

Senate will lose. Rather than say a lot about each of them, I just want to make some observations and take a look at those folks who are leaving the Senate this year. What they have contributed to this country is so at odds with what so many Americans think of politicians and perhaps even of the U.S. Senate these days.

There has been a public sport in the last decade or so in the negative politics of today that I suppose serves some interest. There are those who are trying to diminish or hurt this institution by suggesting that somehow the U.S. Senate, as an institution, is an unworthy place, that Members who serve in it are slothful, indolent folks who sleep till noon and perhaps then go to the club and maybe work an hour in the afternoon before they take a nap, and go home shortly after the nap.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The U.S. Senate is an extraordinary place, and the people who serve here are extraordinary people. I have never in my life had the privilege of serving with so many wonderful people, who are smart, dedicated, tough, honest, and hard-working people. They are on both sides of the aisle, Republican and Democrat.

When I look at this list of names, I think of the people here who work day and night, in many cases 7 days a week, including traveling in their States. You see them here early in the morning, you see them here late at night, always working. That is more the rule in the U.S. Senate with most all Members of the U.S. Senate.

But when I look at the people who are leaving at the end of this Congress, there are those who have been here a good number of years, and have substantial experience. They are going to be hard to replace. Oh, they will be replaced. There is no question about that. Yet it is hard to replace the kind of experience that comes with the service of SAM NUNN from Georgia or NANCY KASSEBAUM from Kansas, and I could go through the list of others as well.

I think it is interesting that in this age of discussion about term limits comes the suggestion by some that what is wrong with our country is that there are those who have too much experience. I have said it before, and I will say it again because I think it bears repeating. I wouldn't have traded one Bob Dole for all 73 freshmen House Republicans in terms of experience and service. What Senator Dole gave to this Senate for so many decades is an extraordinary commitment to public service. Now, I am not supporting him for President, and I am quick to point that out to my colleagues. But, I have a deep admiration for the extended service given our country by some of the great legislators in this country's history.

To suggest somehow that we should not have had the experience of Barry Goldwater or Hubert Humphrey, we should not have had the experience of

Calhoun or Clay or Webster, the experience they gave us over so many years, really does not make much sense to me.

But, I did not come here to debate term limits. I came here to say that those who depart this Senate and who have contributed enormously to this country by their service in this Senate, demonstrate, the substantial commitment that so many people over two centuries have made to this country by serving in the U.S. Senate.

This service, for me, has been the greatest privilege of my life. I come from a town of 300 people and a high school class of 9. I never expected to be sworn in to the U.S. Senate. It is an extraordinary privilege, and I know that all of those who are leaving believe it to be so.

I add my voice to so many others who have, by name and person to person, described those who have been here and what they have contributed in the U.S. Senate. This is a remarkable group of Republicans and Democrats who have contributed greatly to our country, and I salute all of them, and I wish them well in their travels and all of their future endeavors.

TRANSFER OF SMALL BUSINESS AND FAMILY FARMS

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I want to mention two quick pieces of business. I have introduced a piece of legislation at the end of this Congress, intending to take it up in January again when a new Congress convenes, dealing with the estate taxes that we now have in our country. My piece of legislation deals specifically with the transfer of small businesses and family farms from parents to children.

The economy in this country is a kind of an interesting economy. We have large corporations which are given life only because we have given them life by law. We have said, by law, we will allow there to be created artificial people. They can sue and be sued, contract and be contracted with, even have names, but they are artificial. They don't live. They don't give blood. They don't have a beating heart. It is an artificial person. A corporation is recognized in law as artificial.

The interesting thing about the corporation is that it doesn't die. General Motors might get long in the tooth, but General Motors isn't going to die. It isn't going to have kidney failure or have heart disease. General Motors won't die. But a small business run by a husband and wife or a family is different. The husband and wife who start the business and run the business, they die.

So what happens when a family farm or a family business finds itself in a circumstance where the mother and the father who started that business and were running that business pass away. What happens when they want to transfer that business to the son or daughter?

Well, what happens too often is the son and daughter end up owning the business, plus a \$300,000 or \$400,000 tax bill from an estate tax burden that they must pay in order to run the business that their father and mother started. That does not make much sense to me.

Our incentive ought to be to try to say to the children, "You want to continue to run the family business? We want to help you do that. It's in our interest to help you do that." It is in our interest to continue those jobs and to see that businesses continue, as a family farmer or family business.

I have proposed a piece of legislation which would provide for up to \$1.5 million of transferred assets to the children without an estate tax obligation. Those children can then inherit a business and be able to run the business, providing they want to run it.

If they do not want to run the family business, as far as I am concerned, whatever the current estate tax is, that is the tax imposed. If they want to continue to run that business for the next 10 years, I want that family farmer or business to operate without a crushing burden of estate taxes. And my legislation will accomplish that.

The estate tax was originally conceived during the Civil War to finance the Civil War. It has had fits and starts and various turns since then. We ought to make certain the estate tax, as a revenue device, does not interrupt the continuity of a family business or family farm in which the children wish to continue as a viable family business or family farm.

That was the intent of the legislation I have introduced at the end of this session. Of course, without an opportunity for action on it, I will have to, in January or February, in the new Congress, turn to it again and see if we can make some progress on it. I expect there will be bipartisan support for legislation of this type, and I hope that we will see some success.

THE TRADE DEFICIT

Mr. DORGAN. Finally, while I will not characterize this Congress, because it would take too long, I do want to say that one of the pieces of unfinished business in the Congress deals with trade. I want to just discuss that for a moment.

There are failures in this Congress and successes; and we can point to both. The 104th Congress is one of the strangest Congresses I have ever seen operate. It had more twists and turns than a road in hilly country.

It just started out with the kind of bizarre circumstance of people saying, "Well, we have no experience, and we're new here, and we don't intend to compromise. We got here because we bragged we have no experience, and we intend to prove we don't have any in the first 90 days. We don't intend to compromise on anything. And if you

don't like it, we'll shut the Government down." And it went on and on, and it was a mess.

The American people, I think, did not like it much. The first year of this Congress was not a very productive year. The second year of this Congress, I think, was a productive year, especially the last 6 months. Progress was made on a health care reform bill, on the minimum wage, on immigration reform, on welfare reform, and on a range of issues that I think are important to this country. I think the credit for that can be given to a bipartisan spirit of cooperation in the waning months of this Congress.

But the one issue that was not dealt with, and has never been dealt with by this Congress, is an issue dealing with deficits. And, no, it is not the budget deficit. It is the trade deficit.

The budget deficit is down, way down, down more than by one-half. So the budget deficit has been coming down and moving in the right direction. But the trade deficit has not. Yet, almost no one discusses the trade deficit.

As I conclude my remarks today, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an article written by the economist Lester Thurow. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DORGAN. It is entitled, "Awaiting the Crisis." This is by Lester Thurow, MIT economist. The subtitle is, "It's fundamental: No country can run a trade deficit forever."

And I want to read part of it.

When something has gone on for a long time, human beings have a tendency to act as if it could go on forever—even when they know that it cannot. Consider the triangular trading pattern between the United States, Japan, and most of the rest of East Asia. Japan runs a huge trade surplus with the United States and now an even larger one with the other countries of East Asia, most of which pay for their enormous trade deficits with Japan by running even bigger trade surpluses with the United States. The United States ends up with a current account deficit (more than \$150 billion in 1995) that is mostly attributable to its unfavorable balance of trade with Japan and most of the rest of East Asia.

He does not say it, but he should also include Mexico and Canada.

Yet if there is one thing that we know about international trade, it is that no country, not even one as big as the United States, can run a trade deficit forever. Money must be borrowed to pay for the deficit, but money must also be borrowed to pay interest on previous borrowing.

And he goes on. The merchandise trade deficit in this country last year was \$170 billion. And it is growing. There was a great deal of activity on this floor during this Congress talking about the budget deficit. The Federal budget deficit is diminishing, going down, way down. The trade deficit is going up. There has been almost no dis-

cussion about this on this floor except for myself and a couple of others.

What discussion does exist on this floor is generally referred to by others, the very people who have put us in this trade position, who say, "Well, that's simply the complaining by a few certifiable stooges that don't have any training at all."

Lester Thurow is right. No country can run a trade deficit forever. We can see Americans who wear Chinese shirts, Mexican shorts, and Italian shoes, and drive Japanese cars, and watch television on Taiwanese television sets, and then complain about their jobs. "What's happened to my job? I'm paid less. I don't have job security."

It simply does not add up. To the extent we have large trade deficits, because we import more than we export, it means that the manufacturing base of our country diminishes. No world economic power will long remain a world economic power unless it has a sustainable manufacturing base. You cannot move all that you produce overseas and still believe you will remain a strong economic power.

I am not suggesting that our country ought to have a policy by which we establish walls and prevent goods from coming in. I am not saying that at all. What I am saying is that we must have a trade policy that tries to move us toward some kind of trade balance so we get rid of these crippling trade deficits.

My colleague, Senator BYRD, from West Virginia, and I introduced a piece of legislation that we had hoped would be passed by this Congress in the waning days, and it was not. It would have established an emergency commission to end the trade deficit. Under this bill a commission would be impaneled to give us recommendations on how can we tackle this trade deficit, and what kinds of policies this country can employ to reduce this trade deficit.

The trade deficit must be repaid with a lower standard of living in our country. There is not any economist that will argue otherwise. To have a trade deficit that is this large, the largest in human history, and growing, is very dangerous for our country.

That does not argue, as I said, for protectionism. It does not argue for providing consumers with fewer choices. It simply argues that you must have some kind of balance in your trade policies. It suggests to other countries that there are reciprocal responsibilities.

Let me give you an example.

China sends us an enormous amount of products to be sold in our marketplace. And that is fine with me. But then what happens when China needs airplanes. And it does, because it does not manufacture airplanes except for small airplanes, some 50-seat airplanes. It does not manufacture the large planes. When China needs airplanes, because it has a \$30-billion-plus surplus with us, or we have a deficit with them of over \$30 billion, you would think

that China would say, "All right, you buy the things that we produce that you need, so now when we need something you produce, airplanes, we'll buy them from you." It is not the way it works.

China says to us, "We'd like to buy some of your Boeing airplanes. By the way, you must manufacture them in China. Yes. We'll buy your products if you manufacture them in China." I do not understand that. It does not make any sense to me, particularly with a country that is running up a giant trade surplus with us or is putting us in a position to have an enormous deficit with them. When it intends to buy something that we produce, it has a responsibility to buy it from our country, from our workers and from our producers.

The same is true with wheat. I will use China again, although I could use others. China has this enormous trade surplus with us, growing in a very significant way. It buys wheat, and we should be thankful that it buys wheat. But, it is off price shopping with other countries to try to figure out where it can buy discount wheat. China has a responsibility to buy wheat from us. When it is running up a \$30-billion-plus trade surplus or putting us in a deficit position, it has a responsibility to us to buy our wheat.

I could talk at great length about Mexico and Japan and China and Canada. These countries have the significant portion of our trade deficit, and we should talk with them about the need for reciprocal trade policies. But I did not come to the floor to do that. I came to the floor to point out that Lester Thurow, the MIT economist, has written "No country can run a trade deficit forever."

Those in this country who have a nagging feeling somewhere between their brain and the pit of their belly understand what it is. Unfortunately, economists in this town do not and most politicians do not. That nagging feeling of uneasiness is to see a country whose manufacturing is increasingly moving elsewhere. It is not simply the manufacturing of low-skilled circumstances. No, it is the manufacturing with high-skilled labor that is moving elsewhere. The result is we are left in this country with jobs that move from high skill to low skill, from higher pay to lower pay, and from more security to less security. That hurts this country.

My message to the Congress and the President is that we cannot continue to ignore this problem. This article I asked to have printed in the RECORD is entitled "Awaiting the Crisis."

I remember in the last Congress we had a significant debate about NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement. We were promised by economists and others that if we would pass NAFTA with Mexico and Canada, we would see several hundred thousand new jobs in our country. It turns out we passed NAFTA. I did not support it.

I actively opposed it. We not only did not get 300,000 new jobs; we lost more than 300,000 jobs. One recent study places the job loss closer to 500,000 jobs.

It turns out the substantial new imports from Mexico are not imports resulting from low-wage, low-skill jobs. Instead, the imports are largely the result of high-skilled jobs that are still paying low wages in Mexico. They are the result of jobs in electronics, automobiles, and automobile parts. Those are jobs that used to be ours that are now south of the border.

I, personally, do not see that it advances this country's interest to put together trade strategies that result in jobs moving overseas. I might say with respect to that, just parenthetically, we not only have a trade policy that encourages that, we also have a tax policy that says, "By the way, shut your American plant, fire your American workers, and move your jobs overseas and we will give you a big fat tax break."

Twice I tried to get that changed on the floor of the Senate and twice I lost. But I will be back, because we will vote again on that in the next session of Congress. It might be in the interest of the largest international corporations to collect a tax break from moving jobs from Fargo or Bangor or Pittsburgh or Denver to Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, China, or Korea, but it is not in our interests. It might be in their interests, but it is not in ours. We ought to deal with that.

Madam President, this is an issue that the next Congress must tackle. Senator BYRD, the Senator from West Virginia, and I will reintroduce the legislation that we introduced toward the end of this session dealing with an emergency commission to end the trade deficit. I will continue to stimulate and agitate, if necessary, on this.

We must address this issue, but not in a way that retreats from the interests of expanded and open markets. We must address it in a way that focuses on what is in our economic interest as a country. We must not address it in a way that allows those who sloganeer about protectionism to claim anyone who does not share their view is protectionist.

How do we, at the same time as we countenance largely open markets, insist on our trading partners opening their markets to American producers and the products made by American workers? How do we do that? The failure to do that means we load our kids with debt that they will have to repay with a lower standard of living. This is not the budget debt. This is trade debt. The merchandise trade deficit this past year is close to \$170 billion.

Madam President, let me again, as I conclude, pay honor and tribute to those who leave the U.S. Senate. It has been a privilege to me to serve with them.

EXHIBIT 1

AWAITING THE CRISIS

When something has gone on for a long time, human beings have a tendency to act

as if it could go on forever—even when they know that it cannot. Consider the triangular trading pattern between the United States, Japan, and most of the rest of East Asia. Japan runs a huge trade surplus with the United States and now an even larger one with the other countries of East Asia, most of which pay for their enormous trade deficits with Japan by running even bigger trade surpluses with the United States. The United States ends up with a current account deficit (more than \$150 billion in 1995) that is mostly attributable to its unfavorable balance of trade with Japan and most of the rest of East Asia.

Yet if there is one thing that we know about international trade, it is that no country, not even one as big as the United States, can run a trade deficit forever. Money must be borrowed to pay for the deficit, but money must also be borrowed to pay interest on previous borrowing. Even if the annual trade deficit does not grow, interest payments do until they are so large that they can no longer be financed. Americans can also sell their assets (land, companies, buildings) to foreigners to finance deficits, but that approach is also limited since eventually there will be nothing of value left to sell.

At some point the world's capital markets will quit lending to Americans (the risk of default and of being paid back in a currency of much lower value are simply too great), just as they have quit lending to everyone else. The question is not whether the end will come. It will. The question is when and how fast. Will it come as one big shock or as a series of smaller shocks that do less damage?

But no one knows, or can know, when or how fast. Economics is quite good when it comes to assessing fundamental forces, but it is horrible at timing and speed of adjustment. Economic theory simply says nothing about either.

When the ends comes, the biggest effects will be felt in most of the up-and-coming countries of East Asia. They will lose not just their United States market and trade surpluses but also their ability to run a trade deficit with Japan and finance the importation of Japanese products, including components and spare parts. Since much of what they sell in their domestic markets depends on these Japanese imports, cutbacks in production will have to be far larger than what a simple elimination of United States trade surpluses would indicate.

Many of the East Asian countries that think they have reduced their dependence on the American market in recent years will find that they have not. South Korea now sells less than it once did to the United States and more to China than ever before, but China could not afford to buy from South Korea if it did not have a trade surplus with the United States. As China's sales fall in America, its purchases from South Korea will have to fall as well.

In addition, many of the countries in East Asia have their debts denominated in yen, even though most of their sales are denominated in dollars. As a result, when the yen rises in value vis-à-vis the dollar, the real value of their debts explodes. This effect was already apparent as the dollar slid from 120 yen to 80 yen over the last couple of years. Indonesia and China would have been in a lot of trouble if the dollar had not recovered.

As a consequence, when the United States loses its ability to finance its trade deficit, Japan will lose not just its American sales but also most of its East Asian sales. A few countries in East Asia, such as Taiwan, have large foreign-exchange reserves and will be able to continue to import Japanese components and spare parts. But most other have little in the way of foreign-exchange re-

serves—without their American sales these countries will become uncreditworthy. Their Japanese purchases will have to end almost instantly. Having lost their United States and Asian export surpluses, Japan's big export industries will have to undergo a big contraction.

Paradoxically, the problems will be the least severe in the United States. The standard of living there will certainly decline as imports fall back into balance with exports, but United States companies, such as auto manufacturers, will quickly add third shifts and expand production to grab the sales and market share that companies in Japan and the rest of East Asia will be forced to give up. The problems of the United States will be minor compared with those of Japan and the rest of East Asia.

Given this reality, governments should act now to rebalance trading patterns in order to avoid the crisis that will emerge if current trends are simply allowed to play themselves out. Everyone knows that a gradual readjustment that is deliberately engineered now will be a lot less painful than a sudden, market-forced adjustment at some point in the future.

But it is just as clear that these governments will fail to act in time. They will instead wait for the crisis to arrive.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEPARTING COLLEAGUES

Mr. GORTON. Madam President, 2, or 3 days ago I had the opportunity to speak on the floor about those of our colleagues on this side of the aisle who are ending their Senate careers with the termination and adjournment of this Congress.

I wanted to take this opportunity to speak briefly about my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are doing the same thing with particular reference to one who has become a special friend.

Many people have paid well earned tribute to the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. BRADLEY, for his brilliance, dedication, and purposefulness; to a particular colleague, Senator EXON of Nebraska, with whom I have been privileged to serve on both the Budget Committee and the Commerce Committee whose wit, sense of humor, and ability to diffuse difficult situations is wonderfully welcome; to perhaps a favorite of many, Senator SIMON of Illinois who, even when one disagrees frequently with him on issues, is always unfailingly friendly, thoughtful, forgiving, and forthcoming; to the courtly and courteous Senator PELL from Rhode Island.

Madam President, all are individuals that we will miss.

SENATOR BENNETT JOHNSTON

But I want to especially pay tribute to my dear friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Louisiana, BENNETT JOHNSTON; with common interests

in many matters relating to energy, to all sorts of natural resources, to our parks, and particularly to a balanced Federal budget; the companionship that we had in search of a bipartisan solution to those questions and of the balanced budget during the course of the last year or two. We would be closer in any event.

But, Madam President, I want to put on the Record one unique set of circumstances that binds the two of us together in a way that illustrates in some respects how small this world is.

When I first came to the U.S. Senate in 1981, Senator JOHNSTON had been here for a considerable period of time and was a leading, highly respected, and very, very thoughtful Member of this body.

About 6 months after I was here, I visited at length my mother, who died just a couple of months afterward, at her home in Massachusetts, and was talking to her with great enthusiasm about this new challenge of my life and this new career; describing the friendships I had made, at which point I said, "One of the Democrats, mother, that I like best of all is BENNETT JOHNSTON. You know, he comes from Shreveport, LA, where your sister lived and raised her children, my cousins. I just think that BENNETT JOHNSTON is a really terrific Senator." And my mother smiled at me, and responded, and said, "Well, Slade, when you go back to the Senate, you ask Senator JOHNSTON whether he knows that his father proposed to me while we were undergraduates at Louisiana State University."

Well, Madam President, Senator JOHNSTON obviously did not know that his father had proposed unsuccessfully to my mother before he met and married the Senator's mother. But that brought us close enough together that he and I have called one another cousin ever since.

Madam President, of all of the people whom I will miss in this body at the end of this Congress, I want to say that I will very, very much miss my cousin, BENNETT JOHNSTON of Louisiana.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BILL COHEN

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute and bid a reluctant farewell to an outstanding leader, friend, colleague, and mentor—and an individual who has been a tremendous credit to this institution and to his home State—the senior Senator from Maine, BILL COHEN.

The U.S. Senate is often referred to as the greatest deliberative body on earth, a reflection on the stature of its most outstanding individuals throughout our history. These leaders have all faced different challenges in different ages, but share the traits that bind men and women to greatness: courage, integrity, and a thoughtful approach to the issues of the day. They are people for whom public service is a calling, not a career; and a solemn trust not ever to be broken.

Senator BILL COHEN is one of these people.

BILL COHEN grew up in Bangor, ME, and would forever be instilled with the solid, common-sense, honest characteristics that are the hallmark of any good Mainer. From humble but hard-working roots, BILL COHEN would learn the values that have made him a great legislator, and a great leader.

Mainers are a proud and independent people, who believe in thinking for themselves but also in helping each other. They understand that there are no free rides—no endless summers. For every action there is a consequence, and with every right comes a responsibility. People are expected to make the most of the opportunities they have, but also to make certain those opportunities exist for others. They insist that a person keep their promises and be true to their word. And they believe the ultimate measure of any man or woman is how close they remain to their principles precisely when it is most difficult to do so.

It is against this backdrop that BILL COHEN started his political life, and he has carried these ideals with him throughout his tenure in the public arena. He entered politics knowing that he would have to make difficult decisions and willing to make them—but not knowing what or when. As it turned out, his moment would come very quickly.

It became clear early on that BILL COHEN would follow in the tradition of great Maine leaders like Margaret Chase Smith and Edmund Muskie. Indeed, from his earliest days in Congress, Representative COHEN distinguished himself as an island of reason in a stormy sea of scandal. While America was suffering a crisis of confidence, BILL COHEN charted a course straight through the heart of the storm as a member of the House Judiciary Committee considering Articles of Impeachment against a President. Although just a freshman in the House, BILL was already a man of conscience and courage—someone who was willing to make the tough calls and risk his political future for the sake of truth and America's honor.

One of our distinguished colleagues, Senator ROBERT BYRD, once said "What we really need is a constitutional amendment that says, 'There shall be some spine in our national leaders'". I think Senator BYRD might agree that if we had more BILL COHEN's, we might not need such a measure.

Maine and America have come to know that they can count on BILL COHEN to approach issues with thoughtfulness and reason, and I think that Senators on both sides of the aisle have a tremendous respect for his intellect and integrity.

I think that is what Americans want in their leaders. BILL COHEN not only listens to his constituents, but has the capacity to put the day's problems and events into historical perspective. He has the intellect, the integrity, and the strength to know the right thing to do—and the right way to do it.

BILL COHEN does not rise and fall with the political tide, but at the same time he is very much aware of the issues and concerns swirling across America as well as the world. In much the spirit of lighthouse-keepers of Maine's past, BILL COHEN has always stood strong in the face of the often turbulent seas of politics, ever watchful and every ready to guide us in the right direction.

He has been a leader who believes it is his solemn responsibility not simply to echo public sentiment, but to deliberate upon the issues of the day and to add his own voice to the debate.

In fact, in 1992 he admonished that "Those of us in Congress must be willing to tell the American people what they need to know, not just what they want to hear." Otherwise, as he said just Friday in his eloquent farewell speech, "You don't need me; you just need a computer. * * *

It is that kind of powerful eloquence that has been such a persuasive voice for reason in this body. As we well know, Mr. President, BILL COHEN knows just the right thing to say for almost any occasion, and certainly has a gift for the language. Of course, it's not unusual people in our line of work to sprinkle their speeches with pithy little quotes from some famous writer. But let's be honest—most of these are usually stumbled upon by some clever speech writer leafing through "Bartlett's Famous Quotations." I mean, when was the last time you were actually gazing wistfully out the window, thinking, "You know, right now I'm reminded of that line in 'The Iliad' * * *."

Except for BILL. He really is sitting there, thinking about the cost of some arcane weapons system relative to gross national product and how it all reminds him of that line in "The Iliad."

How many of us use timeless poetry and literature to inform our views? Even more remarkably, how many of us use our own poetry and writings?

That is why those of us in this Chamber are well aware that BILL is about more than rollcall votes and unanimous-consent agreements. He is about the thoughtfulness and beauty of poetry; he is about contemplating our place in history; and he is about taking the time to really think about the world around us. He knows that what is really important—what is really lasting and worthy of our attention—is not