

So I just consulted with our distinguished majority leader, who thought that I might take a moment or two now.

As I say, 1 year ago today was the first arrival of the new generation of our family, Silvi Morton Specter. And it is an occasion, on her first birthday, to comment about children, a child, the future of our country, the future of her generation and the generations beyond.

I think that we are making some progress in the United States Senate on protecting her generation and the generations that follow with the progress which we are making on the balanced budget amendment. I certainly would not think of charging any of my expenses to her credit card, and I think as a nation, as we move to the balanced budget amendment, we really are looking after her generation and the future generation.

Similarly, I think we have a great deal to do on national security. As I have taken on a role on the Senate Intelligence Committee on the issue of nuclear nonproliferation, I think recently of her and her generation, just as I do on the issue of personal security, on the crime on the street, thinking about the fundamental duty of Government to protect its citizens.

Silvi Morton Specter, my son's daughter, has a unique opportunity. She has extraordinary parents, Tracey Pearl Specter, a devoted and loving mother. I characterize them when I see them playing together as her mother being her daughter's favorite playmate, and her father, Shanin, is extraordinarily attentive, as are her maternal grandparents, Carol and Alvin Pearl, and her grandmother, my wife, Joan, and I are.

As I reflect on the child, I just wish that all of America's children and all of the world's children had her great advantages.

So I thank my colleagues for indulging me for a few moments. I think we still have ample time before midnight to perhaps take up another subject or two.

I thank the Chair. I thank my colleagues, and I yield the floor.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me say for the benefit of all Senators, we are going to go through this unanimous consent agreement. I think there will

be a couple of questions asked. In fact, I wish to make a statement after the questions have been asked and each side is satisfied with the response, because it has to be in good faith. Otherwise, it is not going to work; there is not going to be another agreement. You would not give us one, and we would not give you one. If it is not in good faith, this may be the last agreement of its kind.

I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be the only first-degree amendments in order to S. 1, and that they be subject to relevant second-degree amendments.

I will not read that list, but there are 47 Democratic amendments, and 15 Republican amendments, a total of 62 amendments.

I further ask unanimous consent that all first-degree amendments must be offered by 3 p.m. on Tuesday, January 24.

I further ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of the above-listed amendments, the bill be advanced to third reading.

I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote scheduled for tomorrow and Saturday be vitiated, and that no votes occur throughout Friday's session of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 10 a.m. on Friday, January 20, and that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Friday, it stand in recess until 9:30 a.m. on Monday, January 23, 1995, and that the Senate resume consideration of S. 1 at 10 a.m. on Monday, January 23.

I ask unanimous consent that if a Senator with an amendment on the list sends the amendment to the desk to be printed on Friday, that be considered as having satisfied the 3 p.m. requirement for having amendments offered.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that no votes occur on Monday, January 23, prior to 4 p.m.

That is the request. But before I put the request, I think there are some questions some might want to address.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me thank the distinguished majority leader for the good faith in which we have attempted over the last several hours to work through this agreement.

There are a couple of questions on our side I would like to reference as they related to the agreement. The first has to do with the reference to all amendments being "offered." Could the majority leader define for us what you mean by the word "offer?" What will be required of a Senator to meet the obligations under this unanimous-consent requirement?

Mr. DOLE. Well, I assume if there is a pending amendment, they would have to get consent to set it aside and send

their amendment to the desk, and that would be offered.

Mr. DASCHLE. So it is the intent of the unanimous-consent agreement to allow any Senator who has an amendment to take it to the desk and be protected for consideration of that amendment during this debate?

Mr. DOLE. That is correct. We have made an exception for tomorrow morning. If somebody wanted to send an amendment and have it printed in the RECORD, that would satisfy the requirements of that section. But it is sending the amendment to the desk and first getting consent. That is why I think, as we have been in the past—it depends on the good faith of side. Somebody can say "I object to setting the amendment aside," and he puts in a quorum call and waits until 3 o'clock and there is one amendment pending. I think that is one thing we cannot let happen.

Second, I would hope that all these amendments are not offered. There are 60-some amendments. Any Senator could take as much time as he wanted after the amendment is offered. He can spend half a day on an amendment. We can be here 30 days.

So this does not preclude—if it is in the judgment of the majority leader and since we are not acting in good faith—filing cloture. Nor does it preclude cloture if we agree to the request by the Senator from West Virginia that we go to third reading and have a period of debate, and if that period of debate goes on and on and on, then I assume no one objects to someone filing a cloture motion.

I do not assume all these amendments will be offered. I think many may be worked out. Many may be there for some reason but will not be offered. But I am prepared to proceed in good faith. I am certain the Democratic leader is, also.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, that is certainly my intention. I think I speak for all colleagues on this side of the aisle. We want to work through the amendments. There are a number on our side, and we are prepared to offer them.

The distinguished majority leader articulated a second question, and for clarification let me again emphasize that it is my understanding that the motion to go to third reading is debatable under this unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. DOLE. As I understand, we would go to third reading, and there would be a period for debate.

Mr. DASCHLE. That is my understanding, after the motion.

Mr. DOLE. After we have gone to third reading. Any further amendments would not be offered, but we would still have a period of debate. There is no limitation. We do not say 1, 2, 3, 4 hours. There may not be any. As I understand it, the Senator from West Virginia wants to protect his interests, in the event some amendment may have been adopted, or not offered, or not disposed of properly, to at least raise that

point. Maybe other Senators on either side have the same position.

Mr. DASCHLE. This unanimous-consent agreement is the product of a great deal of effort on both sides of the aisle by a number of participants. I thank all of those Senators involved on our side, especially the Senator from West Virginia for his guidance and his indulgence in trying to accommodate all Senators as we come to this agreement. I do hope that we can move through the amendments in good faith, that we can offer them tomorrow, Monday, and Tuesday. Certainly, if this agreement is accepted, Senators are protected. That was our desire all along.

So I have no objection to this agreement.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, may I enter into this colloquy and ask one question? When you say the amendments are to be offered by a certain time, are those amendments that have already been filed considered ones that you just—you could repropose them now?

Mr. DOLE. Those were filed because of the cloture rule.

Mr. FORD. Under this unanimous-consent agreement, if you have, as I do—and we have worked them out, I think, with the majority floor leader, my amendments, which then the rest of them would go away. But I have to refile those on the basis of setting aside the pending amendment, and we go to my amendment, or put them at the desk tomorrow; is that the way?

Mr. DOLE. Correct.

Mr. FORD. All I have to do is Xerox it and put it in tomorrow afternoon or tomorrow sometime?

Mr. DOLE. I think all anybody has to do—parliamentary inquiry. Is there an amendment pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. DOLE. So there would not be any amendment pending. After the first one is offered, you would have to set that aside and simply send the amendment to the desk. I do not know how we decide which amendments we take up first. I think that is another question, whether the first amendment offered should be taken up first. I assume that would be the normal way to do it. Whoever offers their amendment first—many Democrats will not be here tomorrow. We will be here. That would advantage us. There has to be a way to work that out.

Mr. FORD. May I continue just a moment? I do not want to belabor it, but I want to be sure that my colleagues understand that if they want to propose an amendment, they have to be here to do that, under this unanimous-consent agreement. And any amendment that has been filed at the desk that was filed based on cloture, those amendments are, for all practical purposes, under this unanimous-consent agreement, null and void?

Mr. DOLE. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. I thank the majority leader and the Democratic leader.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the majority leader yield for a question on that one statement of my friend from Kentucky about having to be here to offer the amendment. I understand that tomorrow, for those of us who might not be able to be here, that somebody could offer the amendment on our behalf, get it to the desk, and that would then constitute the filing of that amendment in time?

Mr. DOLE. It says here if a Senator with an amendment sends it to the desk to be printed. It would take consent to send an amendment to the desk on behalf of someone else. That gets back to the very thing that the Senator from West Virginia objected to—somebody else, in effect, proxy management, or whatever, sending amendments to the desk. In fact, if you want to offer amendments tonight, send them to the desk, I do not see any reason that could not be done, as long as we are on the bill.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not believe the leader has made the request yet.

Mr. DOLE. I said I would withhold until the questions have been presented. I do now make the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object and I do not intend to object. I think this is a good agreement.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand it from the distinguished majority leader's responses to the minority leader's questions, and to those of Mr. FORD, and others, the second paragraph which uses the word "offer," offered by 3 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, that means that any Senator who has a bona fide amendment he intends to call up must offer that amendment by 3 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday. If he stands up and offers the amendment and Senators indicate a desire to debate that amendment and take action on it, that is OK, we can do that Monday. We can do that up until 3 o'clock. We can get action on some amendments or we can agree to stack the rollcall votes, as I understand it.

Mr. DOLE. Until 4 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. BYRD. Where is that?

Mr. DOLE. On page 2, second paragraph.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Now when we reach the hour of 3 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, if Senators have not had an opportunity to offer their amendments by that time but in the meantime they have filed the amendments at the desk, they may offer them, have them temporarily set aside, and then they qualify under this

agreement as having offered the amendment.

The Senator who has the amendment offers it. If for some reason, by the time we reach 3 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, that Senator has not had an opportunity to offer his amendment, he can offer it and, if there are other amendments pending at that point, he can offer it but no action will be taken on it. It will be temporarily set aside. But it has to be on the list—I am just trying to get an understanding—it has to be on the list of amendments that have been read and submitted.

I do not contemplate any great problem with this. Most of these things have a way of working themselves out. And Senators act in good faith. I take that as a given. I hope all Senators take that as a given with me, that I am acting in good faith. That is the only way I know to proceed here, is to be fair with each other.

Mr. DOLE. I would say, if I might respond to the Senator, if there was some unforeseen reason a Senator on either side was unable to send the amendment to the desk by 3 o'clock, I think we can probably work that out. But, it seems to me we have all had notice and if somebody got up at 3 o'clock and started sending five or six amendments to the desk, there could be an objection to setting aside any amendment.

Mr. BYRD. I want to say this, Mr. Leader. The leader and I have worked together many years in various capacities. No leader has ever offered as many cloture motions as I have and seen them all fail to be adopted.

It is conceivable that a Senator might have a death in his family.

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. I think we, being reasonable people, would understand even at that point that another Senator could get unanimous consent that another Senator could offer the amendment on his behalf.

Looking at this, if I understand correctly, I think it is a good agreement. I want to compliment both leaders and all others who have participated in working out this agreement. This preserves, this fulfills, this meets the majority's desire to know who really has amendments, who intends to call up those amendments and what those amendments are. It assures all parties on both sides that all first-degree amendments must have been offered, not by the managers but by Senators themselves.

If I want to come over here and offer my amendment, I have no reason to complain when the hour of 3 o'clock on Tuesday evening next arrives.

If I am saying anything that the majority leader thinks is not accurate, I hope he will say so.

That each Senator offers his or her own amendment, all amendments will have been offered by 3 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, and those amendments, of course, may be disposed of and they are expected to be disposed of as we go along. We made progress today and we

hope to make further progress a day later.

And then, once those amendments have been disposed of, we are not saying that the disposition has to occur by 3 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday. We are saying they have to be offered. The disposition may be 3 o'clock Tuesday or it may be 3 o'clock next Tuesday. Once the amendments have been disposed of, we advance to third reading and then no further amendments can be offered.

That is the case now. Once we are on third reading, except by unanimous consent, no further amendments are in order.

And then we are not closed out of debate at that point. And, of course, the leader, as he always has a right to do, has a right to offer a cloture motion. That is his right.

So, I hope that, as a reasonable man, if we reach that point and it is clear that somebody wanted to debate in a reasonable time, the leader would be willing to let that go forward. If it is obvious that someone just wants to tarry and delay, nobody can quarrel with the fact that the leader has that right to offer a cloture motion.

I would ask this question. Is there any time limit? You say that Senators will be permitted to speak tomorrow during a period for routine morning business. They may speak for how many minutes? Is there a time limit?

Mr. DOLE. I say to the Senator, we did not put a time limit because some might like to speak on their amendment. Even though they cannot offer amendments, they might like to suggest, "I intend to offer this amendment," and they could get rid of some of the debate tomorrow, at least on this side. You would have a chance to rebut that, or whatever.

But we did not put any time limit. We had hoped they would be constrained if they wanted to talk about their amendment, discuss it for a reasonable time, and then move on.

I want to say one other thing about the 3 o'clock deadline. Obviously, if there is some unusual circumstance, somebody's plane was delayed, we have a bad storm or something, I think the two leaders would agree, after consultation with each other, whoever it was on either side would be permitted to offer his or her amendment or amendments.

Mr. BYRD. So it is not the intention of the majority leader to put a limitation on the time for speeches on tomorrow?

Mr. DOLE. We could put a limitation of 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. If they want additional time, they could ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, again, I think this is a good agreement. I think it is a reasonable agreement. It seems to me it protects all Senators' rights. It is a reasonable approach.

I again compliment both leaders and all Senators. Many Senators have par-

ticipated in developing this agreement. I not only compliment them, I thank them for their further indulgence.

I reserve the right to object, but I have already indicated so.

I want to say this: I hope we close this session in a good spirit. I was sitting here a while ago while a rollcall vote was going on and I thought of Paul's epistle to the Colossians and I wrote it down. "Let your speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt, that ye know how ye ought to answer every man."

Sometimes I have to stop and write that down and read it and try to apply it to myself. I find that often fails.

I hope we will all feel good about having reached an agreement, and go home tonight. I think the leaders have done a good job. I think we have accomplished something. I am happy. I think it preserves everybody's rights. It is a reasonable agreement. It does not prostitute the legislative process.

That is what I have been complaining about. I thank the distinguished leader.

Mr. GLENN. Would the distinguished majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. DOLE. Let me say that we will have people speak for not to exceed 15 minutes to amend requests.

Mr. GLENN. I have been asked during the business tomorrow, it says morning business, and speakers can speak on whatever they wish including their possible amendments for next week or whatever; but there will not be any business conducted on S. 1 directly tomorrow, is that correct? So there can be no misunderstanding.

Mr. DOLE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the distinguished majority leader renew his unanimous consent request?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and let me thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his persistence. I did not mean to offend him earlier. I think we have an agreement that satisfies most everyone on each side of the aisle.

Mr. President, I renew my request. I ask unanimous consent the list of amendments be printed in the RECORD.

The list of amendments follows:

DEMOCRATIC AMENDMENTS TO S. 1

Bingaman:

- (1) Relevant.
- (2) Relevant.
- (3) Relevant.

Boxer:

- (1) Sensitive subpopulations.
- (2) Immigration costs.
- (3) Child porn/abuse/labor exclusion.

Bradley:

- (1) Relevant.
- (2) Relevant.
- (3) Relevant.

Byrd:

- (1) Relevant.
- (2) Relevant.
- (3) Relevant.

Dorgan:

- (1) Metric conversion.
- (2) Federal Reserve.
- (3) C.P.I.

Ford:

- (1) Imposing standards on House.
- (2) Imposing standards on House.
- (3) Imposing standards on House.

Glenn:

- (1) Relevant.
- (2) Relevant.
- (3) Relevant.
- (4) Relevant.
- (5) Relevant.

Graham:

- (1) Immigration.
- (2) Fund allocation.
- (3) Relevant.

Harkin:

- (1) Relevant.
- (2) Relevant.

Hollings:

- (1) Relevant.
- (2) Sense of Senate Balanced budget.

Johnston:

Relevant.

Kohl:

Relevant.

Lautenberg:

Relevant.

Levin:

- (1) Relevant.
- (2) Relevant.
- (3) Relevant.
- (4) Relevant.
- (5) Relevant.
- (6) Relevant.
- (7) Relevant.
- (8) Relevant.

Moseley-Braun:

Relevant.

Moynihan:

Relevant.

Murray:

- (1) Hanford.
- (2) CBO.
- (3) CBO.

Wellstone:

- (1) Relevant.
- (2) Relevant.
- (3) Relevant.

REPUBLICAN UNFUNDED MANDATES AMENDMENTS

McCain: Appropriations point of order.

Gramm: 60-vote point of order.

Gramm: Treatment of concurrence reports.

Hatfield: Local Flex. act.

Hatch/Brown: Judicial review.

Hatch: FACA.

Brown: SOS/Review of S. 1.

Grassley: CBO vs. Actual costs study.

Grassley: 60-vote waiver re: direct costs.

D'Amato: Comptroller of the Currency.

Kempthorne: Manager's technical amendment.

Roth: Chairman's technical amendment.

Dole: Relevant.

Kempthorne: Relevant.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I would send six amendments to the desk and ask that they be printed, and this be considered compliance with the Friday paragraph of the unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DOLE. Any further business to come before the Senate?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, if the majority leader would yield, I would simply send three amendments to the desk.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HYMAN BOOKBINDER HONORED

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend, Hyman Bookbinder. On October 2, 1994, Bookie was honored by the National Jewish Democratic Council as the recipient of the First Annual Hubert H. Humphrey Humanitarian Award.

It was very fitting that this honor was bestowed on Bookie. Over the years, Hyman Bookbinder has been indefatigable in his efforts to spread the message on labor, civil rights, and economic justice with a commitment to American ideals.

Admired, loved by family, friends, and colleagues, Bookie has served our country and the Jewish community with honor and distinction. His commitment to his faith and humanity is truly an inspiration. His distinguished career and many contributions was a cause for celebration by NJDC.

All of us owe him a debt of gratitude for his many years of dedicated and exemplary service to others. The celebration of Hyman Bookbinder as the first recipient of the Hubert H. Humphrey Humanitarian Award was a significant milestone in the life of this extraordinary man.

I am pleased to submit to my colleagues, Bookie's remarks upon receiving the Hubert H. Humphrey Award.

NJDC HUBERT HUMPHREY HUMANITARIAN AWARD

(Response by Hyman Bookbinder)

This is the nicest "This Is Your Life" episode I've ever seen! As I look at the names of the Honorary chairs, the list of speakers, the names on the Tribute Committee—and, above all, as I look around this room, I know how lucky I have been all my life to have had such friends and associates. Some of us go back more than sixty years. To have been part of your lives, and you part of mine, to have at times shared with you great pain over society's delinquencies, but at other times to celebrate together over some victories—labor's right to organize, breakthroughs in civil rights, commitment to end poverty, our nation's embrace of Holocaust remembrance and security for Israel—to have been associated with you in pursuit of these and other causes, I express my profound appreciation.

Oh, how I would like to go around the room and identify and thank each of you and say what you individually have meant to me. But limited time, and fear of leaving out some, compels me merely to note how gratified I am to see associates from the earliest days of my trade union work, the Amalgamated and the CIO and the AFL-CIO, from six decades of civil rights alliances and battles, from the halls of Congress since 1950—including its current senior member and chair of a non-existent Jewish caucus—from the war on poverty, including its founding general (although his name is Sargent), from three decades with the American Jewish Committee, including its outgoing President getting ready now to become Ambassador to Romania—and from every campaign since Harry Truman. . . .

I've had a special spot in my heart for our Honorary Chairman for fifteen years now. When another black leader declared that black anger at Jews at the time was just a declaration of independence, Vernon Jordan publicly rebuked him, saying that what was needed was a declaration of inter-dependence.

And there is one name above all, of course, that I wish I could point to. Oh, how I wish we were still with us. Oh, what a different country this might have been if in 1968 a few hundred thousand more Americans had voted for him. I cannot begin to tell you what an honor you have bestowed on me by linking my name with that of Hubert Humphrey. And what an honor to have his son and his sister with us tonight.

Others have already commented on the meaning and the goals of NJDC. Let me add a few words. I'm proud to get its award because its very name—National Jewish Democratic—combines three great commitments and loyalties of my life. National means to me, despite its failures and defaults, a nation we can and do love for its underlying compassion and respect for individual freedom. *Jewish* in our NJDC stands for a Judaism we love because it seeks to live by Hillel's admonition to be not only for ourselves. Democratic, because it is the party that best lives up to our American and our Jewish ideals. Small wonder that such large majorities of Jewish voters have consistently supported Democratic candidates.

I am proud of all three of these identifications and loyalties—and am reminded of that story about Henry Kissinger and Golda Meir. After a long argument with Henry, Golda looked sternly at him and said, "I'm really quite upset with you—you, a Jew!" At which point, Kissinger started to pontificate. "Madam Prime Minister," he said, "I want you to know that first I am a human being, a citizen of the world. Then I am an American. And then I am a Jew." "That may be OK for you in America," Golda responded, "but here we read from right to left."

I hope that nothing I have said smacks of chauvinism. I am a proud American. But I have known many great people who are not American. I am a proud Jew, but—if you will pardon the expression—some of my best friends are not Jewish. I am a proud Democrat, but have had high regard for some—not many, but some—Republicans.

Three years ago, I tried to capture some of the exciting, poignant moments in my life in a book with the sub-title "Memoirs of a Public Affairs Junkie." Permit me to cite briefly two of those precious memoirs that sort of sum up the public passions of my life—one fifty years ago, the second fifteen years ago.

In the late Forties, I was active in the campaign to raise the Federal minimum wage to 75 cents an hour—yes, 75 cents. I helped locate a garment worker in Tennessee who would testify on what 75 cents an hour might mean for her. All we did was urge her to talk frankly to the members of the Senate Labor committee. I sat next to her, not to prompt her, but to put her at ease. Ora Green was her name, and from the official transcript, here are some of her words:

"My youngest girl, she's nine now, goes straight to the piano when we go to a house where they have one. She wants to play so bad. I've thought that maybe I could save fifty cents or a dollar a week to buy a second hand piano for her, no matter how old or battered. But try as hard as I can, and save and squeeze, I haven't found a way to do it. By this time, the Senators had stopped shuffling their papers before them. They had leaned forward and were looking directly at this woman from Tennessee. She went on:

"Maybe I've been foolish to talk to you about music for one of my children when the main problem is getting enough to eat or wear, or blankets to put on the bed, or even a chair to sit on. But down in Tennessee we love music, and factory workers don't live by bread alone any more than anyone else does."

I cherish that moment because it tells us so much. It tells us that in every human

being there is indeed a spark of the divine, that with all its imperfections, our American democracy makes possible such magical moments to occur, and it reminds us how great it is to have a labor movement that cares about the Ora Greens of the world.

Oh, yes. One of the freshman Senators at that hearing was Hubert Humphrey.

My second story. . . The year was 1979. I was one of fifteen Americans appointed by Jimmy Carter to the President's Commission on the Holocaust. Miles Lerman, the present Chairman of the Holocaust Council and the Museum, was another. And so was Ben Meed, the chief co-ordinator of the world's survivors. Both are here tonight. And then there was Bayard Rustin, the late, great black trade unionist and civil rights leader. To help us develop recommendations for a suitable American memorial, we visited a number of concentration camps and existing memorials in Europe and Israel. On this particular day, after a painful tour through Auschwitz and Birkenau, we stopped for a short outdoor service at a row of memorial tablets. In front of the one inscribed in Hebrew, Elie Wiesel spoke as only he can speak. We joined in reciting the Kaddish. As we were about to leave, Bayard whispered to me, "Should I?" I knew exactly what he meant; I said "Sure" and asked the group to remain. Accompanied only by the soft winds of the vast open expanse, Bayard started to sing one of his favorite Negro spirituals:

"Freedom, oh Freedom, oh Freedom over me," he sang.

"And before I'd be a slave, I'd be buried in my grave, And go home to my Lord and be free."

When he finished, there wasn't a dry eye. Tears were being shed, tears not only in reverent memory of six million Jews, but also for untold millions of American slaves who had been deprived of lives of dignity and freedom. Tears, we were reminded, have no color.

On the last page of my book, I quoted some words I had spoken on an earlier occasion. I'd like to conclude tonight with those words.

"If it should be true that in my lifetime I have helped even one Jew or one Haitian or one Pole escape persecution; if I have helped even one ghetto youngster escape poverty; if I have helped one daughter of a Tennessee shirtmaker get to play on her own piano . . . If these things are indeed true, then all that is left to say is that I thank God that I was given some opportunities to help make life a little easier, a little sweeter, a little more secure, for some fellow human beings."

And I thank every one of you for being here tonight to share this proud moment.

Thank you very much.

TRIBUTE TO SGT. MANUEL BOJORQUEZ-PICO

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today to honor and congratulate U.S. Sgt. Manuel Bojorquez-Pico of Alabama's Redstone Arsenal, on the day of his swearing-in ceremony as a U.S. citizen. A dedicated patriot and loyal protector of this country and its people, Sergeant Bojorquez is not only an inspiration and role model but a symbol of American democracy and freedom.

Born in Mexico, Sergeant Bojorquez obtained permanent residency status while living in the United States as a child. For a short period of time he moved back to Mexico due to a family illness, but returned to the United