

are important. The Senator from Georgia has rightly noted the considerable contributions of former President Ronald Reagan. The Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID, has offered an amendment of importance for another reason.

Standards change. Nations learn conduct and behavior. No sooner had the Soviet Union fallen than statues of Stalin and Lenin tumbled to the streets. Samozza, Marcos, Batista had probably not even left office when their names and statues were removed from public places.

In America through the years we have had despots of a different order, people who lived in a free society but did not always respect the law. They were part of the U.S. Government but not always in its best traditions. The Senator from Nevada has raised an issue before the Senate that the name of J. Edgar Hoover remains on the FBI building in Washington, DC. Every year, thousands of American schoolchildren wander down Pennsylvania Avenue to visit the FBI headquarters. Because the FBI now is often a model of law enforcement in our country, because the country has been fortunate to have Louis Freeh as its director, who respects the law and is in the highest traditions of our country, neither those schoolchildren nor many of our citizens, probably, remember or understand that there was a time when the Federal Bureau of Investigation's leadership, under J. Edgar Hoover, neither lived within nor always respected the law.

Mr. COVERDELL. Will the Senator yield for just one moment for an administrative note?

Mr. TORRICELLI. I am happy to yield.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. COVERDELL. I ask unanimous consent that at the closure of the Senator's remarks, the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 6 this evening. As you know, this is for the Members' briefing on Iraq.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for 1 minute following his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request as amended by the Senator from Nevada? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Upon J. Edgar Hoover's death, perhaps his closest colleague in the Bureau, William Sullivan, described Mr. Hoover as a "master blackmailer."

We now know from historians Mr. Hoover had compiled files on Presidents of the United States and Members of Congress through illegal surveillance and wiretapping, holding dossiers on leaders of the U.S. Government. It was a practice of blackmail. It changed policies. It threatened America. And it was wrong.

Probably no one of his time, through subterfuge, within the U.S. Government, had a more adverse impact on the civil rights movement. He vigor-

ously dispatched agents of the U.S. Government to harass the leadership of the NAACP. He called leading civil rights organizations "Communist fronts." Indeed, he instructed agents to stand by and watch as racist mobs would beat up voter registration workers and civil rights workers in organized and lawful marches. To the extent that he harassed Martin Luther King, former Vice President Walter Mondale called J. Edgar Hoover "a disgrace to every American."

I don't know how we explain to American schoolchildren who leave their schools to honor Martin Luther King, who learn in our classrooms about the American Constitution, our respect for laws, that when they visit this proud Capital of our country, the most prominent name on the most prominent street in America is J. Edgar Hoover. But I know this, the Senator from Nevada is right, that it is a contradiction that should be removed, an explanation that no longer need be made. It is time to remove the name of J. Edgar Hoover from the FBI building. And if it is not enough that we suspected all along his intimidation of Presidents and his violation of basic rights, his biographers now give us more than enough reason. If you don't respect the Constitution, or civil rights, or civil liberties, Mr. Hoover lived outside the laws that he pretended to uphold.

It is now known that he had secret relationships with underworld boss Frank Costello, whose primary duties in organized crime including fixing games of chance and horse races. Gambling tips were given to Mr. Hoover, so he was able to support a lifestyle and live with income outside of the law. He had close contacts with members of New York's organized crime families as well, who he refused to investigate, or even acknowledge that they were a public policy problem for more than a decade. It is now claimed that outside of these illegal acts, within the bureau itself he used hundreds of thousands of dollars of public money for his own personal use.

The Senator from Nevada has brought before the Senate a painful decision, because it requires an honest reflection on a period of history of our own country.

Mr. Hoover was not in the best traditions of this country. And in a time when many fear that civil liberties in our country are sometime threatened, no longer from without but from within, it is a valuable message not only to our own people but, indeed, to law enforcement that we honor people not only who enforce the law but who live within it.

As Richard Cohen of the Washington Post observed in 1990:

You affect the future, by what you do with the past and how you interpret it. All over the world, when regimes change, so do names. Danzig becomes Gdansk. Images of Lenin come down all over Eastern Europe, and in the Soviet Union, Stalingrad becomes

Volgograd. These are all political statements. They say, "there's a new way of doing things."

Mr. President, exactly, there is a new way of doing things.

The Senator from Georgia offers the name of Ronald Reagan because Ronald Reagan makes us proud. He was the right way of doing things in our country, whether you agree with the naming of the airport or you do not. Mr. Hoover is an indication of the wrong way of doing things in America. I support the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada. I am proud to offer it with him. I yield the floor.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there may be some who feel that Ronald Reagan was not the greatest President. I have already laid across this RECORD how I feel about Ronald Reagan. But everyone would say that Ronald Reagan's heart was in the right place. He was a true American patriot who did what he thought was best for this country.

The direct opposite is applicable to J. Edgar Hoover. He didn't do things that were good for this country. His heart was not in the right place. He was a vicious, mean-spirited man, and his name should be taken from the building that houses the Federal Bureau of Investigation the very same moment we rename National Airport for President Ronald Reagan.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 6 p.m.

Thereupon, at 5:02 p.m., the Senate recessed until 5:58:32 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COVERDELL).

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from the State of Georgia, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 6:15.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:58 p.m., recessed until 6:18 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. BROWNBACK].

RONALD REAGAN WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering S. 1575.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. We are returning to the Ronald Reagan legislation, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COVERDELL. It is my understanding that the Senator from Connecticut is here to speak on his amendment. I wonder if I might get the Senator's attention for a moment. About how long does the Senator need?

Mr. DODD. I will be taking maybe all of 5 to 10 minutes.

Mr. COVERDELL. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, shortly, I will offer an amendment. I am making some drafting corrections to it. When that is completed, I will submit it to the desk for consideration. Allow me to, first of all, ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment.

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

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in a moment I will send that amendment to the desk. First of all, on the underlying question here, in terms of the naming of the National Airport in honor of President Ronald Reagan, I support that, Mr. President. I realize others apparently do not, and I certainly respect people's right to make that decision. For those who have been around here long enough, I guess going back to the days when President Reagan served as President, there were not many issues on which we agreed. I fought rather vociferously on issues involving Latin America, domestic policy, and questions on a wide range of issues. But I happen to believe that the people who have served this country as President, elected twice, deserve recognition. Whether you agree with him or not, the people elected him twice to the highest office in our land, a position achieved only by some 41 or 42 people in the history of this country. So if this is what has been chosen by those who believe it is a proper way to recognize the contribution of Ronald Reagan, I respect that.

It has been suggested that we haven't named anything for Harry Truman or Jimmy Carter, and I think that is a legitimate point. Certainly, those who want to do that—and I join them in that—ought to find an appropriate way to recognize their contributions. It seems to me that that ought not to detract from the effort here to name something in honor of Ronald Reagan.

So if this is what the President's family and others believe, as I said a moment ago, is an appropriate and proper way to recognize him, then this Senator—this Democrat, if you will, which comes secondary to my role in the Senate, and as a citizen—I am going to support that decision. I noted earlier that it took many years before we were able to recognize Franklin Delano Roosevelt with a monument. He was one of the greatest Presidents in this century, having led us during the Great Depression and a world war. I was saddened that day when the ceremonies opened up that wonderful memorial, and it occurred to me that there weren't many people on the other side of the aisle there.

We ought to take politics out of these decision whenever possible. I call

for the establishment of a commission so that, henceforth—not on this issue, but henceforth when we decide to name or rename facilities, there ought to be a deliberative way in which we proceed. Too often these issues are raised when a particular monument is up for consideration, and based on whether people agree or disagree with that choice, there are suggestions about sending this off to a commission or some group for consideration. I understand that, but too often once that issue is put aside and ended, we go back to business as usual and never come back to how we consider these issues.

So the amendment that I am offering establishes a commission. It does not condition this naming on the commission being established, but rather it is prospective. So that in the future when such namings or renamings will occur, there is a process by which we can do it.

I offer a second part of this amendment, which is a Sense-of-the-Senate resolution that has to do with the naming of facilities here on the Capitol grounds. Rather than trying to write statutory law here, I just made it a Sense-of-the-Senate resolution that would establish a commission made up of former Members of Congress from both parties. So that on the Capitol grounds when we are naming rooms or facilities within the Capitol here, there would also be a deliberate process by which we go, and that is really a sense of the Senate. The idea is that it would give our former colleagues a role to play when the issue arose as to whether or not we ought to name buildings, facilities, porticoes, or balconies that have been named in the past. I think as temporary custodians of these wonderful grounds of the Capitol, we ought to be deliberate and cautious in how we go about naming these facilities, so that long after we are gone, there is an appropriate designation that the test of time would wear well.

I point out to my colleagues that, in the last 24 hours or so, we have heard of the people who have just been named to the National Basketball Association Hall of Fame. What is the relationship? I note that there is a requirement that there be a period of 5 years since the person has left professional basketball before they can even be considered. I note that Larry Bird, someone I admired immensely, as most Americans did for his great skill on the basketball court, I suppose you might have made the case when he retired in 1992 that he should have been named immediately. Yet, the rules are that you have to wait 5 years and then a board thinks about it, analyzes it, and makes its judgment.

All I am suggesting here is as temporary custodians, for these wonderful Capitol grounds, that we ought to establish a similar kind of a process before we go off and name buildings and rooms and facilities and other parts of these grounds for people who may be very well deserving of such a designa-

tion, but the test of time and a little deliberation would serve us all well and serve future generations well accordingly.

So there are two parts of this amendment. First is that we would establish, by law, a commission that would consider naming, in future days, Federal facilities around the country. And the second part is a sense of the Senate to deal with the Capitol grounds and buildings.

Mr. President, as I say, this is prospective. It doesn't affect the decision of naming the National Airport for Ronald Reagan. I support that. I said to my colleagues that, despite whatever differences—and they were significant—I had with this American President, I believe that naming such an airport for him is not inappropriate. In fact, having served this Nation for 8 years as President, chosen by the American public, a designation such as this in his honor is appropriate, and I support that.

With that, I will be happy to yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, if the Senator seeks a rollcall vote, which would occur tomorrow, it would be appropriate to ask for the yeas and nays.

AMENDMENT NO. 1641

(Purpose: To provide an orderly process for the renaming of existing Federal facilities)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] proposes an amendment numbered 1641.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. FEDERAL FACILITIES REDESIGNATION ADVISORY GROUP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established a Federal Facilities Redesignation Advisory Group comprised of—

(1) 2 members of the House of Representatives designated by the Speaker of the House;

(2) 2 members of the House of Representatives designated by the Minority Leader of the House;

(3) 2 members of the Senate designated by the Majority Leader of the Senate;

(4) 2 members of the Senate designated by the Minority Leader of the Senate; and

(5) the Administrator of General Services.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Advisory Group is to consider and make a recommendation concerning any proposal to change the name of a Federal facility to commemorate or honor any individual, group of individuals, or event.

(c) CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In considering a proposal to rename an existing Federal facility, the Advisory Group shall consider—

(A) the appropriateness of the proposed name for the facility, taking into account any history of association of the individual for whom the facility is proposed to be named with the facility or its location;

(B) the activities to be carried out at, and function of, the facility;

(C) the views of the community in which the facility is located (including any public comment, testimony, or evidence received under subsection (d));

(D) the appropriateness of the facility's existing name, taking into account its history, function, and location; and

(E) the costs associated with renaming the facility and the sources of funds to defray the costs.

(2) AGE AND CURRENT OCCUPATION.—The Advisory Group may not recommend a proposed change in the name of a Federal facility for a living individual unless that individual—

(A) is at least 70 years of age; and

(B) has not been an officer or employee of the United States, or a Member of the Congress, for a period of at least 5 years before the date of the proposed change.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) MEETINGS.—The Advisory Group shall meet publicly from time to time, but not less frequently than annually, in Washington, D.C.

(2) HEARINGS, ETC.—In carrying out its purpose the Advisory Group—

(A) shall publish notice of any meeting, including a meeting held pursuant to subsection (f), at which it is to consider a proposed change of name for a Federal facility in the Federal Register and in a newspaper of general circulation in the community in which the facility is located, and include in that notice an invitation for public comment;

(B) not earlier than 30 days after the date on which the applicable meeting notice was issued under subparagraph (A), shall hold such hearings, and receive such testimony and evidence, as may be appropriate; and

(C) may not make a recommendation concerning a proposed change of name under this section until at least 60 days after the date of the meeting at which the proposal was considered.

(3) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT.—The Administrator of General Services shall provide such meeting facilities, staff support, and other administrative support as may be required for meetings of the Advisory Group.

(e) REPORTS.—The Advisory Group shall report to the Congress from time to time its recommendations with respect to proposals to rename existing Federal facilities.

(f) PROPOSAL TO RENAME DCA.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), the Advisory Group shall not have the authority to consider any proposal to rename Washington National Airport, or a portion of the airport, in honor of former President Ronald Reagan.

SEC. 2. REPORT REQUIRED BEFORE EITHER HOUSE PROCEEDS TO THE CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION TO RE-NAME FEDERAL FACILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order, in the Senate or in the House of Representatives, to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, or amendment to rename an existing Federal facility unless the Advisory Group has reported its recommendation in writing under section 1(e) concerning the proposal and the report has been available to the members of that House for 24 hours.

(b) RULES OF EACH HOUSE.—This section is enacted by the Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and as such subsection (a) is deemed to be a part of the rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives; and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate and the House of Representatives to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of the Senate or

House of Representatives, respectively) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the Senate or House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) ADVISORY GROUP.—The term "Advisory Group" means the Federal Facilities Redesignation Advisory Group established by section 1.

(2) FEDERAL FACILITY.—The term "Federal facility" means any building, road, bridge, complex, base, or other structure owned by the United States or located on land owned by the United States.

TITLE III—SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING COMMISSION TO NAME FEATURES OF CAPITOL BUILDING AND GROUNDS

SEC. 301. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING COMMISSION TO NAME FEATURES OF CAPITOL BUILDING AND GROUNDS.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should establish, in accordance with the rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives, a commission consisting of former members of Congress, appointed by the Speaker of the House, the Minority Leader of the House, the Majority Leader of the Senate, and the Minority Leader of the Senate, to recommend the naming or renaming of—

(1) architectural features of the Capitol (including any House or Senate office building); and

(2) landscape features of the Capitol Grounds.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, may I inquire of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, chairman of the committee, may it not be possible—and I see my colleague, the distinguished Democratic leader arriving. He has an amendment that is very similar. In fact, it is drawn in similar language, but it has a different application. I inquire as to whether or not the ordering of the amendments might be such that his amendment be considered—

Mr. DASCHLE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I think the Senator may be referring to an amendment that I understand the Senator from Virginia may be offering. I will be offering another amendment. But I think the suggestion made by the Senator from Connecticut is a good one and perhaps we could make that arrangement later on in the unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. DODD. I hope that might be the case. It would be a proper ordering of these.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: Could the distinguished floor manager, the distinguished Senator from Georgia, or the distinguished Democratic leader, advise the Senate, is tonight to embrace all of the debate that is going to be on the central bill as well as the amendments and, therefore, Senators desiring to speak should do so this evening?

Mr. COVERDELL. By close of business this evening.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, at some point I hope to be recognized for a period not to exceed 4 or 5 minutes.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, under the unanimous consent I believe we have established the order of the amendments. The first was an amendment to be offered by Senator DASCHLE or his designee regarding the commission. So the Senator's desire that that be considered first is accomplished.

The next amendment is the one offered by the Senator from Connecticut to be followed by another amendment to be offered by Senator DASCHLE or his designee regarding Dulles Airport. There is then an amendment to be offered by myself, which I would at the moment not likely offer, to be followed by the amendment which has already been offered by Senator REID dealing with the FBI building. There is a provision for a relevant amendment to be offered by the majority leader which may or may not be offered, and a similar amendment—I think that is what we have here—to be offered by the minority leader. So I believe the order has been established, and it accomplishes what the Senator from Connecticut would have preferred.

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleague for that.

Mr. President, if I may inquire further, I was just told—I apologize to my colleague from Virginia, Senator ROBB—it is my understanding that the distinguished Democratic leader would be offering the commission amendment. All I was suggesting is if it is appropriate at the proper time that an unanimous consent request would provide an order for these amendments so there would be a proper flow here in a way that we would consider the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, I suspect, prior to mine, and then mine. If that would be the order, again, I am here on the floor because I have another engagement and was asked to come over and properly deal with the amendment which I want to offer. There was no attempt to try to get ahead of anybody in line. Maybe a sequencing of these amendments would serve everybody's interest. I would have no objection to that, if the amendment of the Senator from Virginia can be considered prior. We can deal with this at a later point.

Mr. COVERDELL. If I might ask a question of the minority leader, is the amendment of the Senator from Virginia fulfilling this first amendment request, he or his designee, on the commission amendment?

Mr. DASCHLE. I will respond, if the Senator will yield, by acknowledging the leadership of the Senator from Virginia. It is my understanding that he will be prepared to offer the amendment relating to a commission and that we would want to precede to the other commission amendment offered by Senator DODD.

I will simply inform colleagues that the amendment relating to the renaming of Dulles International Airport will likely not be offered.

So, as the Senator from Georgia has suggested, it may be appropriate just to ensure that everyone has a clear understanding, that the amendment relating to a commission offered by Senator ROBB, be first; the amendment by Senator DODD, second; the amendment, should he choose to offer it, by Senator COVERDELL, third; the amendment by Senator REID, fourth; the amendment by Senator LOTT, fifth; and the amendment by myself relevant, or my designee, sixth.

Perhaps there would be an appropriate time to propound the unanimous consent, and I will do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the sequence of the amendments?

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, which I will not, the minority leader has followed the path of the unanimous consent previously ordered. I can think of no reason for anybody on our side, even though I can't counsel with the majority leader, to object. Therefore, there is no objection.

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

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the indulgence of the senior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, as I noted, the amendment relating to the renaming of Dulles International Airport will not be offered, and Senator ROBB will be offering the amendment relating to a commission.

I would like to use my authority under the unanimous consent agreement relating to the relevant amendment to send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

AMENDMENT NO. 1642

(Purpose: To require approval by the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority of the renaming of Washington National Airport as the Ronald Reagan National Airport)

Mr. DASCHLE. I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) proposes an amendment numbered 1642.

On page 3, after line 5, insert the following:
SEC. 3. MWAA APPROVAL REQUIRED.

This Act shall not take effect until the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority approves the redesignation of the airport provided for by section 1 of this Act.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, that is the entire text of the amendment.

I have spoken on this issue on several occasions, so I don't need to restate many of the thoughts that were already expressed. Obviously, this is an issue that will unfortunately divide us in some respects. But I don't think the question of honoring President Reagan should divide us at all.

There is no doubt that we, on a bipartisan basis, should seek ways in which to honor former leaders and former Presidents. Frankly, I am not all that troubled about whether they are still living and very much a part of our country and society in roles of leadership, as is the case with President Reagan. I do think there have been a number of questions legitimately raised about whether this is the most appropriate way with which to honor our former President, and the appropriateness of renaming Washington National Airport has been the subject of a good deal of discussion over the last several days.

Senator ROBB and others have pointed out that Washington National Airport was transferred to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority in 1986 under a 50-year lease. The Airports Authority and other local authorities under that lease have been given all jurisdiction relating to matters pertaining to the airport. Some have noted that imposing this change in name will require countless businesses to make, in some cases, substantial investments and commitments financially that they have already noted could be very prohibitive.

Some asked as well whether it is appropriate, given the fact that the International Trade Center in Washington will be named after our former President, Ronald Reagan in May. This is the single most expensive Federal building ever erected and is second only to the Pentagon in size. The naming of this building will provide us with a sufficient opportunity to call attention to Ronald Reagan's commitments and contributions to this country.

That isn't the only matter that will be raised with regard to renaming or naming of facilities. A new *Nimitz*-class aircraft carrier will be named after the former President as soon as it is completed.

So we have the International Trade Center to be named in May and the *Nimitz*-class aircraft carrier in the near future. We have clearly demonstrated that we are prepared to honor this former President on a bipartisan basis.

Many people have questioned whether or not the Greater Washington Board of Trade's views about renaming Washington National Airport ought to be considered. In a letter to Congressman SHUSTER, the Washington Board of Trade noted that this change "would be very confusing to air travelers, visitors, and local residents alike."

The imposition of the Federal Government on local jurisdiction has also been raised. Perhaps no one spoke more

forcefully and passionately about the importance of local control, about the importance of local decisionmaking, about the importance of giving more power to the local level, than President Reagan. Yet, we find the chairman of the Arlington County Board in opposition to this name change. Christopher Zimmerman, the chairman of the Arlington County Board, noted, "Memorializing President Reagan by imposing a name change, against the wishes of the local business community, Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, and local jurisdictions which it serves, would certainly go against the spirit and intent of the President's actions while in office."

The chairman of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, also questions whether Congress could impose the change legally without the authority's consent, given the contractual arrangements under which we are now operating. Alexandria Mayor Kerry Donley is concerned that the name change could affect nearby businesses and suggested that Congress "leave well enough alone."

The city council of Alexandria also urges Congress to "retain the present name of Washington National Airport, which honors the 'Father of our Nation' and our first President, George Washington."

Linwood Holton, who served as the chairman of the Airports Authority when the Federal Government leased Washington National Airport in 1986, also opposes renaming it. He argues that the purpose of the lease was to achieve "local control, management, operation and development of the airport," and that this bill is not "consistent with either the literal terms or the purpose of that lease agreement" and "would be detrimental to the airport and its users and affect the traveling public in ways currently not intended by the drafters of this legislation."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Mr. Holton's letter sent by Mr. Holton to Congressman MORAN which describes the concern in greater detail be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, as I noted, President Reagan made it very clear that were he to waive the magic wand, the more the Federal Government could turn local decisionmaking over to local decisionmakers, the happier he would be. Here we have virtually every single local decisionmaker elected and appointed who oppose the very renaming that is incorporated into this legislation.

How ironic that in the name of President Reagan we do the very thing that he opposed the most—forcing Federal will on local officials.

I don't think that Congress should pass legislation that removes Washington's name from National Airport and

replaces it with the name of another President, or anybody else, over the objection of local officials. I personally oppose it. But that shouldn't be the issue. In the name of the spirit of Ronald Reagan, the issue should be, what do the local authorities think? What would they do? And if we are prepared to say tomorrow that we don't care what they think, it doesn't matter how opposed they are, we are going to do it anyway, Mr. President, how ironic.

How ironic, indeed. The airports authority has only had this very unique opportunity to govern themselves for 11 years. We turned over that airport to them for 50 years.

Another irony is that Ronald Reagan signed that legislation. So it, indeed, represented the spirit of the Reagan philosophy when we enacted it. All the local entities, in keeping with his spirit, said, "We'll take this responsibility. This is what is probably as indicative of what you are trying to do as anything. You are turning over the responsibility to us. Give it to us." Now they have it. They have had it for 11 years. Now the irony is we are saying, "Well, we take it back." And all the more ironic, we are going to take it back in the name of President Ronald Reagan.

So, Mr. President, the amendment I am offering simply says, look, if we are going to honor the spirit of former President Ronald Reagan, let's, at the very least, do what he said was what his Presidency was all about. Let us ensure that local governmental decisionmakers have the opportunity to have a voice in keeping with the spirit of Ronald Reagan. So the amendment I am offering is very simple. It states this act shall not take effect until the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority approves the redesignation of the airport.

As everyone knows, the airports authority is a bipartisan panel, Republicans, Independents and Democrats. Let's do what President Reagan said we should do in honoring his name, in honoring the spirit of his Presidency. Let us not say we did not mean it in 1987. Let us not say, over your objections, we are going to do it anyway. Let's honor the spirit of this President by doing the right thing. Let's give them the opportunity to have a voice. This amendment does that. We will have the opportunity to vote tomorrow. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

LINWOOD HOLTON,

McLean, Virginia, January 29, 1998.

Hon. JAMES MORAN,

DEAR JIM: I am writing to you in regards to the pending legislation to change the name of the Washington National Airport to "Ronald Reagan National Airport." I had the honor of working closely with the Congress and Secretary of Transportation Elizabeth Dole in advancing the Metropolitan Washington Airport Act of 1986 to transfer Wash-

ington National Airport out of the Federal Government to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority. This legislation of course was signed into law by President Reagan. The Airports Authority was created by the Commonwealth of Virginia and the District of Columbia. The Federal Government leased Washington National Airport and Washington Dulles International Airport to the Authority for fifty years beginning on June 1987. I was privileged to serve as Chairman of the Authority at that time and I signed that lease on behalf of the Authority.

The purpose of the transfer, as recited in the lease itself, was to achieve "local control, management, operation and development" of the airports. I am very concerned that after ten years of this lease arrangement, the Congress now proposes to take unilateral action to change the name of the airport. This is not at all consistent with either the literal terms or the purpose of that lease agreement. Further, the change to the name as proposed, while honoring a president for whom I have the greatest respect, would be detrimental to the airport and its users and affect the traveling public in ways certainly not intended by the drafters of this legislation.

The lease grants the Authority complete control, power, and dominion over the airports. The intent of Congress, Virginia and the District of Columbia in this arrangement is clear. Even though the Federal Government continues to own the underlying land, the airport is to be treated as any other airport, not as a federal facility. In the past, there have been changes made to the lease at the request of Congress and the changes have been brought about by a mutually agreed upon agreement to the lease to secure the consent of the Airports Authority. The proposed name change legislation does not acknowledge the need to obtain the consent of the Authority and this is inconsistent with the intended relationship between the Federal Government and the Authority.

As for the consequences, the removal of "Washington" from the airport name removed the location and market identifier that is obviously very important to travelers and shippers at points distant from the Washington area. It is worth noting that well over half of those who travel through National are not residents of the Washington region. The word "Washington" provides immediate market and location information. Without it, there will be confusion that does not exist today about where the airport is and what market it serves. The cost of such loss of identity and confusion may not be readily qualified, but I believe that it would be substantial. There also are other costs such as the costs to local businesses who have associated their identities with Washington National Airport.

In conclusion, the legislation which transferred Washington National Airport to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority granted to the Authority the control and oversight of the airport. Unilateral action by the Congress to take the drastic action of changing the name of the airport is inconsistent with both the spirit and the intent of the transfer.

Very truly yours,

LINWOOD HOLTON.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, this amendment would be among those that the sponsors of S. 1575 would oppose. I want to first acknowledge that the Senator from Connecticut in offering his amendment, which is prospective, offered his support of the effort of the sponsors to redesignate Washington National as Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport, and that he would vote for this redesignation even though he had differences. The differences

were so pronounced I can remember them, and I was a long way from the Senate at that time.

I really believe the nature of the amendment that has just been described by the minority leader is basically a disagreement of redesignation and not so much one of the philosophical issue over local control. Of course, it isn't the Alexandria airport. It is the National Airport. Cities are constitutional instruments of States. The Governor of the State of Virginia has endorsed the redesignation of the airport which is an appropriate governing local facility.

But, again, we could argue this forever. The level of Federal Government control of operations at Washington National is without parallel in the United States. The legislation that authorized limited local authority over Washington National contains congressional directives—appropriate landing fees, employee bargaining rights. The precise composition of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority and political affiliations of its members is mandated by Congress, not constructed by State or local government.

By statute, the Federal Government limits the length of nonstop flights to and from National Airport—National Airport, not Alexandria—to 1,250 miles. That is the Metropolitan Washington Airports Act of 1986, section 6012. There is only one other federally imposed perimeter rule in the country, in the entire United States—Love Field, TX.

In addition, the Federal Government controls the number of slots, take off and landing rights at four "high density rule" airports: Washington National, New York LaGuardia, JFK, and Chicago O'Hare. Air carriers are limited to 37 hourly operations at Washington National; 11 hourly operations are reserved for commuter aircraft, and 12 for general aviation and business activity, all Federal mandates.

When the Federal Government authorized the lease of Washington National and its limited governance by the Washington Metropolitan Airports Authority in 1986, it codified all of the regulations of the Metropolitan Washington Airports into Federal regulations. These Federal regulations govern airport operations such as taxicab operation, nighttime noise, and landing fees. And the Federal Government has the prerogative and authority legally and emotionally to designate the name of the National Airport.

I could cite the specific authority, but in deference to time, and I know the Senator from Virginia has strong opinions and wants to be heard, I will not linger on this question. I do want to say that any amendment that creates a retroactive impoundment on Congress' ability to designate will be opposed by the sponsors.

We are pleased that there is bipartisan support for this designation. I want

to say, and I have mentioned it several times during the discussion, obviously there are disagreements on the contribution, but, as Senator DODD said, there is no disagreement about the admiration the American people have for former President Ronald Reagan. To be quite candid about it, talking about the ironies, I am not sure that the naming of the most expensive building in Washington's history is exactly in concert with President Reagan.

In conclusion, let me say that this President is wounded. He was a great American servant. He is in the sunset of his life. He is probably engaged in the most courageous battle he ever was tested for. I think sometimes extraordinary conditions and circumstances call for a spontaneous response. I am most hopeful that this legislation will be successful, and it will be successful in order to meet his 87th birthday, which is this Friday.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBB addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from the great State of Virginia.

Mr. ROBB. I thank the Chair. I thank you for the characterization of Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 1643

(Purpose: To provide an orderly process for the renaming of existing Federal facilities)

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, in accordance with the unanimous consent agreement, I would like to send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB) proposes an amendment numbered 1643.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. FEDERAL FACILITIES REDESIGNATION ADVISORY GROUP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established a Federal Facilities Redesignation Advisory Group comprised of—

(1) 2 members of the House of Representatives designated by the Speaker of the House;

(2) 2 members of the House of Representatives designated by the Minority Leader of the House;

(3) 2 members of the Senate designated by the Majority Leader of the Senate;

(4) 2 members of the Senate designated by the Minority Leader of the Senate; and

(5) the Administrator of General Services.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Advisory Group is to consider and make a recommendation concerning any proposal to change the name of a Federal facility to commemorate or honor any individual, group of individuals, or event.

(c) CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In considering a proposal to rename an existing Federal facility, the Advisory Group shall consider—

(A) the appropriateness of the proposed name for the facility, taking into account any history of association of the individual for whom the facility is proposed to be named with the facility or its location;

(B) the activities to be carried out at, and function of, the facility;

(C) the views of the community in which the facility is located (including any public comment, testimony, or evidence received under subsection (d));

(D) the appropriateness of the facility's existing name, taking into account its history, function, and location; and

(E) the costs associated with renaming the facility and the sources of funds to defray the costs.

(2) AGE AND CURRENT OCCUPATION.—The Advisory Group may not recommend a proposed change in the name of a Federal facility for a living individual unless that individual—

(A) is at least 70 years of age; and

(B) has not been an officer or employee of the United States, or a Member of the Congress, for a period of at least 5 years before the date of the proposed change.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) MEETINGS.—The Advisory Group shall meet publicly from time to time, but not less frequently than annually, in Washington, D.C.

(2) HEARINGS, ETC.—In carrying out its purpose the Advisory Group—

(A) shall publish notice of any meeting, including a meeting held pursuant to subsection (f), at which it is to consider a proposed change of name for a Federal facility in the Federal Register and in a newspaper of general circulation in the community in which the facility is located, and include in that notice an invitation for public comment;

(B) not earlier than 30 days after the date on which the applicable meeting notice was issued under subparagraph (A), shall hold such hearings, and receive such testimony and evidence, as may be appropriate; and

(C) may not make a recommendation concerning a proposed change of name under this section until at least 60 days after the date of the meeting at which the proposal was considered.

(3) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT.—The Administrator of General Services shall provide such meeting facilities, staff support, and other administrative support as may be required for meetings of the Advisory Group.

(e) REPORTS.—The Advisory Group shall report to the Congress from time to time its recommendations with respect to proposals to rename existing Federal facilities.

(f) PROPOSAL TO RENAME DCA.—The Advisory Group shall meet within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act to consider proposals to rename Washington National Airport, or a portion thereof, in honor of former President Ronald Reagan.

SEC. 2. REPORT REQUIRED BEFORE EITHER HOUSE PROCEEDS TO THE CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION TO RE-NAME FEDERAL FACILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order, in the Senate or in the House of Representatives, to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, or amendment to rename an existing Federal facility unless the Advisory Group has reported its recommendation in writing under section 1(e) concerning the proposal and the report has been available to the members of that House for 24 hours.

(b) RULES OF EACH HOUSE.—This section is enacted by the Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and as such subsection (a) is deemed to be a part of the rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives; and it supercedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate and the House of Representatives to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of the Senate or

House of Representatives, respectively) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the Senate or House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) ADVISORY GROUP.—The term "Advisory Group" means the Federal Facilities Redesignation Advisory Group established by section 1.

(2) FEDERAL FACILITY.—The Term "Federal facility" means any building, road, bridge, complex, base, or other structure owned by the United States or located on land owned by the United States.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I was going to go ahead and allow the amendment to be read because it is not terribly long, and I think it is fairly straightforward.

I am also conscious of the fact that there are sufficient votes to pass the Coverdell bill as it was introduced. I would point out, however, that the bill was not referred to a committee. It was not subject to a hearing and does not have the benefit of any of the local input that would have been so desirable under the circumstances.

Because local views on this proposal were not considered, I made a speech in this Chamber yesterday reflecting my own views and, I believe, the views of many Virginians. My comments were similar to the views that were just expressed by the minority leader, who spoke more eloquently but came to the same conclusion.

I mentioned yesterday that I have long personally admired President Reagan's personal courage, his strong convictions, his infectious spirit, and his leadership in the national and international community. But I thought this particular legislation, because it was contrary to the wishes of all of the local governments that President Reagan worked so hard to empower, was simply not the right way to proceed.

I also suggested that renaming some other international airport, perhaps in his native State of Illinois or his adopted State of California, would be more appropriate. I talked about the fact that the most substantial Federal building ever built in Washington is going to be dedicated in his name on May 5. And I talked about the fact that the next super carrier will bear his name, and that given his role as Commander in Chief and the respect that he generated, not only throughout the United States but around the world, I wholeheartedly endorsed this designation.

The difficulty I have with the legislation before us is that it directly contravenes the legacy of the man we hope to honor. We have clear expressions of the views of the local governments. Both of the local governments, the City of Alexandria, and the County of Arlington, have expressed their concern and opposition.

In addition, my predecessor, the first Republican Governor of Virginia in this century, and a former chair of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, was very explicit in his description of the intent of the 50-year

lease of the National Airport and Dulles airport, and the autonomy it provided for the Airport Authority.

I do not quarrel with the characterization of the distinguished Senator from Georgia as to some of the Federal strings that remain attached to that particular legislation. We seldom really ever turn loose anything in its entirety in this body, and I understand that.

But the bottom line is, in my judgment, this legislation disregards the views of local officials and business leaders, and thrusts the central government upon a local authority that was divorced from the federal government by President Reagan himself.

The amendment I have sent to the desk simply creates an advisory group which would take into consideration the views of the local community, and the history of a particular facility, before any renaming occurs.

There may be other approaches to this particular challenge, and in listening to the distinguished minority leader, I believe his approach would be entirely appropriate.

The problem here is that we are taking up and considering legislation that has not been considered by any committee of the Senate, that has not had any hearing. Indeed, when we have been able to ascertain the views of those who would normally be considered most interested, they have expressed reservations in various degrees. I think it would be appropriate under the circumstances, since the legislation before us today purports to honor the 40th President, if the views of either the President or Mrs. Reagan, who speaks so eloquently for him, were known on this matter. I think that would be helpful to many Members in considering this issue.

It may be entirely appropriate, after appropriate consultation, to go ahead and rename Washington National Airport.

In any event, the haste with which we move is designed, I believe, to reflect the coming birthday of President Reagan. And I would simply suggest that some consultation with the family—and specifically the President, or speaking for the President, Mrs. Reagan—might very much be in order.

A very nice ceremony, I am informed, has been planned for the dedication of the Ronald Reagan Building on May 5. The former First Lady is planning to participate, and I think all the Members of Congress will certainly be there, if not in body, then in spirit.

So I ask my colleagues to think about what we are doing, and think about whether or not this properly honors the man it is designed to honor.

The amendment I have sent to the desk will be taken up tomorrow. Again, it would create an advisory group that would deliberate on some of the issues I have raised, and report back to Congress in a timely fashion. It would not preclude any action by the Senate or the House. It would simply provide

input from some of the local governments and communities that President Reagan so strongly defended during his long and illustrious tour as President of the United States.

Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays on the amendment I have sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, unless the Senator from Georgia wishes to take the floor at this point, 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, once again this argument, which I just simply do not understand, suggesting that the President's family somehow has to come here and seek homage, or lobby the Congress—it is an incredible argument. That family would never do that. Anybody waiting for some communique or something of that nature—I would not hold my breath.

As I said a moment ago, this is something the Nation has to feel it needs to do. It is a "thank you" that they need to express; our country, our citizens. There is no way that family would come here lobbying for this kind of thing. I am always surprised when it is suggested that we have not heard or something. That is disappointing.

Mr. President, again I want to make it clear, the sponsors are going to oppose any of these amendments that change the rules retroactively, that impose some new constraint on this redesignation or some new constraint on the Congress. The concept of putting something in place prospectively may be laudable. There are several amendments here by Members on the other side who have declared they are going to vote for the redesignation but they have another issue that they are bringing forward. I think that is appropriate. But the amendments that reach backwards are not acceptable on our side.

The argument that a local city or authority has jurisdiction here is, in my judgment, a specious argument. The Federal Government's relationship with Washington National Airport is indisputable. You cannot go to that airport without seeing the presence of it any day or any night. And the law is very clear, in terms of the Federal role in that facility. I will read the short version rather than the elongated:

The Federal Government has a continuing but limited interest in the operation of the two federally owned airports which serve the travel and cargo needs of the entire metropolitan Washington region as well as the District of Columbia as the national seat of Government.

As I said, municipalities are creatures of State governments and chartered by State governments and the Governor of the State of jurisdiction is in support of the redesignation.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The nomination received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT OF DEFERRALS OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 89

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, to the Committee on the Budget, to the Committee on Finance, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report eight new deferrals of budgetary resources, totaling \$4.8 billion.

These deferrals affect programs of the Department of State, the Social Security Administration, and International Security Assistance.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 3, 1998.

REPORT CONCERNING FISHERIES OFF THE COASTS OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 90

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 16 U.S.C. 1823, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), I transmit herewith an Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Latvia extending the Agreement on April 8, 1993, Concerning Fisheries Off the Coasts of the United States, with annex, as extended (the 1993 Agreement). The