

War II and SAM NUNN enlisted as a seaman some 20 years later when the world faced other stresses.

SAM NUNN leaves the Senate at a relatively early age with a solid record of accomplishment. I wish him well in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HATFIELD

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as my own time in the Senate draws to a close, I find myself reflecting on those people and events that I will remember always.

A man who holds a unique place in my regard and that of many others in the Senate is the senior Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD). He came to the Senate in 1967, 6 years after I did, and he has become a Senator known for his intelligence, acuity, grace, and for love of his State and country.

The State of Oregon has a fine heritage. Mr. HATFIELD has a number of distinguished predecessors. A fellow Oregonian, Senator Wayne Morse, voted in 1964 against the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution that provided the congressional blessing for what later became the Vietnam War.

MARK HATFIELD was not in the Senate at that time. He was then Governor of Oregon. But in 1965 MARK HATFIELD cast the only vote at the National Governor's Conference in opposition to a resolution supporting President Johnson's Vietnam war policy.

He has taken other principled and unpopular positions over time. In 1981 he joined with my friend, the senior senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) in spearheading the Senate campaign for a nuclear freeze.

He has been a constant advocate of restraint in the nuclear arms race, limits on defense spending, an end to nuclear testing and a code of conduct in international arms transfers.

Some of Senator HATFIELD's efforts such as the Nuclear Freeze in the 1980's or the effort in the last several years to enact the code of conduct on arms transfers have not come to fruition. Other endeavors, such as his effort to bring about a comprehensive test ban have been smashing successes. It was Senator HATFIELD's own initiative in 1992 as ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations that led to the U.S. moratorium on nuclear testing and led to the eventual ending of testing by all the nuclear powers and the completion this summer of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Like John the Baptist, MARK HATFIELD has often been a voice crying in the wilderness. It is not however a role in life he has regretted. He has felt obligated to speak his convictions and to let his judgments be known throughout his Senate career.

Mr. President, as a naval lieutenant (j.g.) in the Navy, MARK HATFIELD commanded landing craft in some of the bloodiest battles World War II in the Pacific. He was one of the first military officers to enter Hiroshima after

the atomic blast destroyed that city in 1945. I was in the North Atlantic in Coast Guard escort duty during World War II, and I know some of the emotions MARK HATFIELD's experiences must have stirred in him and the feelings that remain after. I can tell you that, if you have seen combat, it is quite possible for you to become zealous in your desire to find solutions other than war and other than military buildups to the problems you face. Among other things, having seen combat, you do not want to capriciously subject your children or anyone else's children or loved ones, to the horrors of war.

The needless and pointless sacrifices of some conflicts, such as Vietnam, weighs heavily if you are in the position of participating in important national decisions, as MARK HATFIELD has been.

Senator HATFIELD has spoken to us all on the floor with great eloquence over time about the value of arms control and of the importance of peace to all Americans. In 1990, he told the Senate:

Peace is not the town in Pennsylvania which last year was forced to cancel its high school graduation because officials believed that a group of students planned to commit suicide at the ceremony. And peace is not here in Washington—where after leading the Nation in murders last year, children are beginning to show the same psychological trauma as children in Belfast, Northern Ireland.

Can we really believe that the decisions we have made—and are making—do not have a direct relationship to the violence which plagues our Nation?

I suggest that we consider changing the motto on our coins. Mr. President, It now reads: In God We Trust—but by blindly pursuing the nuclear arms race, by putting the destruction of life over the preservation of life, we have forsaken our trust in God. We have shaken our fist at God—as E.B. White once put it, we have stolen God's stuff. Our motto ought to be: In Bombs We Trust. That is our national ethic—that is the example we are setting—here, on this floor.

In a time when too many opinions are formed on the basis of the latest polling results, it is good to have among us a Senator like MARK HATFIELD who moves unswervingly ahead toward what he perceives on the basis of his intelligence and experience to be the best course for the Nation and to continue the avid pursuit of what he sees as truly best for all of the people of America.

In his 30 years in the Senate MARK HATFIELD has tried time and again to do what is right. He has been willing to live with defeat, but he has been steadfast in his willingness to try and try again, so long as a chance at victory is in sight.

Mr. President, I am sure that the voters of Oregon, of Rhode Island, and of other States will do their best to make good choices in the next election. We will be replaced by people with different skills and capabilities, and many of them will have distinguished careers here in the Senate. There will

not be another MARK HATFIELD, however. The nation should be thankful that it has been blessed with Senator HATFIELD's service.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR SIMON

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I first met the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] some 40 years ago in Moscow when we found ourselves sitting next to each other at the Bolshoi Ballet. Little did we ever think that our paths would intertwine so closely in the years that were to follow.

After PAUL came to the House of Representatives in 1974, we found ourselves in close collaboration in advancing the cause of education. We worked together on a myriad of education issues when he was chairman of the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education. When he came to the Senate more than a decade ago, he joined me on the Education Subcommittee and we have worked even more closely together on education issues since.

There is no Member of either House whose opinion on education issues I respect more. PAUL SIMON is the person we turn to for guidance on the subjects of literacy and adult education. His is the counsel I have valued most in higher education, on issues such as TRIO, institutional aid, international education, graduate education, foreign language instruction, and student aid. Even when we disagreed, as we did on direct loans, I listened to what PAUL SIMON said, and I have had a deep and abiding respect for his advocacy of that cause. While I have normally deferred to PAUL on library issues, I must candidly admit that the opinion of Jean, PAUL's wonderfully talented wife, carried equal weight on those matters.

During PAUL's first term in the Senate, our paths were to become further intertwined when he became a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. During his 8 years as a member of the committee he brought to its work the energy, creativity, and intellectual capacity which are his hallmarks. Much of that time he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa and he was tireless and eloquent in urging the committee's attention to the plight of that often neglected continent.

PAUL SIMON is very much an internationalist and he made important contributions in such areas as human rights, arms control, and foreign assistance. I deeply appreciate having him as an ally in the efforts to reinvigorate the Arms Control and Disarmament Administration and to restrain the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. He was a true stalwart.

Finally, Mr. President, he brought his passion for the teaching of foreign languages to the field of foreign policy. He consistently pressed the State Department to broaden its foreign language capabilities and every State Department nominee knew that, during a nomination hearing, Senator SIMON

was likely to grill him or her on how fluent they were in the language of the country to which they had been assigned. Alas, too often Senator SIMON learned that the fluency was minimal, but he never ceased to press the Department to improve.

Throughout the period we have worked together, I have never failed to be impressed by the depth of PAUL's knowledge, the quiet deliberation with which he pursued his goals, the strength of his convictions, and perhaps most important, the wisdom of his counsel. I can think of no more decent and dedicated public servant.

OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, yesterday, I was 1 of only 15 Senators to vote against the omnibus spending bill.

Mr. President, I deplore the process by which this bill was created.

Mr. President, when the Republicans took over the Congress—the Democrats were spending about \$503 billion on domestic programs. Last year, after holding firm on principle we cut that to \$488 billion. Now that number is back up to \$503 billion.

Because we already have a \$5 trillion debt, the billions in new spending represent a new 30-year obligation for our citizens. This is an obligation that we cannot afford.

Next year, we will have to cut \$10 billion to get back on track and keep our commitments under the 1997 budget resolution. The budget resolution was the blueprint by which we would achieve a balanced budget in 7 years by the year 2002. We have already changed the plan and this is just year one.

There were supposed to be offsets to this new spending. But they were phony offsets.

The so-called refinancing of the savings insurance fund for the S&L problems is really coming from the banking industry. That money is to be used in a separate fund in case of future S&L failures. But the Congress has decided that we should use it to offset more spending.

We cut the defense budget further. Yet, the defense budget, in real dollars, has been cut in half since 1984.

While the President says on the campaign trail that he is not a liberal his aides were back here in Washington forcing us to spend more money on more liberal programs, cutting defense, and using accounting gimmicks to justify all of this.

This kind of game has gone on for too long, and it has to stop.

If we care so much for the children, why don't we leave them a country that is less in debt, not more in debt.

The wasteful spending that is littered throughout this bill is truly astounding. More foreign aid spending. Over \$200 million for the United Nations, a bloated, wasteful bureaucracy. Over \$200 million for the Advance Technology Program in the Commerce Department—this program has prin-

cipally been known as the prince of corporate pork—serving Fortune 500 companies.

This is \$40 million more for D.C. schools, even though they spend \$9,000 per student, more than any other city in the United States.

And, \$196 million for Howard University in the District of Columbia, \$4 billion more for the Department of Education, \$82 million for the National Endowment of the Arts, \$1.6 million for the Kennedy Center, money for a new defense program called Security at International Sporting Events, \$9 million for 100 percent guaranteed international housing loans, \$1.9 million for supervision of the Teamsters election, \$27 million for debt restructuring with Latin America countries, \$19 million for the International Fund for Ireland, \$5 million for the victims of Chernobyl, and the creation of a new Middle East Development Bank in which we authorize over \$1 billion to be spent.

Mr. President, can we really afford this kind of spending. If we can't stop it where is it going to stop. This is the reason why I voted against this bill.

Now, Mr. President, I am grateful for the funding for Hurricane Fran in my State. This money will be helpful to that State, but my concern was that in order to vote for that funding—so much waste was attached to the bill—that on balance North Carolinians would be worse off for it.

Mr. President, finally, I am disappointed with the results of the illegal immigration bill.

Once again, the President campaigns like a moderate, but those are not the policies he advocates in Washington.

How can we stop illegal immigration if we continue to provide benefits to those that come here illegally.

The President has essentially forced ever school district in this country to educate, at taxpayers expense, children of parents who are in this country illegally. What kind of respect for the law does this demonstrate.

Mr. President, this Congress has made great progress on many issues. We fell just one vote short of getting a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. We made great strides in cutting spending. But in the wee hours of the morning this weekend, we had to give the President what he wanted or else he, not us, would have shut the Government down.

This is a shame, but next year the process will start again, and we have to be dedicated to reducing this debt on the American people by reducing the kinds of waste that we approved yesterday.

Thank you Mr. President, I yield the floor.

FAREWELL TO RETIRING COLLEAGUES

JIM EXON

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it has been a real pleasure serving with JIM EXON in the Senate. I have always ad-

mired his independence, dedication to his fellow Nebraskans, and his sense of humor.

As a small businessman, he brought an important perspective to our consideration of legislation; and as a former Governor, he never forgot about the important role of State governments.

On matters ranging from the budget to agriculture, in the minority or in the majority, he demonstrated amazing technical expertise as well as skillful and fair handling of debate.

I will miss Senator EXON and wish him the best in all his future plans.

NANCY KASSEBAUM

I want to congratulate our colleague from Kansas, NANCY KASSEBAUM, for her adroit and amicable leadership of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee.

As one who has "been there, done that," I can say with authority that she has led the committee expertly and fairly; and she surely deserves our commendation for delivering landmark health insurance reform legislation as well as so many other important measures in public health and education. And, no matter what side of a contentious labor issue one happens to be on, every Senator should admire the courage with which Senator KASSEBAUM tackled issues in labor and employment policy.

I know that NANCY is devoted to her family, and I can well appreciate that her future occupation is reported to be that of grandmother. It may be the only calling higher than leading public policy in some of the key and most pressing domestic and foreign policy issues. But, perhaps she will be training the next generation of Landons to follow her example of distinguished public service.

CLAIBORNE PELL

The Senate will indeed be a very different place as we say goodbye to our third most senior Member, the senior Senator from Rhode Island, CLAIBORNE PELL. Senator PELL has served the State of Rhode Island and our country extraordinarily well for over 35 years.

While Senator PELL has put his indelible mark on foreign policy as a long-time chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, it was through our common membership on the Labor and Human Resources Committee that I know him best.

Senator PELL will long be remembered for helping millions of young people achieve success by making a college education more accessible through the grant program which bears his name. He has helped more people gain access to the arts and cultural enrichment programs by sponsoring the law establishing the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities.

It is hard to name a single education initiative that he has not been instrumental in enacting.

And, I might add, Mr. President, that Senator PELL's unfailing sense of civility and decorum, his insistence on fair