

Rose Kennedy's remarkable life was full of hills and valleys. And through moments of triumph and tragedy, Rose Kennedy exhibited a seemingly endless supply of grace, grit, and courage.

There were two enduring principles at the center of Rose Kennedy's life. The first was love of family—and what a remarkable family it is. Over the past half-century, the Kennedy name has become synonymous with public service.

Indeed, during Rose Kennedy's life, she would see three of her sons serve in the U.S. Senate—one of whom, of course, became President of the United States.

One daughter currently serves as Ambassador to Ireland; another is regarded as one of the great humanitarians of our time.

Two grandsons currently serve in the U.S. Congress; and just last week a granddaughter was sworn-in as Lieutenant Governor of Maryland, and a grandson became a member of the Maryland House of Delegates.

The other principle at the center of Rose Kennedy's life was love of God. And it was that love that enabled her to survive through the deaths of four of her children.

Many words will be written and spoken in the coming days about Rose Kennedy, but none will be more eloquent than those of our colleague, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, who said, "She was the most beautiful rose of all."

ROSE KENNEDY

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I want to join my voice with so many other voices in expressing sorrow at the loss of Rose Kennedy, a woman who epitomized, I think, strength and class and grace; and say to Senator KENNEDY and all the members of the Kennedy family that our thoughts and our prayers are with them as we celebrate the life of that remarkable woman.

THE PASSING OF GREATNESS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as one of millions upon millions of Americans mourning today the passing of a great woman, I want to extend to our colleague Senator EDWARD KENNEDY from Massachusetts, and to his extended family, my wife Erma's and my condolences on the death yesterday of his mother, Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy—Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy, as we knew her best.

Some Americans have expressed a regret that our representative democracy precludes the granting of titles of noble recognition as is common among our British cousins.

To be certain, if titles were granted in America to those most worthy, Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy would long, long ago have been known affectionately as "Lady Kennedy."

Indeed, given her innate intelligence, political acumen, and enviable sense of self, had Rose Kennedy been born per-

haps 50 years later than she was, she might well have been the first United States Senator in her family.

Instead, being born 104 years ago, from her childhood and youth, Rose Kennedy imbibed the air of the politics of Boston, of Massachusetts, and of America, and learned to play magnificently the role of wife to her husband and mother to her sons and daughters as she brought her incomparable strengths and graces to bear on their successes.

Rose Kennedy's life spanned more than half the history of the Republic of the United States. For much of that history, Rose Kennedy was a frontline participant in the great events of our era, and in more than a peripheral fashion.

Where else in American history can be recorded that one woman was the wife of an Ambassador to the Court of St. James, the mother of an American President, the mother of three United States Senators, mother of the Attorney General of the United States.

And, perhaps, above all else, Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy will live on in the hearts and memories of untold millions of Americans who witnessed her fortitude and faith in the face of pitiless tragedy in the loss of three of her sons in the service of our country—her son Joe, Jr., in World War II, and her sons John and Robert to the mindless hatred of the previously nameless assassins on whom infamy will forever rest through the sins against our country and history itself that they committed in murdering these two outstanding men.

Mr. President, I hope that the members of the Kennedy family will experience some degree of comfort in the condolences that we offer them today, and, more importantly, that the Kennedy family will find increased strength in consolation in recalling the strength and character that Rose Kennedy embodied and in realizing the affection and reverence in which she was held by the American people and by people around the world.

Let Fate do her worst, there are relics of joy, Bright dreams of the past, which she cannot destroy;

Which come, in the night-time of sorrow and care,

And bring back the features that joy used to wear.

Long, long be my heart with such memories filled!

Like the vase in which roses have once been distilled,—

You may break, you may shatter the vase, if you will,

But the scent of the roses will hang round it still.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I would like to compliment the Senator from West Virginia for a beautiful tribute to a remarkable woman. I know that will be of great, soothing comfort to the family.

I think on behalf of many people, I say how much we appreciate the tribute.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I, too, would like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia. It is hard to believe that Rose Kennedy in her 104 years comes close to encompassing almost half the time period that this country has been in existence—a little short of that, but not very much.

It has been my pleasure to know her from some years ago. I have not seen her in recent years, but we were visitors with the Kennedy family on a number of occasions years ago when she was there. We got to know her as a very gracious lady.

I think Senator BYRD has very properly given the accolades that he has, that she has so well deserved. And I associate myself with his remarks at this time.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

ROSE FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to extend my wife's and my deepest sympathy to our colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], on the death of his mother, Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy. I extend condolences also to two of her grandsons, my Rhode Island colleague Representatives PATRICK KENNEDY and Representative JOSEPH KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

No other woman in American history can match the distinction of Rose Kennedy in nurturing progeny for distinguished service to the Nation. Three sons who became U.S. Senators, one of them a President, and now in the next generation two grandsons in the House of Representatives, a granddaughter who is a Lieutenant Governor, and another grandson in a State legislature.

History will look back in wonder and admiration at such a family and especially at the woman who instilled it with so much vitality and high sense of purpose.

Rose Kennedy was privileged to savor the highest of life's triumphs but she also had to bear the burdens of tragedy of almost unbearable weight. Where lesser mortals would have been crushed by such adversity, Rose Kennedy remarkably kept on course, guided, as it were by some strong inner compass.

We know now that the compass was steadied by her own great faith and religious commitment, and that these were the sure cornerstones on which she built her extraordinary family.

Rose Kennedy left a legacy like no other to the Nation, and the Nation will always be grateful.

Mr. President, there is only one other woman in history that comes anywhere near Rose Kennedy, in my memory or in my view. That is the mother of Napoleon, Madam Le Mere. She ruled the known world at the time, most of Europe and the countries there. And she, herself, gave her imprimatur to all kings and queens and rulers around Europe.

I send all my sympathy to Senator KENNEDY.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The legislative clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCERN OVER MEXICAN DEBT

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I would like to rise to say a few words about the Mexican debt situation and about our relationship with Mexico. I have been very troubled that our leadership has agreed to support this loan guarantee package with Mexico without further analysis.

There are two things that give me great trouble, and as a member of the Finance Committee I will be asking some very hard questions. First of all, why can we not get this package collateralized? Why can it not be attached either to the Mexican oil resources or to some other collateral, because I am afraid the American people may not get their money back.

Many who are advocating this are going around saying it will not cost us anything. But I have been in this body since 1978, and the House since 1975, and I have heard this again and again, and the U.S. taxpayers frequently end up paying the bill.

The second thing that troubles me a great deal is the Chile example. Economists tell me that the example of what happened in Chile in the early 1980's is almost perfectly analogous to what is happening in Mexico. For example, in Chile in the early 1980's they had a similar economic crisis where their money had been devalued and Chile was unable to get any assistance from the United States at that time because General Pinochet, the dictator, was not approved by the United States and the United States had cut off all aid and even economic relations with Chile so Chile had nowhere to turn.

Under General Pinochet's leadership Chile made economic reforms. They tightened their belt, they went through the steps necessary to restore their economic health internally, and today Chile is one of the most prosperous and booming countries in the world. Indeed, Chile is emerging like one of the supereconomies that we have seen emerge in Asia. Chile is the first such supereconomy of South America. And

Chile now seeks to join in a trade agreement with the United States. Its businesses are competing around the world.

If we roll history back and imagine that in the early 1980's Chile had been a democracy and we had been giving aid to Chile, we would have given Chile a series of loan guarantees and aid and Chile would not have made the necessary economic reforms. And Chile would probably still be a struggling Third World country today.

So I say the same is true with Mexico at this time, 1995. Mexico has not taken many of the strong measures necessary. I had great hopes for the last Salinas government. It seemed, as it got toward the end of that time, Mexico, and the PRC, in wanting to win the election, took softer and softer economic policies, devaluing, trying to create artificial wealth, printing money, and doing all the things they are not supposed to do in terms of sound economic decisions.

Now should the American taxpayers be asked to pay for that? Once again we are in one of these circumstances where a lot of aid would be going to some of our large bond funds and banks in the United States. Mutual bond fund types who bought a lot of the Mexican paper would be bailed out. We would be bailing out a lot of our own mutual bond funds, banks and others.

We are also bailing out the Mexican politicians who did not make the right decisions and the hard decisions, who did not tell their people the truth in their speeches as they went about Mexico. But the worst part of the whole thing is, aside from bailing out private groups who maybe do not deserve it, the worst of all is that we may well be delaying real reform in Mexico. Would it not be better to let 6 months or 1 year pass and observe that Mexico is taking some of those tough economic measures? Why do we have to act on this so quickly?

I think Mexico should be required to make internal economic reforms and also to collateralize the loan guarantee. The Mexicans refuse to sell their publicly owned oil fields and oil industry, which was nationalized at one point. It is a socialistic endeavor and a very unhealthy one in terms of what it produces for Mexico. Here we are, a free-enterprise country, giving a noncollateralized guarantee to Mexico while not requiring them to sell their oil industry. The economists tell me if they were willing to privatize their oil industry, they could have far in excess of the billions of dollars they are seeking from the United States.

So in closing I would like to say, let us call this what it is. It is a bailout. There are many arguments that are made—the specter of refugees coming across the border, et cetera, et cetera. But we are going to have the same problem again in 2 or 3 years unless Mexico makes the economic reforms that are necessary. Let us look at the Chile example, the example of a coun-

try that made the reforms, did not get any aid from anybody, and is one of the healthiest countries in the world today.

In terms of foreign aid, I have observed over the years the countries that have developed the most economically in the world have been those that have not received economic aid from the United States—with one or two exceptions. All the tigers of the Far East did not receive aid packages from the United States. They did it themselves. Many of the countries that we have consistently given foreign aid to have faltered, have not made internal decisions, have expected a handout, and have remained very, very poor. So we have not done these poor people a favor. As Chile, when they needed help and they were looking for international grants and aid—nobody gave it to them. They have become the most prosperous country in South America as a result of it.

So I think there is something to be learned here. I know it may sound harsh. Maybe it sounds cold and calculating. But if we really want to help people, sometimes we should require they make reforms before we give them aid, or we should try to give them trade rather than aid. Also, I point out the huge budgetary deficit we have in our own country and the number of people we have in need of some kind of small business assistance here within the United States.

So, I have made it known to the leadership I was disappointed that both sides, both the President and Republican and Democratic leadership, endorsed this plan without further consulting and assessing the feelings of other Members of the Congress. As a member of the Finance Committee, I do not feel obligated to support this until I see much more collateralization, until I see much more performance on the part of the Mexicans in terms of getting their house in order, and until I see the American taxpayers reassured.

Recently I have been in on some debates about privatizing public broadcasting in this country, and I have been criticized for things I have never said. I find that privatizing sounds bad to some people inside the beltway. The fact of the matter is, there are ways that public television can make a great deal of money through programming rights, through working with regional communications companies, and through working with other communications companies. In terms of marketing the product that they have, they can make a lot of money and they can save the taxpayers money. But in the whole debate the taxpayer is almost forgotten.

So it is with the Mexican debt issue. Let us think about the taxpayers of this country as we consider the Mexican debt situation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.