

years. Irving Berlin did not die until he was 101 years old, but he was investigated by J. Edgar Hoover for most of his life.

He conducted surveillance on Albert Einstein, Wernher Von Braun, Vice President Hubert Humphrey, Marilyn Monroe, Clark Gable, Rock Hudson, Elvis Presley, Senator John Tower, Cesar Chavez.

Mr. President, in Chavez's case, the FBI seemed omnipresent, tuning in to the Reverend Jesse Jackson's radio broadcasts dealing with Cesar Chavez when Jesse Jackson was simply appealing for support for the farm workers. Chavez created so much concern by J. Edgar Hoover that they had many FBI agents keeping tabs on a Valentine's Day dance at Grand Rapids Junior College in Michigan where there was literature being distributed about a grape boycott. He even had investigators following people who were on a 12-man march dealing with the grape boycott.

We simply do not honor the historical record of this country by maintaining this man's name on Bureau headquarters.

Mr. President, in a biography that I talked about yesterday, written by Curt Gentry, which he spent 10 years writing, Gentry says that Hoover used his FBI files to advance the careers of numerous politicians he liked, including President Nixon, and against those he did not like, including the Kennedys, Estes Kefauver and Adlai Stevenson.

Gentry further said that extensive records were maintained on the suspected amorous adventures of President Kennedy. And Hoover ordered the bugging of the entire Justice Department during Bobby Kennedy's tenure as Attorney General. Gentry isn't saying that he maintained wiretaps of various places in the Justice Department, but everything was wiretapped in the Justice Department.

So the list is endless of people who this man thought was suspicious. There is no question in my mind that he is the greatest violator of human rights during this century in this country. That says a lot. I hope that my colleagues will remove from that building something that is and should be an embarrassment to all people who believe in human rights.

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. GRAMS. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. GRAMS. Mr. President, I want to rise today to introduce the Survivors of Torture Support Act and to ask my colleagues for their support, and I send the bill to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and referred to the appropriate committee.

(The remarks of Mr. GRAMS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1603 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. GRAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RONALD REAGAN WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 1575, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1575) to rename the Washington National Airport located in the District of Columbia and Virginia as the "Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport."

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Reid Amendment No. 1640, to redesignate the J. Edgar Hoover FBI Building in Washington, District of Columbia, as the "Federal Bureau of Investigation Building".

Dodd Amendment No. 1641, to establish a Federal Facilities Redesignation Advisory Group to consider and make recommendations for the renaming of existing Federal facilities.

Daschle Amendment No. 1642, to require the approval by the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority of the renaming of Washington National Airport as the Ronald Reagan National Airport.

Robb Amendment No. 1643, to provide an orderly process for the renaming of existing Federal facilities.

AMENDMENT NO. 1643

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 4 minutes equally divided in the usual form on amendment No. 1643 offered by the Senator from Virginia, (Mr. ROBB).

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia, (Mr. COVERDELL), is recognized.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment. My remarks were made last night. In essence, the amendment by my distinguished colleague from Virginia vitiates or makes moot the entire effort of the bill. His amendment has the effect of nullifying what we have been endeavoring to do throughout the week.

I might take another second to say that several of these amendments that have been offered—and I see the Senator from Nevada here—have considerable merit and substance. The problem is that we have used the week in a very inefficient way. I have been up very late last evening and early this morning endeavoring to resolve this matter and deal with some of these amend-

ments that don't nullify the legislation, but there is not time now to deal with this effectively with the House and meet the attempt to have this occur on the President's birthday. So the week has cost us the ability to resolve some of the other issues. In any event, I would have been opposed to the amendment offered by the good Senator from Virginia.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBB addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia, Mr. ROBB, is recognized.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I suggest that the lack of time is part of the problem that we are dealing with here, as just alluded to by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. This is not the right way to do what we propose to do, even if that is our objective.

This amendment, crafted by the minority leader's office, would simply provide a procedure whereby there would be input from the local jurisdictions. The problem right now is that this bill was introduced, held at the desk, and there were no committee hearings, no committee votes, no public hearings on the matter. We have heard from countless people who have a local interest. Those jurisdictions—Alexandria, Arlington, Washington Metropolitan Airports Authority, Greater Washington Board of Trade—are against it. Normally, even in judgments we give the local Senators input on whether the judge who would be sitting in their particular jurisdiction ought to go forward without some additional debate. You do not have the support of either of the local Senators or the local Members of Congress on this. I normally don't suggest this is scientific or pay that much attention to sheer numbers, but the calls are overwhelmingly against proceeding with this. This sets up a procedure so that we can consider it in an appropriate manner.

With that, I think my two minutes are about up. I ask for the support of this amendment. Senator DASCHLE has an amendment that is even more precise and specific, if we want to deal with this issue in a very short period of time. But the problem is the lack of time to thoughtfully consider the implications for the renaming, as well as for all of the local jurisdictions concerned.

With that, I yield whatever time I have remaining.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has approximately 35 seconds.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I just say that I think there has been sufficient time to consider a very uncomplicated issue here, renaming the airport Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

As I said to the Senator last evening, the Governor of his State does support this. This is not the Alexandria airport; this is a national airport.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question occurs on amendment No. 1643, offered by the Senator from Virginia, Mr. ROBB. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 63, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 4 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Akaka	Glenn	Leahy
Baucus	Graham	Levin
Biden	Harkin	Mikulski
Bingaman	Hollings	Moseley-Braun
Bryan	Inouye	Murray
Bumpers	Johnson	Reed
Cleland	Kennedy	Reid
Conrad	Kerrey	Robb
Daschle	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Kohl	Torricelli
Feingold	Landrieu	Wellstone
Ford	Lautenberg	

NAYS—63

Abraham	Enzi	Mack
Allard	Faircloth	McCain
Ashcroft	Feinstein	McConnell
Bennett	Frist	Murkowski
Bond	Gorton	Nickles
Boxer	Gramm	Roberts
Breaux	Grams	Rockefeller
Brownback	Grassley	Roth
Burns	Gregg	Santorum
Byrd	Hagel	Sessions
Campbell	Hatch	Shelby
Chafee	Helms	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Collins	Hutchison	Snowe
Coverdell	Inhofe	Specter
Craig	Jeffords	Stevens
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thomas
DeWine	Kyl	Thompson
Dodd	Lieberman	Thurmond
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Durbin	Lugar	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Coats	Moynihan
-------	----------

The amendment (No. 1643) was rejected.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). Under the previous order, there will now be—

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Could we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next vote in this series be limited to 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1641, AS MODIFIED

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to send a modification of my amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The modification is as follows:

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.

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.

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 the Architect of the Capitol and 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 4 minutes of debate equally divided for each side on the amendment as modified.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, let me, first of all, say to my colleagues here, my intention, as I have said earlier, is to support the underlying legislation to name the airport in honor of Ronald Reagan.

As I said yesterday, I certainly had no lack of disagreements with Ronald Reagan during the 8 years of his stewardship but believe that a two-term President deserves to be recognized. And if it is the desire of his family and others to rename this airport, given the fact it has had name changes over the years, I do not object to that. I had offered this amendment for the purpose of dealing in the future with these same issues.

In a sense, Mr. President, it has become sort of a modern day graffiti when we run around naming things here willy-nilly, both on the Capitol grounds and in this city. We are mere custodians of these facilities; we don't own them, and we ought to have a process by which we make solid determinations about whose names are associated with great monuments, buildings and rooms that we have. When we as an institution decided to decorate the reception room with five of our former colleagues, it was Senator John Fitzgerald Kennedy who chaired that commission—I look to my colleague from West Virginia as our historian—where a deliberative process went forward and that decision was made.

It seems to me we as a body ought to adopt something like this so that we are not faced with these situations year in and year out.

Now, Mr. President, I gather from talking with my colleague and friend from Georgia that my amendment to the underlying legislation is going to be rejected, but I hope that we might consider something like this amendment at the appropriate place. Unfortunately, what happens in the absence of a decision like this, these matters get shunted aside and we do not bring them up again until the next issue emerges. But I happen to believe that setting up a commission that would deal with these issues, having a commission made up of former Members to deal with Capitol grounds, possibly the Architect of the Capitol included, is the way we ought to go about the process of naming rooms, buildings, and renaming facilities, Federal facilities, here in Washington and elsewhere.

Having said that, I know my colleague from Georgia will want to be heard on this. When he completes his comments, I will withdraw my amendment and hope that at some point in the not too distant future we can bring this matter up through the Rules Committee or other such committees where it would be appropriate. I see my colleague from Texas who I know is interested in this as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Who yields time to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. COVERDELL. How much time have we remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. COVERDELL. I ask unanimous consent the Senator from Texas be

granted 1 minute to make her comments on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Texas.

Ms. HUTCHISON. I agree with what the Senator from Connecticut is doing in laying this aside. I do think we need a process and procedure. I am on the Rules Committee. I will work with the Senator from Georgia and our leadership as well as the Democratic leadership. I would like to see us have a process in which all the views are represented and then we can go forward. And I pledge to the Senator from Connecticut my support.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REID, who has time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia controls the time.

Mr. BAUCUS. Will the Senator yield for just 15 seconds?

Mr. COVERDELL. I yield.

Mr. BAUCUS. I might inform the Members there is a process. It is the Environment and Public Works Committee. If this bill had been referred to the proper committee, we would have gone through the proper process. That committee has jurisdiction over public buildings. We have rules as to naming and when not to name buildings after whom and under what circumstances. There is a process. One of the problems with this whole procedure here today is the process was skirted. The process wasn't used.

Mr. President, this is a very difficult issue for me, but I am going to be voting against the underlying bill basically because I do not think we should displace George Washington, our Founding Father, with what we might be doing here, and a whole host of other reasons which I do not have time to get into.

There is a process. We are not following it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I should like to address my remarks to my colleague from Connecticut. He appeared yesterday. He has been very facilitating to the effort. I appreciate very much what he and my colleague from Texas are endeavoring to do. As I said to him this morning, I look forward to joining with him in his attempt to prospectively deal with these kinds of issues in the future. I am very appreciative of his collegiality.

I would say, as I have said repeatedly, that there are certain extraordinary conditions associated with the manner in which we are dealing with this issue. The former President's birthday is this Friday, and he is facing the most difficult battle he has faced in his life. And he has faced many. This is a spontaneous response to that. I will leave it at that. But I do want to again thank the Senator from Connecticut and make known that I intend to join with him in his efforts pro-

spectively to deal with these sorts of matters.

I yield back all time.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

AMENDMENT NO. 1641, AS MODIFIED, WITHDRAWN

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 1640

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order there will now be 4 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form on amendment No. 1640 offered by the Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID.

The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. My friend from Connecticut indicated that any amendment that was offered to this bill was rejected. I have not heard that. I have not heard a single person come forward and speak against the amendment I have offered. I suggest that this amendment would not hold up this bill one bit; that anyone voting against this amendment is voting against good Government. There is not an organization in this country that is concerned about human rights or civil rights that wants J. Edgar Hoover's name on the FBI building. This is a building that houses officials sworn to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States, our civil liberties, the liberties of all Americans. No official in the history of this country has done more to violate the rights of people than J. Edgar Hoover. Consider going after Irving Berlin, the man who wrote God Bless America. He is one of scores of people I have talked about these last few days.

I think we should honor those who work in that building by removing this man's name from the building. It is one of the most popular places to visit by visitors that come to this Nation's Capital, and they should not be subjected to a building with this man's name on it.

Mr. President, Ronald Reagan stands for what is good about this country. J. Edgar Hoover stands for what is bad about this country. This small man violated the rights of hundreds, if not thousands, of people, famous and not so famous. He was a vindictive, petty man who harassed and abused untold thousands during his entire 48 years as the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. We should remove the last segment of the McCarthy era by deleting his name from one of the most important buildings in this city.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. First, let me say to my colleague from Nevada I appreciate the remarks he made about the underlying bill. We do have a logistical problem here in terms of—and we have

spent the better part of the week perhaps in a less efficient manner than we could have, and it has robbed me of the opportunity to iron the way on the other side, so I regretfully will in a moment move to table the amendment.

It may not be much comfort to the Senator from Nevada at this time, but I would welcome working with him. Obviously, there have been a number of assertions made about the individual to which the Senator from Nevada takes umbrage. It is a complex issue, and as I said I simply do not have time, given where we are in the week and what we are attempting to do, to resolve the matter in the House. So for that reason, Mr. President, I move to table the amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator withhold for just a short moment?

Mr. COVERDELL. I withhold my motion.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has 40 seconds remaining.

Mr. COVERDELL. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my colleague.

I oppose this amendment. Yes, there are things that can be said, but there are many things that have been accomplished during the tenure of Hoover. I have to say there is a raft of FBI agents who would be very offended by this. And I don't think we should do it. As a matter of fact, if we go back through time, if you look at all the good things that were done and all the many accomplishments of the FBI, you have to conclude there was an awful lot that we have to be proud of even though there are some things that are certainly to be criticized and rightfully so.

When the Senate takes action to honor—or discredit—men and women who have favorably shaped this nation, we should do so only after careful reflection and deliberation. We must also be careful not to allow the faults or excesses of an individual overshadow the contributions they have made to our country.

I think we need to consider the negative effect passage of this amendment could have on an institution that has made a profound contribution to the safety and security of this nation. The FBI is deservedly recognized as the preeminent law enforcement agency in the world. And whether we care to like him or not, unlike any other institution in our federal government, there is one person that is directly responsible for the FBI's rise in prominence, J. Edgar Hoover. Under Hoover, the FBI was transformed from a small sleepy Washington office, into the major force thwarting criminal activity in this country.

Hoover took over the FBI in May 1924 and placed the Bureau at the forefront in combating the major gangster activity of that era. The FBI was directly

responsible for the arrest of notable gangsters such as John Dillinger and Baby Face Nelson. During World War II the FBI spearheaded efforts to uncover Nazi saboteurs and spies infiltrating the United States in an effort to disrupt the Allied war effort.

In the 1950's under Hoover's leadership the Bureau was instrumental in the identification and arrest of Soviet Spies of the likes of Sobel and Abel, as well as the arrest of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. Remember also, that it was the Hoover FBI that cracked the infamous Brinks robbery in Boston, loudly touted as the "Crime of the Century" at that time.

Among many other responsibilities, the FBI played a vital role in the 1960's in fighting deep seated racism in the deep south. It was Hoover's FBI that combated threats from the Ku Klux Klan. It was this same FBI that investigated the infamous "Mississippi Burning" case that brought to justice those responsible for the senseless murder of 3 civil rights workers. It was this same FBI that brought James Earl Ray to justice. It was also the Hoover FBI of the 1960's that conducted an extensive investigation into organized crime that led to the identification of an enormous criminal network stretching from Chicago to New York and Boston, and touched the lives of countless communities in between. Today we recognize this network as La Cosa Nostra.

This is merely a snap shot of the considerable accomplishments made by the FBI under the leadership of J. Edgar Hoover. Let me remind my colleagues that the day after his death in 1972, Hoover's body was laid in State in the Rotunda of the Capitol—an honor bestowed upon only 21 other Americans in the history of this great nation.

In his death, despite revelations that have been made, it is undeniable that Hoover's legacy in building the FBI to its current stature continues to have a profound effect upon the safety and security of this nation. From the investigation and arrest of those responsible for the World Trade Center bombing, to the recent conviction of Unabomber Ted Kaczynski; from the arrest of CIA agent Aldrich Ames for espionage, to the investigation that resulted in the convictions of Timothy Macveigh and Terry Nichols for the Oklahoma City bombing, the FBI continues to be recognized as a vital component of law enforcement. Let us honor the legacy of this honorable institution, by continuing to give appropriate recognition to Mr. Hoover, the principal architect in its rise to prominence.

In reviewing my colleague from Nevada's reasoning for this amendment, it is clear that he believes he is doing the right thing. I do not question his sincerity. But I do not think the Senate should act on accounts contained in a single book.

More importantly, we are here today to honor President Reagan. I urge each of my colleagues to address this issue alone without being compelled to bring

other agencies or memorials into the equation.

So I hope our colleagues will vote against this amendment. I respect my good friend from Nevada, but I oppose this amendment.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 1640 offered by the Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 5 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Abraham	Frist	McCain
Allard	Graham	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gramm	Murkowski
Baucus	Grams	Nickles
Bennett	Grassley	Roberts
Bond	Gregg	Rockefeller
Breaux	Hagel	Roth
Brownback	Hatch	Santorum
Burns	Helms	Sessions
Byrd	Hutchinson	Shelby
Campbell	Hutchison	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Inhofe	Smith (OR)
Collins	Jeffords	Snowe
Coverdell	Johnson	Specter
Craig	Kempthorne	Stevens
D'Amato	Kohl	Thomas
DeWine	Kyl	Thompson
Dodd	Lieberman	Thurmond
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Enzi	Lugar	Wellstone
Faircloth	Mack	

NAYS—36

Akaka	Feingold	Lautenberg
Biden	Feinstein	Leahy
Bingaman	Ford	Levin
Boxer	Glenn	Mikulski
Bryan	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Bumpers	Harkin	Murray
Chafee	Hollings	Reed
Cleland	Inouye	Reid
Conrad	Kennedy	Robb
Daschle	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Kerry	Torricelli
Durbin	Landrieu	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Coats Moynihan

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 1640) was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. COVERDELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I want to compliment the manager of the bill for his good arguments.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we still do not have order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is correct, we do not have order. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I want to compliment the manager of the bill and others who voted against this amendment. I know it was sincerely brought, and I know that there may be some arguments that some could raise. But in all honesty, the FBI has been one of our most venerable institutions for all of these years.

We know that the former Director deserves most of the credit for building it and that there are literally thousands of FBI agents who would have been very upset if that amendment was adopted.

I thank all of our colleagues for having voted to table the amendment, and I hope that we do not do this in the future. We do not put names on buildings idly, and we do not do them facetiously, and we do not do them foolishly. Once they are there, we ought to remember the traditions and history and the good things that really were done. All of us have faults, all of us make mistakes, and all of us need to work out our own repentance for things that we do from time to time.

So I thank everybody who did vote to table the amendment for having done so, and I think they did the right thing.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Utah and others who voted to table this amendment that I think it was a bad vote. The fact of the matter is, when the name was placed on this building, J. Edgar Hoover's record was not clear to the American public. It was not clear that he conducted investigations of Irving Berlin and hundreds and hundreds of other people.

I say without any qualification, there is no one this century who has violated the human rights and civil rights of America's citizens more than J. Edgar Hoover.

I have the greatest respect for the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, my good friend, but on this issue, I think he is flat wrong, and I think we missed an opportunity to take a person's name off a building that should be an embarrassment and is an embarrassment to the people who work inside that building, as reflected in private conversations with an FBI agent today.

AMENDMENT NO. 1642

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 4 minutes equally divided in the usual form on amendment No. 1642 offered by the Democratic leader, Mr. DASCHLE. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, thank you. I had the opportunity to discuss this amendment last night. President Reagan stood for a lot of things, but I think the things for which we identify him more than anything else is local control, the need to ensure that at the local level, government is given the greatest opportunity.

In 1987, President Reagan signed a bill into law that provided authority to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority for all decisionmaking regarding the operation of the Washington National Airport. That was 11 years ago. My amendment, Mr. President, simply says, let's keep the spirit of Ronald Reagan alive as we pass this piece of legislation; let's ensure that the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, in keeping with local control, has an opportunity to voice its approval. That is what this amendment does.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, may we have order? There are pockets of conversation all over this Chamber, and I want my leader to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader deserves to be heard. Conversations will cease or be removed from the Senate Chamber. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank my friend from Kentucky and I thank the Presiding Officer.

I simply conclude, Mr. President, by saying if we are for local control, if we are for the spirit of what Ronald Reagan represented, then we all ought to be supporting this amendment. This amendment, again, simply says, let's give the Washington Airports Authority the authority given to them by President Reagan in 1987, the opportunity to be heard, to have a voice, to say yes. So I hope my colleagues will join me in the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. REID. Will the leader yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. Whatever time I have remaining I will be happy to yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I just say briefly to my friends on the other side of the aisle, I support renaming the airport after President Reagan, but using the logic of my friend from Utah, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, he said you should not change the name of existing buildings. I assume that should also apply to airports. So if that logic is carried through, I would think everybody on the other side of the aisle would vote against renaming this airport for the President.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I yield the manager's time to my distinguished colleague from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I think we all ought to understand that if this amendment were accepted, it would kill our effort to rename Washington National Airport after President Ronald Reagan. So let's be very clear about the effect of this amendment.

Second of all, again, I am intrigued by this continuous argument from the other side that Washington National Airport, which identifies the airport as servicing Washington, DC, is somehow George Washington. Obviously, we know that is not true.

If we want to give local control to National Airport and the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, I strongly suggest to my friend, the distinguished Democratic leader, that we repeal the perimeter rule which is a Federal law which prevents aircraft from flying any further west than the far western end of the runway at Dallas-Fort Worth Airport, a law that was passed by former Speaker of the House Jim Wright who happens, as we all know, to reside there.

So, if we are going to give truly local control, I hope the distinguished Democratic leader would want to remove Federal laws that also affect Washington National Airport which, frankly, has affected the lives of millions of Americans for many years in preventing them from going from one end of this country to the other without stopping in between.

So I say to my colleagues, have no doubt about the effect of this amendment. It would kill our ability to do an appropriate thing and, if I may add as an aside, I hope we get this done pretty soon, because I think everybody knows how we and the majority of the American people feel about this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1642 offered by the Democratic leader, Mr. DASCHLE. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 63, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 6 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Akaka	Glenn	Levin
Baucus	Harkin	Mikulski
Bingaman	Hollings	Moseley-Braun
Breaux	Inouye	Murray
Bryan	Johnson	Reed
Bumpers	Kennedy	Reid
Cleland	Kerrey	Robb
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kohl	Torricelli
Dorgan	Landrieu	Warner
Feingold	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Ford	Leahy	

NAYS—63

Abraham	Cochran	Frist
Allard	Collins	Gorton
Ashcroft	Coverdell	Graham
Bennett	Craig	Gramm
Biden	D'Amato	Grams
Bond	DeWine	Grassley
Boxer	Dodd	Gregg
Brownback	Domenici	Hagel
Burns	Durbin	Hatch
Byrd	Enzi	Helms
Campbell	Faircloth	Hutchinson
Chafee	Feinstein	Hutchison

Inhofe	McConnell	Smith (NH)
Jeffords	Murkowski	Smith (OR)
Kempthorne	Nickles	Snowe
Kyl	Roberts	Specter
Lieberman	Rockefeller	Stevens
Lott	Roth	Thomas
Lugar	Santorum	Thompson
Mack	Sessions	Thurmond
McCain	Shelby	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Coats
Moynihan

The amendment (No. 1642) was rejected.

Mr. COVERDELL. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as we move into a vote on final passage, it still seems somehow impossible that 23 years have passed since that genial American—the one who had starred in movies and television, who early in his career had been a talented sports broadcaster, who served as a commissioned officer during World War II and who had served with distinction as Governor of California—that this remarkable man yielded to the urgings of thousands of his fellow Americans and tossed his hat in the ring for consideration as the 1976 Republican presidential nominee.

But in the instance of Ronald Reagan, history proves that *tempus does fugit*. It has indeed been 23 years. Ronald Reagan has done all of the above, and done them well. But when he agreed to be a candidate for the Presidential nomination, there were few who foresaw the profound effect this remarkable American would have on his party, his country—and the entire world.

Mr. Reagan did not, of course, win the nomination in 1976. But he did lay the groundwork for 1980 when delighted Republicans chose him as the party's standard bearer in the presidential election that year.

He won overwhelmingly and, as Paul Harvey always says, now you know the rest of the story.

Mr. President, I had known Ronald Reagan for some years when he announced in 1976—the year when I was in the middle of my first six years in the U.S. Senate. Like Mr. Reagan I had once been a registered Democrat—and I confess that I was stunned on that November 1992 evening when the election returns were coming in that I had become the first U.S. Senator ever elected by the people of North Carolina.

I was disappointed in 1976 when Mr. Reagan failed to win the GOP primary for president because it seemed clear to me then, and clear to millions of others, that Ronald Reagan was an eloquent and forceful defender of conservative values. For that reason, and because of my friendship with him, I became the first sitting Senator in 1976 to endorse Candidate Reagan for the Presidency—a fact that I shall forever note with pride because history is already clear that Mr. Reagan was the

outstanding President of the 20th Century.

There have been others who served well but it was President Ronald Reagan who stout-heartedly defended Thomas Jefferson's counsel that the least government is the best government.

Indeed, the enormity of President Reagan's domestic achievement boggles the mind. Consider the unprecedented Gross National Product expansion and job creation after a period of failed statist economic policies; declining interest rates that allowed entrepreneurs to enter the market, bringing energy and innovation to countless industries; tax cuts that at long last allowed Americans to keep more of what they earned; a long overdue hiatus in the unchecked growth of the federal bureaucracy. Simply put, our economy is strong and vibrant today because Ronald Reagan had the courage to trust the free market.

Ronald Reagan did all of this, yes, but the real heart of his legacy will forever rest upon in his courageous opposition to communism and totalitarianism opposition that led to the birth of freedom in Eastern Europe and the end of the Cold War.

Two years before the remarkable fall of the Berlin Wall, Ronald Reagan traveled to Berlin, stood at the Brandenburg Gate, and thundered: "As long as this gate is closed, as long as this scar of a wall is permitted to stand, it is not the German question alone that remains open, but the question of freedom for all mankind."

In this cynical age, when so many ridicule anyone attempting to divine the difference between right and wrong, Ronald Reagan dared to believe in democracy. It was, perhaps, his old-fashioned belief in the goodness of America and all that it represented that led him to understand what so many so-called experts failed to understand: that the Cold War was a struggle not of military might or economic theory, but of the human spirit's longing to be free.

President Reagan never lacked detractors—it seems there is no easier way to arouse scorn than to stand up for traditional values—but even his most vociferous opponents stood in awe of his amazing rhetorical gifts. They called him the "Great Communicator." But President Reagan—with his typical humility—rejected the moniker. In his farewell address to the Nation, delivered on January 11, 1989, he said:

I never thought it was my style or the words I used that made a difference: it was the content. I wasn't a great communicator, but I communicated great things, and they didn't spring full bloom from my brow, they came from the heart of a great nation—from our experience our wisdom, and our belief in the principles that have guided us for two centuries. They called it the Reagan revolution. And I'll accept that, but for me it always seemed more like the great rediscovery, a rediscovery of our values and our common sense.

Indeed, the Reagan years were a recitation of traditional principles. And

all Americans owe Ronald Reagan a great debt, one that the simple renaming of an airport doesn't begin to repay. But this does not lessen the importance that the name of Ronald Reagan be enshrined in national institutions.

In the same farewell address to which I referred a moment ago, President Reagan issued a warning for those who would forget history. "If we forget what we did," he said, "we won't know who we are." He spoke of an "eradication * * * of the American memory that could result, ultimately, in an erosion of the American spirit."

This Friday, Ronald Reagan will be 87 years old. All of us are saddened by his illness, but we are inspired by the gracious manner in which he and his family have faced it. And while he is still with us, we should heed his admonishment to remember the values he stood for, the President he was, and the man that he is.

Today, our classrooms and our universities are a battlefield of revisionist history and sometimes venomous ideology. But long after today's petty scholastic disputes lie forgotten in the pages of some academic journal, the Washington Monument, and the Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials, and other national shrines will continue to stand in tribute to achievements of great Americans.

Ronald Reagan richly deserves to be remembered for his achievements just as earlier great American patriots are remembered. I am proud to support the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport, and I hope that Americans will accept this gesture of deep and genuine appreciation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I support this legislation. I disagreed with President Reagan on many issues, but I believe this proposal is an appropriate honor for a distinguished former President. I also support it because of the many personal kindnesses that President Reagan and his family have shown to the Kennedy family over the years.

In particular, I remember two extraordinary occasions. On a wonderful morning in the Rose Garden in June of 1981, President Reagan presented a Gold Medal authorized by Congress and honoring Robert Kennedy to our family, and he spoke about my brother. Four years later, on a magnificent evening in June of 1985, President came to my home in McLean, Virginia and spoke about President Kennedy. These are two of the finest tributes that anyone has ever given to my brothers. I believe our colleagues will find these tributes of interest, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN ON PRESENTING THE ROBERT F. KENNEDY MEDAL TO MRS. ETHEL KENNEDY, JUNE 5, 1981

The *President*. Mrs. Kennedy, the Congress has authorized the presentation of a medal

for you in recognition of the distinguished and dedicated service which your husband, Robert Kennedy, gave to the government and to the people of the United States.

Robert Kennedy's service to his country, his commitment to his great ideals, and his devotion to those less fortunate than him self are matters now for history and need little explanation from me. The facts of Robert Kennedy's public career stand alone. He roused the comfortable. He exposed the corrupt, remembered the forgotten, inspired his countrymen, and renewed and enriched the American conscience.

Those of us who our philosophical disagreements with him always appreciated his wit and his personal grace. And may I say I remember very vividly those last days of the California primary and the closeness that had developed in our views about the growing size and unresponsiveness of government and our political institutions. Among the last words he spoke to this Nation that night in Los Angeles were, "What I think is quite clear is that we can work together in the last analysis, and that is what has been going on within the United States—the division, the violence, the disenchantment with our society; the divisions, whether it's between blacks and whites, between poor and more affluent, or between age groups or on the war in Vietnam—is that we can start to work together. We are a great country, an unselfish country, and compassionate country."

Obviously, many of you here knew him better than most. You knew him as husband, as brother, as father, and uncle. He wrote to his son, Joseph, on the day of President Kennedy's death, "Remember all the things that Jack started. Be kind to others that are less fortunate than we and love our country." And it is in the final triumph of Robert Kennedy that he used his personal gifts to bring this message of hope and love to the country, to millions of Americans who supported and believed in him. "Come my friends," he liked to quote the Tennyson lines, "it's not too late to seek a newer world." And this is how we should remember him, beyond the distinguished public service or our own sadness that he is gone.

His friend, composer John Stuart, said about him what he said about the first fallen Kennedy and about us: that when a chill wind takes the sky, we should remember the years he gave us hope, for they can never die.

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN AT A FUNDRAISING RECEPTION FOR THE JOHN F. KENNEDY LIBRARY FOUNDATION JUNE 24, 1985

I was very pleased a few months ago when Caroline and John came to see me and to ask for our support in helping the library. I thought afterwards what fine young people they are and what a fine testament they are to their mother and father.

It was obvious to me that they care deeply about their father and his memory. But I was also struck by how much they care about history. They felt strongly that all of us must take care to preserve it, protect it, and hand it

They're right, of course. History has its claims, and there's nothing so invigorating as the truth. In this case, a good deal of truth resides in a strikingly sculpted library that contains the accumulated documents, recollections, diaries, and oral histories of the New Frontier. But I must confess that ever since Caroline and John came by, I've found myself thinking not so much about the John F. Kennedy Library as about the man himself and what his life meant to our country and our times, particularly to the history of this century.

It always seemed to me that he was a man of the most interesting contradictions, very

American contradictions. We know from his many friends and colleagues, we know in part from the testimony available at the library, that he was self-deprecating yet proud, ironic yet easily moved, highly literary yet utterly at home with the common speech of the ordinary man. He was a writer who could expound with ease on the moral forces that shaped John Calhoun's political philosophy. On the other hand, he possessed a most delicate and refined appreciation for Boston's political wards and the characters who inhabited it. He could cuss a blue streak—but then, he'd been a sailor.

He loved history and approached it as both romantic and realist. He could quote Stephen Vincent Benét on General Lee's army: "The aide de camp knew certain lines of Greek and other such unnecessary things that are good for peace, but are not deemed so serviceable for war." * * *

And he could sum up a current statesman with an earthy epithet that would leave his audience weak with laughter. One sensed that he loved mankind as it was, in spite of itself, and that he had little patience with those who could perfect what was not really meant to be perfect.

As a leader, as a President, he seemed to have a good, hard, unillusioned understanding of man and his political choices. He had written a book as a very young man about why the world slept as Hitler marched on. And he understood the tension between good and evil in the history of man; understood, indeed, that much of the history of man can be seen in the constant working out of that tension. He knew that the United States had adversaries, real adversaries, and they weren't about to be put off by soft reason and good intentions. He tried always to be strong with them and shrewd. He wanted our defense system to be unsurpassed. He cared that his country could be safe.

He was a patriot who summoned patriotism from the heart of a sated country. It is a matter of pride to me that so many men and women who were inspired by his bracing vision and moved by his call to "ask not," serve now in the White House doing the business of government. Which is not to say I supported John Kennedy when he ran for President; I didn't. I was for the other fellow. But you know, it's true, when the battle's over and the ground is cooled, well, it's then that you see the opposing general's valor.

He would have understood. He was fiercely, happily partisan. And his political fights were tough—no quarter asked, none given. But he gave as good as he got. And you could see that he loved the battle.

Everything we saw him do seemed to betray a huge enjoyment of life. He seemed to grasp from the beginning that life is one fast-moving train, and you have to jump aboard and hold on to your hat and relish the sweep of the wind as it rushes by. You have to enjoy the journey; it's unthankful not to.

I think that's how his country remembers him, in his joy—and it was a joy he knew how to communicate. He knew that life is rich with possibilities, and he believed in opportunity, growth and action.

And when he died, when the comet disappeared over the continent, a whole nation grieved and would not forget. A tailor in New York put up a sign on the door: "Closed because of a death in the family." The sadness was not confined to us. "They cried the rain down that night," said a journalist in Europe. They put his picture up in huts in Brazil and tents in the Congo, in offices in Dublin and Warsaw. That was some of what he did for his country, for when they honored him they were honoring someone essentially, quintessentially, completely American. When they honored John Kennedy, they honored the Nation whose virtues, genius, and contradictions he so fully reflected.

Many men are great, but few capture the imagination and the spirit of the times. The ones who do are unforgettable. Four administrations have passed since John Kennedy's death; five Presidents have occupied the Oval Office, and I feel sure that each of them thought of John Kennedy now and then and his thousand days in the White House.

And sometimes I want to say to those who are still in school and who sometimes think the history is a dry thing that lives in a book: Nothing is ever lost in that great house; some music plays on.

I've even been told that late at night when the clouds are still and the Moon is high, you can just about hear the sound of certain memories brushing by. You can almost hear, if you listen close, the whir of a wheelchair rolling by and the sound of a voice calling out, "And another thing, Eleanor!" Turn down a hall and you hear the brisk strut of a fellow saying, "Bully! Absolutely ripping!" Walk softly, now, and you're drawn to the soft notes of a piano and a brilliant gathering in the East Room when a crowd surrounds a bright young President who is full of hope and laughter.

I don't know if this is true, but it's a story I've been told. And it's not a bad one because it reminds us that history is a living thing that never dies. A life given in service to one's country is a living thing that never dies—a life given in service, yes.

History is not only made by people; it is people. And so, history is, as young John Kennedy demonstrated, as heroic as you want it to be, as heroic as you are.

And that's where I'll end my remarks on this lovely evening, except to add that I know the John F. Kennedy Library is the only Presidential library without a full endowment. Nancy and I salute you, Caroline and John, in your efforts to permanently endow the library. You have our support and admiration for what you're doing.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of this bill to rename the Washington National Airport "Ronald Reagan National Airport."

I am disappointed in the partisanship and delay tactics involved in stalling this legislation. Personally, I can think of no more fitting tribute to our 40th President than renaming the main airport facility for visitors to our nation's capital.

During his eight years in as President, Ronald Reagan stood as a President of principle, integrity and optimism. He took America at a time of great disillusionment—gasoline shortages, hyper-inflation and American diplomats held hostage abroad—and transformed our spirit through vision and leadership.

President Reagan showed America that leadership is not making promises, it's keeping promises.

Ronald Reagan promised us a better future and he delivered. His message was simple: America can be better. His charm, wit and eloquence combined to communicate exactly the message that Americans needed to hear. And the nation reacted:

Interest rates, inflation and unemployment fell faster under President Reagan than they did immediately before or after his Presidency;

The nation experienced a 31% increase in real, inflation-adjusted gross national product;

Exports increased 92.6% and manufacturing increased by 48%;

Median family income grew every year during his Presidency for an increase of nearly \$4000, after years of zero-growth in pre-Reagan years;

In short, during the Reagan era, economic growth was stronger, job creation was faster, incomes were higher and productivity was healthier.

President Reagan's accomplishments were achieved because he believed that a healthy economy should create opportunities and reward responsibility and work. In his first inaugural address he told us:

It is not my intention to do away with government. It is rather to make it work with us, not over us; stand by our side, not ride on our back. Government can and must provide opportunity, not smother it; foster productivity, not stifle it.

Some people believe that President Reagan's greatest legacy was the restoration of pride and optimism in America. He made us believe in ourselves and told us: "There are no such things as limits to growth, because there are no limits on the human capacity for intelligence, imagination and wonder."

Americans reawakened to themselves as a great people with a great future. A notable Democrat, our former colleague, Majority Leader George Mitchell said, "Like President Roosevelt, President Reagan possesses a legendary ability to inspire in Americans pride in their nation and faith in its future."

And, perhaps, our colleague Senator TED KENNEDY said it best in a quote from the Boston Globe in 1989: "He (Reagan) has restored the public's confidence in the presidency. For that alone, he deserves our appreciation."

Not only did President Reagan restore our sense of purpose and meaning as a great country, but it was because of his vision and commitment to freedom and democracy that today there is no longer a Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. There is today, no longer a Berlin Wall.

These two seminal events of the 20th century are a direct result of the policies of President Reagan. Our children and grandchildren will know a level of security and peace well into the next century because President Reagan understood that peace can only be achieved and maintained when we provide the full measure of resources to our men and women in the military who stand guard to protect liberty 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year.

Mr. President, I ask my fellow colleagues to help demonstrate to President Reagan that appreciation. I ask my colleagues to help me in passing S. 1575.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I would like to voice my opposition to this bill.

Mr. President, I certainly have respect for our former President, Ronald Reagan. I served in the Senate during his two terms as President and we

worked together on many pieces of legislation. One of my proudest achievements was the passage of the national minimum drinking age bill that established a national drinking age of 21.

That law, which President Reagan proudly signed, is credited with saving nearly 1,000 young lives each year. I am thankful to President Reagan for being a part of that fight. While I did not agree with him on a number of other issues, I do respect him and believe his legacy is a powerful one.

However, Mr. President, Washington National Airport in Alexandria, is already named after a great American—George Washington, our first president. George Washington's role in our nation's history and in this area's history is rich and well documented.

George Washington, the father of our country, the man who led our troops against the powerful British army, the man who chaired the Constitutional Convention, the man who lived a short 15 miles away at Mount Vernon in Virginia, certainly does not deserve to have his name stripped from the airport, and replaced by another, which this bill would effectively do. If this legislation passes, most people will refer to it as Ronald Reagan airport, and President Washington's name will rarely be associated with this facility again.

Mr. President, a short time ago, Congress named the second largest federal office building in the nation—second to the Pentagon—after Ronald Reagan.

Naming the Federal Triangle Project in downtown Washington the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center is a fitting tribute to President Reagan, who signed the authorization for that project into law, and who believed strongly in free trade. In the wake of honoring President Reagan with that naming, this bill is not necessary.

Mr. President, I have other concerns with this legislation, and I believe that those issues would also concern President Reagan.

There is a serious question as to whether it is appropriate for Congress to change the name of Washington National Airport. The bill would impose Congress's will upon the local authorities by forcing them to change the airport's name. This would be done with no input from the local communities. No hearings. No votes. No discussion. No opportunity for public comment. Simply put, the airport authority must adopt the name as determined by Congress, the federal government. This clear mandate from the federal government, imposed on the local communities, is precisely what President Reagan would object to.

His legacy is clear on this matter. We should not offend that legacy in an attempt to honor the man himself.

I am not ruling out any legislation with respect to this issue, but the underlying bill will have to be improved before I will vote for it.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of this bill

designating Washington National airport as the "Ronald Reagan National Airport." Mr. President, I am honored to participate in renaming this airport after such a distinguished American.

Ronald Reagan presided over an era of tumultuous change and great challenge. His policies helped reverse stagflation and high interest rates, and unleashed the longest economic recovery in recent history.

His courage extended freedom around the world. Ronald Reagan knew that weakness is provocative. He not only restored America's military strength, but challenged the tyrants who would shed American blood and deny freedom to others. He confronted terrorists boldly and decisively—with or without the assistance of other nations. He defied conventional wisdom to challenge Mr. Gorbachev to "tear down [this] wall." And the wall fell. He demonstrated that America would stand strong—even when she stood alone.

But perhaps most importantly, Ronald Reagan helped restore faith in the American dream. When Reagan took office, America, is was said, was suffering from "malaise." Reagan reaffirmed the vision of a "shining city on a hill." He spoke to the hopes and dreams of ordinary citizens for opportunity, achievement, and growth. He helped dispel the public cynicism that had darkened politics for years, and celebrating the dawning of "morning in America."

President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt once said that "the presidency is pre-eminently a place of moral leadership." It was in this area that Reagan's leadership was the most significant. Reagan was always more simple than subtle. The American people knew where he stood, and what he stood for. In times of economic or international crisis, Americans knew that Reagan's word was true, and that his resolve would not waver.

It is for these reasons that I offer my support for S. 1575, to honor a man who honored America.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I rise today to add my vocal support to S. 1575, the bill to rename Washington National Airport the "Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport."

Last year, I was the first co-sponsor of this measure. At the time, I thought I had just beat the rush, and that I would be merely the first of a long list of co-sponsors. I thought that surely, if every Member of this chamber was aware of the debt they and their country owe to Ronald Reagan, this bill would have 99 co-sponsors.

Instead, I was surprised that only 35 others have co-sponsored Senator COVERDELL'S bill. I was surprised when I learned that this bill is encountering serious opposition. And I will be more than surprised if this bill does not pass. I will be shocked and I will be saddened. It is not often we are able to consider a bill so simple and so right as this one.

Ronald Reagan can truthfully be called one of the greatest living Americans. President Reagan's most important contribution to his country was the leadership he provided during the West's long struggle with totalitarian communism. When he called the Soviet Union an 'evil empire' media pundits scorned him. Today, we all know that he was right. But President Reagan provided far more than rhetoric in the struggle against communism. In 1980, America was dangerously weak and demoralized. President Reagan understood this and he directed the strengthening of all aspects of our military, coordinating our efforts with other members of the Western alliance.

From the point when Ronald Reagan entered the White House, no additional territory fell to the Communists. From that point forward the tide began to turn. On all fronts, the Reagan administration backed the forces of freedom. Reagan supported Solidarity in Poland, he backed the freedom fighters in Afghanistan, Grenada was liberated, and he helped democratic struggles throughout Latin America. The Soviet Union was everywhere confronted by a Western alliance that had finally awakened to the dangers of appeasement. The alliance was greatly strengthened by the friendship and support of President Reagan's close friend and ally, British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. Together they thwarted Communism and made the Kremlin and its puppet states aware that the free world intended to remain free. The West won the cold war, and Ronald Reagan deserves much of the credit.

President Reagan's second great triumph was his economic plan. He was the first modern President to directly challenge the notion that more government was good. In his view, Government does not solve problems, it subsidizes them. While this view is widely held today, it was ridiculed throughout the 1960's and 1970's. During those years, Reagan was nearly alone in his struggle against the endless growth of government. But he never altered his message. Unlike other politicians, he stood firm, and gradually the country moved his way. He stopped the slow socialist slide of our Nation, and instead implemented policies that provided the catalyst for the unparalleled financial and economic security and freedom we now enjoy.

The Reagan program of lower taxes and less regulation was a tremendous success. In the early Reagan years all income taxes were cut across-the-board by 25 percent. The decade to follow witnessed the longest peacetime economic expansion in the history of our Nation. All income groups experienced significant income gains from 1980 to 1989. Twenty million new jobs were created, and the vast majority were high-paying professional, production, and technical jobs.

In the late 1970's inflation was as high as 18 percent, and interest rates rose to 21 percent. The Reagan eco-

nomics program brought both of these down dramatically. The 1970's malaise brought on by high inflation, skyrocketing interest rates, high unemployment, and high taxes was replaced by an economy that fostered opportunity, growth, and optimism.

President Reagan rallied our Nation. He reminded each of us of our proud history and heritage. He was never afraid to proclaim his love for America. Most important, he stood up for what he believed. He knew the importance of strength and resolve. The result was the most successful Presidency in decades. As Reagan himself reminded us:

History comes and goes, but principles endure and inspire future generations to defend liberty, not as a gift from government, but as a blessing from our creator.

I know that the Federal Triangle building will be opening soon. I know that it is named after Reagan. But Ronald Reagan was a man of the people, not of bureaucrats. When he was called "The Great Communicator" it was not because of his skill with memos or inter-office correspondence. It was because of his ability to speak with, and for, the average American. Some good can come of the irony in naming the second largest and by far the most expensive federal building in America after Ronald Reagan. We can let the name of the Ronald Reagan building stand as a direct counter to the waste and excess involved in its building. It will also be a constant reminder to the civil service workers inside of President Reagan's belief in a small, responsible and effective government.

But again, Reagan was not a man who loved big government. He should not be memorialized solely by a big government building. The Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport—an airport that is used by our government, but more importantly, by our people, and by the free people of the world—should stand as the monument to the Great American President.

President Reagan's 87 Birthday is Friday. We need to approve this bill, and present him with a small but well deserved gift from the country he so ably served.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I will not support the legislation to rename the Washington National Airport. This is not legislation to name an unnamed airport or a new airport. Washington National Airport already has an appropriate name and has had that name since it opened in 1941.

We should have a normal and systematic process for the naming of buildings, bridges, monuments, airports and other public facilities. The names of these landmarks should not bounce around from name to name in response to current events. Such decisions should be made in a non-political and careful manner weighing the many factors which come into play, including the concerns of local governments and authorities.

There are many past Presidents, admired by millions of Americans, and others around the world, including Harry S Truman who have no monument in Washington, D.C.

We have already, quite appropriately, recognized the accomplishments of President Ronald Reagan in several appropriate ways, including the new federal Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center at Federal Triangle (which is the largest building in D.C.) and the Navy's newest *Nimitz*-class aircraft carrier.

The Washington Post, in an editorial this past Saturday titled "Don't Rename Washington National" stated, "It is a bad proposal on many counts, all of them going well beyond any public wishes to honor the former president."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial be printed in its entirety immediately following my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for all these reasons and others, I cannot support this legislation to precipitously strip Washington National Airport of the name it has borne for more than half a century.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 1, 1998]

DON'T RENAME WASHINGTON NATIONAL

With alarming speed and little serious thought, members of the House and Senate are pushing a bill to strip Washington National Airport of its time-honored name and call it instead Ronald Reagan National Airport. It is a bad proposal on many counts, all of them going well beyond any public wishes to honor the former president. As it happens, this capital city already has honored Mr. Reagan in a most impressive way, naming a major new, heart-of-downtown federal office building after him. As it also happens, the name Washington National honors this country's first president, who lived just down the road a bit from the airport site. In addition, the name Washington National clearly identifies the airport's location and market—an important aid to travelers and shippers all over the world.

There is yet another solid reason to drop the proposal. Former Virginia governor Linwood Holton, the first Republican to hold statewide office in the Old Dominion since Reconstruction and former head of the Washington Airports Authority, cites the history, intent and spirit of congressional legislation signed in 1986 by President Reagan. That act transferred Washington National and Dulles International to the regional authority, granting it control and oversight of the two airports. Gov. Holton notes that 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."

Mr. Holton notes that in the past, any changes in the lease at the request of Congress were done with agreement to secure the consent of the regional authority. And in this instance, the local governments involved oppose the change—not for any partisan or political reasons but because of the name recognition that Washington National Airport conveys in the travel and commercial industries, as well as the costs that

would have to be borne by businesses in and around the airport (changing signs, business forms and promotional materials, for example).

Yet the renaming proposal is being rushed along without proper hearings in an attempt to make it law in time for Mr. Reagan's birthday next week. Thoughtful members of Congress should consider the negative effects of this measure. There are many ways to salute Ronald Reagan—as has been done here already—but stripping Washington National of its name and history is not an appropriate way. There is no insult attached to voting no; on the contrary, this is the respectful and proper way to redirect and continue any movement to honor President Reagan here or elsewhere in the country.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, earlier today this body passed legislation to rename Washington National Airport to the Ronald Reagan National Airport. I rise today to express my opposition to that legislation. My opposition is in no way meant to dishonor President Reagan. Recently, we have named the nation's second largest federal building after President Reagan and have named a *Nimitz*-class aircraft carrier after him as well. Clearly, Ronald Reagan accomplished a great deal during his Presidency, and he deserves to be recognized for that contribution to our country.

However, I do not believe that we should seek to honor President Reagan by diminishing the honor that we have bestowed upon President George Washington when we named the Washington National Airport—truly one of our nation's greatest founding fathers. Mr. President, I recently finished reading a biography of George Washington. I recommend everyone in this body do so also. It is important to remember and recognize the many contributions that he made to this country. For it is largely through his efforts that the United States is a world leader in every sense of the word.

Because of his leadership, the thirteen individual colonies united to become the United States—a sovereign, independent nation.

After the Revolutionary War, George Washington took a lead role in crafting our constitution and in the campaign for its ratification. The success of Washington's campaign was assured by 1797, at the end of his second presidential term, and his legacy continues to be the basis of law today.

President Washington acted with Congress to establish the first great executive departments and to lay the foundations of the modern federal judiciary. He directed the creation of a diplomatic service. Three presidential and five congressional elections carried the new government, under the Constitution, through its initial trials.

His policies procured adequate revenue for the national government and supplied the country with a sound currency, a well-supported public credit, and an efficient network of national banks.

Above all, he conferred on the presidency a prestige so great that political leaders afterward esteemed it the high-

est distinction to occupy the chair he had honored. His work and leadership as President is a benchmark by which we should measure all those who serve in that high office.

Most of the work that engaged Washington had to be achieved through people. President Washington found that success depended on their cooperation and that they would do best if they had faith in causes and leaders. To gain and hold their approval were among his foremost objectives. He thought of people, in the main, as right-minded and dependable, and he believed that a leader should make the best of their good qualities.

As a national leader he upheld the right of everyone to freedom of worship and equality before the law, condemning all forms of bigotry, intolerance, discrimination, and persecution.

Throughout his public life, Washington contended with obstacles and difficulties. His courage and resolution steadied him in danger, just as defeat steeled his will. His devotion to his country and his faith in its cause sustained him. Averse to harsh measures, he was generous in victory. "His integrity," wrote Thomas Jefferson, "was the most pure, his justice the most inflexible I have ever known. He was, indeed, in every sense of the word, a wise, a good, and a great man."

Therefore, Mr. President, despite the respect and admiration I have for President Reagan, I cannot in good conscience support a bill which will diminish the great contributions President George Washington has made to our nation.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, needless to say, I think we are all grateful to be at this moment.

I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, S. 1575, pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 7 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Abraham	Feinstein	Mack
Allard	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Bennett	Graham	Mikulski
Biden	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Murray
Boxer	Grassley	Nickles
Breaux	Gregg	Reid
Brownback	Hagel	Roberts
Bryan	Hatch	Rockefeller
Burns	Helms	Roth
Byrd	Hutchinson	Santorum
Campbell	Hutchison	Sessions
Chafee	Inhofe	Shelby
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kempthorne	Smith (OR)
Coverdell	Kennedy	Snowe
Craig	Kerrey	Specter
D'Amato	Kerry	Stevens
DeWine	Kohl	Thomas
Dodd	Kyl	Thompson
Domenici	Landrieu	Thurmond
Durbin	Leahy	Warner
Enzi	Lieberman	Wyden
Feingold	Lott	
	Lugar	

NAYS—22

Akaka	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Glenn	Reed
Bingaman	Harkin	Robb
Bumpers	Hollings	Sarbanes
Cleland	Inouye	Torricelli
Conrad	Johnson	Wellstone
Daschle	Lautenberg	
Dorgan	Levin	

NOT VOTING—2

Coats Moynihan

The bill (S. 1575) was passed, as follows:

S. 1575

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

SECTION 1. REDESIGNATION.

The airport described in the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes", approved June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 686), and known as the Washington National Airport, shall be known and designated as the "Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) The following provisions of law are amended by striking "Washington National Airport" each place it appears and inserting "Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport":

(A) Subsection (b) of the first section of the Act of June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 686, chapter 444).

(B) Sections 106 and 107 of the Act of October 31, 1945 (59 Stat. 553, chapter 443).

(C) Section 41714 of title 49, United States Code.

(D) Chapter 491 of title 49, United States Code.

(2) Section 41714(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended in the subsection heading by striking "WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT" and inserting "RONALD REAGAN WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT".

(b) OTHER REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Washington National Airport shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport".

Mr. COVERDELL. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SANTORUM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senate and our cosponsors. I want to reiterate my gladness that this has been a spontaneous effort on the part of the U.S. Senate to respond to a great American President.

Throughout the debate it was questioned from time to time, what was the position of the Reagan family? There was not a position. This is a gesture from a people and grateful nation and a grateful Senate. And I thank my colleagues, those who disagree, for the collegiality in which this matter was resolved.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I want to congratulate and express my appreciation to the Senator from Georgia for the leadership he has exhibited here. He kept calm and he got the job done. I think it was the right thing to do, and I am very proud that the Senate, in a very broad, bipartisan vote, voted to name this airport after former President Reagan. I had the opportunity to talk to a couple of colleagues here in the well as we were voting—Democrats who came up and remembered acts of kindness they had experienced from former President Reagan, and they voted for the legislation.

I know some had reservations or misgivings, but I think it was the right thing to do and it was the right time to do it. I thank the Senator for his efforts; he did an excellent job. I thank one and all for their cooperation.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

THE HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act reauthorization, ISTEA—in other words, the highway bill—sets the authorization levels for the current fiscal year and the next 5 years for our Federal highway construction, bridge, highway safety, and transit programs. When the Senate found itself unable to complete action on S. 1173 at the end of the last session, it was necessary to pass a short-term extension bill to tide these programs over from October of last year until May 1, 1998. I supported that short-term extension measure, but I did so with the understanding from the distinguished Senate majority leader, and others in the leadership, that “immediately following the President’s State of the Union Address,” the Senate would return to the highway reauthorization bill.

It now appears that things have changed and that the distinguished majority leader is being urged by a handful of Senators to delay action on it and not bring up ISTEA until after Congress completes action on the fiscal year 1999 budget resolution. Mr. President, as one who has been majority

leader, I can understand the pressures that are upon our own distinguished majority leader at this time with reference to the highway bill. I have had discussions with the able majority leader, and prior to the reconvening of the Senate, I had the pleasure of talking with the majority leader in my office. He showed me the courtesy of coming to my office, and we sat for 30 minutes and discussed this measure and other matters. I can understand the pressures that are on him from other Senators in this body. Having been majority leader, I know that one cannot please all Senators on his own side, much less Senators on the other side of the aisle. I am fully aware of that. And what I say with respect to the bill certainly is not in denigration of our majority leader. I have an excellent relationship with him, as I do with my own leader on this side of the aisle, and I would not want to do anything to impair that relationship.

But, Mr. President, having said that, this would be a very shortsighted approach to handling one of the most important matters to come before this Congress—the highway bill. I understand that the very able chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. DOMENICI, has expressed his hope and intention to proceed quickly with his hearings and the markup of the budget resolution. As Senators are aware, Section 300 of the Congressional Budget Act sets a date of April 1 as the deadline for the Senate Budget Committee to report the budget resolution each year. The Congressional Budget Act requires Congress to complete action on budget resolutions every year by April 15.

I was here, Mr. President, when we enacted the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and I spoke for it, supported it, and had a considerable bit to do with the formulation of it. But in all of the years since the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, Congress has met the deadline for completing action on budget resolutions only 3 times. Those 3 years were fiscal years 1976, 1977 and 1994.

I say to all Senators, but particularly to the leadership, that this is not a very good record upon which to base our hopes for early completion of the fiscal year 1999 budget resolution. Yet, that’s what the plan appears to be, as it relates to the highway bill. As I say, I implored, I importuned, I beseeched, I pleaded with the distinguished majority leader before this session was convened and urged that we be allowed to bring up the highway bill. That was the commitment that was made. It was made to the Senate, it was made to the American people. As I say, I know the majority leader has a lot of pressures on him, and I can understand those, having been majority leader. So I am not going to be one to criticize the majority leader in this respect. Heavy and uneasy is the head that wears the crown.

We are being told we should just be patient and our State highways and transit authorities should not worry.

We’ll get around to enacting the ISTEA bill after the budget resolution is finished. Mr. President, that places our State highway departments in an extremely precarious and uncertain position as they struggle to continue, without interruption, the Nation’s critically important highway construction, bridge construction and repair, highway safety and transit programs.

Now, every highway department is being put into that position. How can we be sure that the budget resolution will be completed at all, much less by the April 15 statutory deadline? Eventually, it will be completed, but how can we be sure that it will be finished in time to meet that deadline? In the past 25 years, Congress has only met that deadline three times, as I have already indicated. On all other occasions, the deadline was missed, sometimes by months, as it was in fiscal year 1985 when the budget resolution was not completed until October 1, 1984; and for fiscal year 1991, when the budget resolution was not completed until October 9, 1990.

But even if it is passed, how can we afford to wait until that deadline? How can we afford to wait until April? How can we afford to wait until April 15 to bring up the highway bill? Construction seasons are upon us. Construction seasons in the northern States, in particular, are going to be constricted.

If the leadership continues to hold up the ISTEA bill, I am concerned that Congress will not be able to act on a new highway bill prior to the statutory deadline now in existence for the obligation of highway and transit funds. How many more days do we have, Mr. President until May 1? May 1 is the drop-dead date with respect to highway obligations—new obligations by the highway departments throughout this country. May 1. How many more days remain? We don’t count Saturdays and Sundays, naturally. But only 41 session days remain. Only 41 session days when the Senate will be in session. The States will hit the spending walls for highway transfer funding on May 1. I assure all Senators that we will hear from the American people if we continue to ignore the basic transportation needs of this Nation in such a cavalier fashion. The disruption of these transportation projects will be massive, massive in the Northeast, in the Northwest, in the Southwest, and in the Southeast—all over this country. The disruption of these projects will be massive across the Nation as States will be required to stop obligating funds on May 1 for the highway and transit programs. Congress needs to get its act together!

This is an irresponsible and unnecessary course that threatens the very lives of people as well as the economic well-being of the people throughout the country. Does it take a crisis, Mr. President, to force us to act here in Congress? Do we have to have a bridge collapse and possibly have people killed before we wake up? I have not