

him working today on the illegal immigration bill, a tough issue; and, quite frankly, one that is not as important in Wyoming as it is in other places. But that does not matter. AL said this is an important issue to our country, as he has undertaken to deal with Social Security in ways to honestly change it, and has had some controversy with groups that want the status quo. He has been willing to undertake the difficult question of entitlements that, obviously, have to be dealt with but are political dynamite—the old third rail of politics that no one is willing to touch. AL SIMPSON has done that, and will continue to.

One of his first activities following his departure here—I thought about saying “departed friend.” That is not right. He has his whole life before him. He is not departing. He is simply moving on to Harvard to teach at the Kennedy School of Government. It will be interesting to see the impact he will have at Harvard. I think it will be wonderful.

He has taken on the media on entitlements. He has done all of those things that are not easy to do. He stands for the things that are good about this system.

So I will miss our good friend and mentor—lifelong friend—who has the wisdom and willingness to take on the tough problems. Besides, I will not have anyone to join with me in the recitations of the “Cremation of Sam McGee” which we enjoy doing from time to time.

So I want to say, “Hats off” to AL SIMPSON, and we wish him the very, very best. I know he and Ann will have a wonderful, continuous time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR ALAN SIMPSON

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in a matter of days, or even hours, one of the finest individuals it has been my privilege to know will bring to a close another chapter in what has been, by any measure, an extraordinary legislative career.

Of course, no one should be surprised by the fact that our friend from Wyoming, who has served in the Senate for nearly 18 years, is one of the most accomplished legislative craftsmen to ever grace these hallowed halls. In fact, one could say that ALAN SIMPSON was born to a life in politics, that he really did not have a choice in the matter. One might say that. After all, when one's family has practiced law for the past 100 years, and when one's father has served the beloved State of Wyoming as both a Governor and as a U.S. Senator, it is hard to argue that one's fate was not predetermined.

Although actually born in Denver, CO, Senator SIMPSON is a lifelong native of Cody, WY, which, as he would be

quick to remind us, is the home of the Buffalo Bill Historical Center. Following graduation from the University of Wyoming with a bachelor of science degree in law, the young Senator-to-be began his life of public service as a 2d Lieutenant in the U.S. Army, serving in the 5th Infantry Division in Germany.

After leaving the Army, ALAN SIMPSON returned to the University of Wyoming to obtain his juris doctor, and then commenced a law practice with his father in their hometown firm of Simpson, Kepler and Simpson. His love of the law is evident in the fact that ALAN remained with the firm for the next 18 years, during which time he served as the State's assistant attorney general, and the Cody city attorney.

Responding to the call of greater professional challenge, and carrying on in the family tradition, Senator SIMPSON entered the political arena when he won election to the Wyoming House of Representatives in 1964, a position he would occupy for the next 14 years. His love for the art and the process of legislating further propelled ALAN to seek and win a seat in this great legislative body.

Mr. President, having been elected to three terms here in the Senate, it is obvious that his Wyoming constituents understand and appreciate the degree of skill, dedication, and integrity that ALAN SIMPSON has brought to his work. And, as a former assistant majority leader, and a former assistant Republican leader, it is obvious that his Republican colleagues have understood and valued those qualities in Senator SIMPSON as well.

But despite his steady climb up the leadership ladder, no one should make the mistake of assuming that the senior Senator from Wyoming has shied away from controversy.

To the contrary, it is doubtful that there is any other Member of this body who is more willing to enter into the fray, who is more willing to take on the special interest groups, or who is more willing to apply his quick and often devastating verbal wit to any and all situations, including turning that laser-sharp humor on himself.

One need look no further than the difficult and contentious issue of immigration to see that ALAN SIMPSON is not content to simply sit by and watch others take the lead and take the heat. For more than 15 years, dating back to when he first became chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Immigration Subcommittee, ALAN has undertaken the arduous and generally thankless task of crafting bills that would discourage illegal immigration and bring much-needed common sense to our national policies with respect to legal immigration. He has led the way in calling for tough sanctions on those employers who hire illegal immigrants, by articulating the need to establish a strong and workable employment verification system and by speaking out

on the necessity of lowering the total number of legal immigrants this Nation annually absorbs.

I have been fully supportive of ALAN SIMPSON in these endeavors.

I know I speak for many of my colleagues when I say that with respect to immigration, I will certainly miss the advice and counsel of my good friend from Wyoming, ALAN SIMPSON. All of us, on both sides of the aisle, will lament the loss of his informed and courageous leadership in this legislative area.

His work on immigration, though, was not the only complex and troubling issue that ALAN SIMPSON has been willing to tackle. After gaining a seat on the Finance Committee, Senator SIMPSON was resolute in his desire to stem the growth of entitlement spending. That conviction, of course, put him on track to collide with some of the most powerful and entrenched special interests Washington has ever known, but he did not waver. He did not tremble. He did not trim his sails. He did not run from the issue. He did not retreat from the battlefield. Instead, in his usual forthright and relentless manner, Senator SIMPSON, Senator ALAN SIMPSON—I say ALAN. I served with his father in this body—Senator ALAN SIMPSON coauthored a bipartisan proposal to make long-term cuts in Social Security spending including an eventual increase in the retirement age to 70.

Mr. President, ALAN's commitment to absolute honesty in addressing the many profound and troubling problems that face this Nation is emblematic of the devoted public servant that ALAN SIMPSON has shown himself to be over these past 18 years. There will be few, if any, who will match the accomplishments of our friend from the West, few who will bring to this body a deeper passion, and few who will legislate with greater skill.

And so, Mr. President, as he prepares to leave the Senate, not for a well-deserved retirement but for new challenges, this time in academia, I offer my sincere gratitude to Senator ALAN K. SIMPSON for his professionalism, for his friendship, for his leadership, for his wit, for his candor, and for his many years of dedicated service to our Nation.

As Thomas Paine once wrote:

I love the man that can smile in trouble, that can gather strength from distress, and grow brave by reflection. 'Tis the business of little minds to shrink; but he whose heart is firm, and whose conscience approves his conduct, will pursue his principle unto death.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BREAUX addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I was very privileged to be in the Chamber as the senior Senator from West Virginia was making his remarks. I commend him for acknowledging one of our friends and leaders of the Senate who is

going to be such a loss as we lose so many of our retiring Members who have contributed so much. I think Senator BYRD's comments about our good friend serve him very well. I wish I could have said them as eloquently, but I join with him in commending Senator ALAN SIMPSON.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend. I am sure that Senator SIMPSON will be grateful for the expressions that have been made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAU].

Mr. BREAU. I thank the Senator.

U.S. TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. BREAU. Mr. President, I take the floor to make some comments on the current situation in this Senate with regard to relations with some of the other countries that we enter into negotiations with on a regular basis. I think today is a sad day for this country with regard to our relations with other countries with whom we negotiate treaties. In fact, this has been a sad week. This has been a sad Congress because despite the best efforts of many in this administration who have negotiated with friends and allies in other countries around the world for years, indeed decades, this Congress this session failed to follow through and ratify or approve these treaties that have been negotiated in good faith and signed by other countries including the United States. Just this session we failed to enact in this Congress a chemical weapons treaty.

Yesterday, I took the floor to lament the fact that this Congress and this Senate has refused to ratify the OECD agreement on shipping, which was negotiated for years and years and years, which our country signed and every country that signed with us expected us to ratify. It will not even be brought up in the Senate. Indeed, it was a sad week, and today unfortunately once again I say how terribly disappointed I am that apparently the Tuna-Dolphin Treaty, which this and previous administrations have worked on, which this country has signed along with 10 other countries around the world, will not be enacted in this Congress.

If I was a delegate from some other country, I would say, "You know, I don't think I want to negotiate with the United States and spend a decade of trying to enter into an agreement which we all agree on and then have forces in the Congress stop it from even being considered." This Tuna-Dolphin Treaty, which we will apparently not bring up, was supported by the administration. I have letters from Vice President AL GORE, on two separate occasions, to the Republican leader, the Democratic leader, and to Members of Congress saying this is an important treaty, that it should be passed this session. Yet we have forces that say, "No, it is not going to be considered. It is not going to be taken up."

It is interesting that some will say it is not environmentally strong enough.

The Vice President's letter to Senator DASCHLE and myself and to Senator LOTT and everybody else points out the strong support that this treaty has from environmental groups, from fishing groups, from industry groups. It points out that this treaty is supported by major environmental groups including Greenpeace, the World Wildlife Fund, the National Wildlife Federation, the Center for Marine Conservation, the Environmental Defense Fund—all have pledged their support. I commend them, because many times we have not been on the same side on some of these fisheries issues that I have been dealing with for over 20 years as a Member of Congress. But they recognize, as I do, that this agreement is by far the best agreement that countries could ever enter into, to allow an industry of multimillions of dollars to coexist with environmentalists who are legitimately concerned about protecting dolphin as fishermen are catching tuna in the same vicinity, the same areas.

There have been strong editorials endorsing this agreement from the New York Times and from the Washington Post, saying that this, indeed, is a solid and sound environmental treaty and should be adopted by the Congress—and we are not going to even be able to bring it up.

The countries around the world that do tuna fishing and have conflicts with dolphin, that have agreed to make major and significant changes to the way they catch tuna in order to implement this treaty, are now going to have the United States say: Well, we got you to negotiate it, we got you to sign it, we got you to make these concessions, we got you to put observers on your boats but, guess what, we are not going to ratify it now. Sorry, we were just joking.

What kind of feeling do these countries that have spent these years negotiating with us have when they find out Congress is not going to follow through? Countries like Mexico, Venezuela, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Belize, Honduras, France, and Japan, who fish in the eastern tropical Pacific, Spain, Colombia, Vanuatu, all of these countries have negotiated this agreement in good faith. Environmental groups have signed off. The Vice President of the United States has sent two strong letters saying this should be passed this year, yet we will not bring it up.

I would say that those who think that they somehow are doing something to protect dolphin by killing this treaty are going to find that just the opposite will occur. When these countries that I have just read off find out the United States has turned its back on them at this late date, what incentive do they have to continue to follow the rules of this treaty? None. Mexico, for one, will probably—they should—file a GATT violation against our country because, right now, we are unilaterally banning the importation of tuna caught without following procedures

that we have determined are the best procedures. That, in this Senator's opinion, is a clear violation of GATT because it sets into effect a unilateral embargo which is not based on science and not based on environmental concerns whatsoever. It is my opinion, if they proceed—and why should they not?—now to file a complaint against our country for a unilateral embargo of their product, then I suggest that, unfortunately, they will probably win that case against our country.

But even more important than some case before a GATT commission, as serious as that is, I am very concerned that other environmental efforts that people negotiate and try to enter into agreements on with these countries will not be able to be reached. We have just worked very hard with Mexico in order to get them to agree—and the Presiding Officer now in the chair knows this—to get Mexico to agree to take certain actions to protect turtles in their area. We have to do it in our country, and our shrimpers are adversely affected, but we are doing it. We have tried to get other countries to follow the same rules and regulations that we are following in trying to protect turtles. Yet, when we tell them with this agreement, "We do not care what you negotiate, we are not going to enact it," then they are not going to have an incentive to follow these new rules and regulations that they have agreed to.

It is most unfortunate—most unfortunate—we are not able to enact this agreement, which has such far-reaching meaning as far as conservation is concerned.

The current situation is, I think, not very good, frankly. We have all of our people who buy tuna in stores have it labeled "dolphin safe," and that is supposed to mean it was caught without any dolphin being killed by the fishermen. But it only affects one type of fishing, and that is the encirclement method, where fishermen encircle their nets around an area where dolphin are in order to catch the tuna that are below the dolphin. But fishermen can currently use any other effort, from log fishing, from school fishing, from kill fishing for tuna with nets of a certain size, and kill dolphin in the process and still allow it to come into this country and label it "dolphin safe." That is not dolphin safe, if you take it to mean that dolphin should not be killed.

This agreement, for the first time, says we do not care how you fish, let us look at all the methods, and if the methods then produce tuna without any dolphin being killed, then you can label it dolphin safe. That is a huge improvement over the current situation, a huge improvement over the current practices by the industry out there because it looks at all methods of fishing, not just one method of fishing.

So it is very unfortunate that we will not be able to enact this legislation. It really has been bipartisan. We have had professional scientists who are not Republican or Democrat negotiate this