out rather than having the resolution amended to add other names; the resolution be amended to take care of the IRS, the resolution be amended to do a lot of other things.

So let's look at the ownership of this property for a moment, if we may.

Originally it was owned by the Alexandria family, for which the city of Alexandria is named. That is who owned this property.

The property was later owned by the Custis family. John Parke Custis acquired the land from the Alexandria family. John Parke Custis was the son of Martha Washington, and the stepson of George Washington.

George Washington was close to John Custis, and following John's death adopted his two children. The children then lived at Mount Vernon. And the airport was designed after Mount Vernon.

The Abington Plantation was returned later to the Alexandria family.

In the 1920's, the land was owned by Lewis Smoot, and later sold to the Richmond, Fredericksburg, and Potomac Railroad.

Two airports were located near the Virginia side of the 14th Street Bridge; one the Hoover Field. That was after a President, which opened in 1926, and Washington Airport opened in 1927. The airports merged because of the Depression.

The decision to build Washington National Airport did not occur until 1938 when Franklin Delano Roosevelt effectively bypassed this body and began construction.

Following a series of disputes over who actually owned the land, the District of Columbia and Virginia claimed title. The Federal Government asserted jurisdiction in 1946.

So not only has the George Washington family—the first—of these United States been involved in this property in this area for the lifetime of this country but I think that leaving the name as it is, or changing the name to whatever should be, as President Reagan insisted that we do back in the 1986 when he wrote his Federal Executive order, I think it would be much better to honor his wife since his name is already etched in the second-largest building in this area, second only to the Pentagon. I hope that a way can be found rather than to make it look partisan, and some will take my position because they think it is right. Others will take an opposite view because of the political arena. Some will take the same view I have because of politics. I have taken the view because of what President Reagan said in his papers, Executive Order 16612, that said that communities and the States and in their judgment should be respected. And I think we ought to do what the former President asked us to do.

I see no one wanting the floor. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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. SESSIONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### REPORT OF THE BUDGET OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 88

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, to the Committee on Appropriations, and to the Committee on the Budget.

#### *To the Congress of the United States:*

The 1999 Budget, which I am submitting to you with this message, is a balanced Federal budget, marking the first such budget in 30 years and bringing an era of exploding deficits to an end.

By reaching balance, my budget represents a remarkable turnaround in our fiscal policy over the last five years. It brings to an end three decades of fiscal chaos, a period in which Americans had lost confidence in their Government and the ability of their leaders to do the people's business.

This budget is not just balanced, it is balanced the right way. It not only ends the deficit, it reflects the values that Americans hold dear—the values of opportunity, responsibility, and community. The budget reflects my commitment to continue helping working families with their basic needs—to raise their children, send them to college, and pay for health care.

The budget invests in education and training and in research to raise the standard of living for average Americans. It invests in the environment and in law enforcement to raise the quality of life across our Nation. It invests in our communities at home while providing the resources to maintain a strong defense and conduct the international relations that have become so important to our future.

In the public and private sectors, prospects for a budget surplus are spurring a wide array of ideas about how to spend it. At this point, the Government has not yet reached the surplus milestone, and I continue to believe strongly that we should not spend a surplus that we don't yet have.

More specifically, I believe that the Administration and Congress should not spend a budget surplus for any reason until we have a solution to the long-term financing challenge facing Social Security. With that in mind, my budget proposes a reserve for the projected surpluses for 1999 and beyond.

#### PREPARING THE NATION FOR A NEW AMERICAN CENTURY

Five years ago, my Administration took office determined to restore the American Dream for every American. We were determined to turn the economy around, to rein in a budget that was out of control, and to create a Government that once again would focus on its customers, the American people.

Five years later, we have made enormous progress. Our economy is strong, our budget is headed toward balance, and our Government is making noticeable progress in providing better service to Americans.

We are beginning to bring Americans together again, to repair the social fabric that has frayed so badly in recent decades. All across America, crime is down, poverty is down, and welfare is down. Incomes are rising at all levels, and a new spirit of optimism is sweeping through many of our urban and rural communities that are rebounding from decades of lost jobs and lost hope.

Now that we have turned the economy around, our task is to spread the benefits of our economic well-being to more Americans, to ensure that every American has the chance to live out his or her dreams. As we move confidently ahead as a Nation, we want to ensure that nobody is left behind.

A century ago, the economy shifted from agriculture to manufacturing, changing the way that Americans lived, the way they worked, the way they related to one another. Today, the economy is shifting once more, this time from manufacturing to services, information, technology, and global commerce.

We can ensure that every American fully enjoys the benefits of this exciting new age, but only if we continue to give people the tools they need and create the conditions in which they can prosper. That is what my budget is designed to do.

#### CREATING A BRIGHT ECONOMIC FUTURE

When my Administration took office, the Nation was mired in economic problems. The economy had barely grown over four years, creating few jobs. Interest rates were high. Incomes remained stagnant for all but the most well-off. The budget deficit, which had exploded in size in the early 1980s, had reached a record \$290 billion and was headed higher. Clearly, the Nation needed a new course.