

Mr. DOMENICI. The Office of Oil and Gas Technologies plays a vital role in two major areas. First, DOE will help ensure that the regulatory structures that emerge in these developing countries are favorable to U.S. businesses. This is a particularly important mission for the DOE to undertake because the Office of Oil and Gas Technologies has the technical experience and day-to-day interactions with businesses involved in this area. Moreover, because the energy business in many countries is still wholly or partially controlled by the Government, the prestige of the U.S. Government play a key role in gaining access to the markets for U.S. companies.

Second, the U.S. government needs to be vigilant in helping ensure that the technical and business implications of new trading agreements in the energy sector do not discriminate against U.S. businesses—especially service companies and smaller independent producers who often lack the resources to track these international developments. Since we are making the investment in the technology, we should also make the relatively much smaller investment in helping to ensure that this business and technology do not face unfair competition overseas.

Mr. GORTON. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. DOMENICI. As we have seen in the past few years, tremendous opportunities have arisen for U.S. companies abroad. I hope that the Chairman will join me in supporting continued funding for the Office of Oil and Gas Technologies and their international competitiveness work. I yield the floor.

#### COMMENDING MICHAEL J. MATTHES FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE U.S. SENATE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I would like to commend Michael J. Matthes for his exemplary service to the U.S. Senate, and to me, for these past two legislative sessions of the 104th Congress.

Mike is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy and has served with distinction for fifteen years in the U.S. Navy.

He has earned the rank of commander and has had extensive experience as a nuclear submarine officer.

He has served as a legislative military advisor in my office with great skill and professionalism.

The Senate will greatly miss his sound judgment, good counsel, and witty sense of humor. Soon he will assume his new duties as a commander of a nuclear submarine.

As Mike quickly became a member of my office family, I witnessed in his daily demeanor his devotion and love for his wife, Mara, and his four lovely daughters, Kelly, Cailin, Colleen, and Sarah.

Mr. President, the Senate has benefited greatly from Mike's service. I wish he and his family every success in the future and hope that his Navy ca-

reer will soon bring him back to the Senate.

#### EXPATRIATION PROVISION OF THE IMMIGRATION BILL

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, the immigration bill signed into law on September 30 includes the following provision:

##### SEC. 352. EXCLUSION OF FORMER CITIZENS WHO RENOUNCED CITIZENSHIP TO AVOID UNITED STATES TAXATION

(E) FORMER CITIZENS WHO RENOUNCED CITIZENSHIP TO AVOID TAXATION.—Any alien who is a former citizen of the United States who officially renounces United States citizenship and who is determined by the Attorney General to have renounced United States citizenship for the purpose of avoiding taxation by the United States is excludable.

The wording of the statute is embarrassing. How can an alien renounce U.S. citizenship? In what capacity would said alien do so officially? One assumes that a court of law would find the language incoherent and unenforceable. Still, the intention is clear and needs to be addressed.

This is the way we legislate at 5 o'clock in the morning 4 days before adjournment. One wonders how many other similar items ended up in the continuing resolution passed by the Senate less than 6 hours before the end of the fiscal year.

The provision imposes an extraordinary penalty on certain persons who exercise the legal prerogative of expatriation: permanent exile from the United States. Wealthy individuals who renounce their American citizenship to avoid U.S. taxation—expatriates, as they are called—have now been added to the list of terrorists, convicted criminals, persons with communicable diseases, and others who are by statute deemed unworthy of admission to the United States.

It occurs infrequently, but expatriation to avoid taxes is even so a genuine abuse. By renouncing their U.S. citizenship, individuals may avoid taxes on gains that accrued during the period in which they acquired their wealth—and while they were afforded the benefits and protections of U.S. citizenship.

This issue was considered by the Finance Committee early in the 104th Congress. In March 1995, a measure to address the problem was included in Senate legislation to restore the health insurance deduction for the self-employed. Prior to the House-Senate conference, however, concerns were raised about whether the expatriation provision comported with article 12 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which states: "Everyone shall be free to leave any country, including his own." The United States is a party to this treaty, and it is accordingly law. We consulted a number of scholars, but there was no immediate consensus on the matter.

Because of the urgency of the underlying legislation, which had to be enacted before the April 17th tax return filing deadline, the conferees chose to

drop the expatriation provision so that the questions of international law could be studied. That decision by the conferees was met with criticism in the Senate. This was surprising, since I believed—and I said on the Senate floor more than once—that it was our duty to act with special care when dealing with the rights of persons who are despised.

The issues of international law were later resolved, and on April 6, 1995, I introduced S. 700, the first Senate bill to tax expatriates on gains accrued prior to expatriation. Subsequently, Chairman ARCHER introduced a bill that did not follow the accrued gains approach, but instead built on current law. In my view and that of the Treasury Department and most other tax experts, the House bill will not effectively deter tax-motivated expatriation. However, the Joint Committee on Taxation estimated that the House bill raised more revenue, and it was included as an offset in the recently enacted Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996.

Now, having failed to adopt the preferable—in my view—Senate expatriation measure, we have compounded our error by enacting an ill-advised provision to punish tax-motivated expatriates by banishing them from the land.

The appropriate response to exploitation of a loophole in the Tax Code is to close the loophole. Just 6 months ago, the Deputy Attorney General of the United States agreed. On March 13, 1996, Deputy Attorney General Jamie S. Gorelick wrote to House Speaker GINGRICH in opposition to the provision. She wrote:

The Administration believes that tax issues should be addressed within the context of the Internal Revenue Code, and that it would be inappropriate to use the [Immigration and Naturalization Act] to attempt to deter tax-motivated expatriation.

A short while later, however, the administration reversed its position. On May 31, 1996, Ms. Gorelick wrote another letter in support of the provision. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts of both letters be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, we were unable in this Congress to secure needed changes in the tax laws to resolve, again in my view, the expatriation problem. We ought to have enacted S. 700. Instead, we have enacted a measure that does not reflect well on a free society. I do hope we will reconsider this matter early in the 105th Congress.

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

OFFICE OF THE  
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Washington, DC, March 13, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER GINGRICH: This letter presents the views of the Administration concerning H.R. 2202, the "Immigration in the National Interest Act of 1995," as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary on October 24, 1995.

Many of the provisions in H.R. 2202 advance the Administration's four-part strategy to control illegal immigration. This strategy calls for regaining control of our borders; removing the job magnet through worksite enforcement; aggressively pursuing the removal of criminal aliens and other illegal aliens; and securing from Congress the resources to assist states with the costs of illegal immigration that are a result of failed enforcement policies of the past. The Administration's legislative proposal to advance that strategy is H.R. 1929, the "Immigration Enforcement Improvements Act of 1995," introduced by Representative Howard Berman on June 27, 1995.

The Administration endorses a framework of legal immigration reform that respects our immigration tradition while achieving a moderate reduction in overall admission numbers to promote economic opportunities for all Americans. The Administration seeks legal immigration reform that promotes family reunification, protects U.S. workers from unfair competition while providing employers with appropriate access to international labor markets to promote our global competitiveness, and promotes naturalization to encourage full participation in the national community.

While the Administration strongly supports reform of the current immigration law that affects both illegal and legal immigration, and H.R. 2202 contains many provisions that are similar or identical to the Administration's legislative proposal, enforcement initiatives, and overall strategy, H.R. 2202 raises serious concerns in specific areas that we hope the House of Representatives will examine thoroughly. The Administration's concerns include, but are not limited to the following:

\* \* \*

Section 301(e) amends section 212 (a)(10) of the INA, as redesignated by this bill, by adding a new subparagraph which makes inadmissible any alien, who is a former citizen and who the Attorney General determines has officially renounced his citizenship for purposes of avoiding taxation by the United States.

The Administration has proposed changes in the Internal Revenue Code to remove incentives that encourage certain U.S. citizens to avoid U.S. taxes by renouncing U.S. citizenship. The Administration approach has been passed by the Senate twice and is being considered in the ongoing balanced budget negotiations. The Administration believes that tax issues should be addressed within the context of the Internal Revenue Code, and that it would be inappropriate to use the INA to attempt to deter taxmotivated expatriation.

\* \* \*

Sincerely,

JAMIE S. GORELICK,  
Deputy Attorney General.

OFFICE OF THE  
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Washington, DC, May 31, 1996.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Immigration and  
Claims, Committee on the Judiciary, House  
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter presents the views of the Administration on H.R. 2202, the "Immigration Control and Financial Responsibility Act of 1996". The Administration is reversing decades of neglect in controlling illegal immigration. Many of the provisions in both the House and Senate bills would ratify the Administration's efforts in the field to combat illegal immigration. The administration's four-part strategy calls for regaining control of our borders; protecting

U.S. workers through worksite enforcement; aggressively removing criminal and other deportable aliens; and obtaining the resources that are necessary to make the strategy work. Both the House and Senate bills contain many provisions that support the Administration's enforcement initiatives and are based on or similar to the Administration's legislative and budget proposals.

We look forward to working with the conference committee to craft a strong, fair, and effective immigration bill. However, H.R. 2202 raises serious concerns in specific areas that we hope the conference committee will examine thoroughly. In addition, a number of amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) made by the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, Pub. L. 104-132, present substantial obstacles to the effective enforcement of the immigration laws. The conference committee has an opportunity to remedy some of those problems with a careful and more comprehensive approach to amending the INA. The Administration's views include, but are not limited to the following:

\* \* \*

We strongly recommend adoption of the House provisions contained in sections 301 (except 301(c) and (f)), 303, 304, 305, 307, 308, and 309. However, an amendment must be made to strike section 241(d) (added by the AEDPA) which provides that aliens "found in" the United States without having been inspected and admitted are inadmissible. This language is problematic, will lead to litigation; and is inconsistent with the House immigration bill. In addition, there is no waiver provision for inadmissibility under the newly-created section 212(a)(9), even for immediate relatives of U.S. citizens. We strongly recommend the inclusion of a discretionary waiver of inadmissibility.

\* \* \*

Sincerely,

JAMIE S. GORELICK,  
Deputy Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

#### FAREWELL TO OUR COLLEAGUE FROM NEBRASKA

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, may I add my remarks to those by many Senators in the Chamber as we bid a fond farewell to our colleague from Nebraska. Senator EXON and I came to the Senate together and, from our first day, served together on the Senate Armed Services Committee. Senator EXON attended his last hearing of that committee earlier this afternoon and, once again, propounded the tough questions as he has done year after year, coming directly to the point of the issue, but bringing to bear a background in which he draws upon the distinguished period of his life from World War II, when he was proud to wear the uniform of this country in the cause of freedom.

He is another who has worn the uniform who is leaving the Senate. The Senate gradually, primarily because of change of times and demographics, has fewer and fewer in its membership who served in uniform. Having had that privilege, he brought with him that knowledge that could be applied, that is unique and particularly useful when our Armed Services Committee had to

make decisions relative to the safety, welfare, training, and the active duty pay of the men and women of the Armed Forces.

So, not only does the Senate today salute him at the end of this chapter of his career in public service, but so do generations of the men and women of the Armed Forces.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I thank my dear friend and colleague from Virginia for his most kind remarks. Indeed, we came here together. But, indeed, we knew each other even before that.

I remember very well my friend, the Senator from Virginia, when he served as Secretary of the Navy with great distinction. When I was Governor of Nebraska, he was the head of the centennial commission and came out to Nebraska. That is the first time I really got well acquainted with JOHN WARNER. At that time I had no idea we would eventually serve in the U.S. Senate.

As students of history understand, and I think most people would believe, probably more great individual contributors to government at all levels have come from the State of Virginia than from any other. Certainly, I just want to say from my perspective, none has done more, none has dedicated himself more fervently to what he thought was right for Virginia and for the United States of America than my good and dear friend, JOHN WARNER.

I wish you nothing but the best, my friend. I assure you that we will be keeping in touch.

Thank you very much.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my distinguished colleague. I wish to carefully note in the RECORD that that was a statement of courage, looking to the future, and not marking any imminent retirement by myself from the U.S. Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

#### A TRIBUTE TO SAM NUNN

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I was privileged to shake the hand of SAM NUNN just now, the distinguished, esteemed Senator from Georgia, as he departed the Chamber. He said to me, "This will be our last handshake on the floor of the U.S. Senate."

That was, indeed, a very moving split second for me, because we have, through the 18 years that I have been a member of the Armed Services Committee, shaken hands many times on this floor—and on occasion shaken a few fists at one another. But the period that I remember the best is when he was chairman of the committee, having succeeded a long line of very distinguished individuals: John Stennis, "Scoop" Jackson, John Tower, Barry Goldwater—all Senators. But my most memorable period is when I was privileged to serve as the ranking member of

the Armed Services Committee some 6 years. I served with the chairman, who was Senator NUNN, and we took, in each of those years, to this floor legislation of our committee, the authorization bills, and debated them with our colleagues, sometimes long into the night.

We don't seem to have the night sessions as we did in the old days, but I can remember leaving the Chamber with some of those bills and the Sun was coming up—12, 14, 16 hours of continuous debate as 1 day's activities on usually a 3- or 4-day consideration of our bill.

So I will miss him a great deal. He is a very dear friend.

I think back on how he was elected to the Senate in 1972 and served on the Armed Services Committee for 24 years. He served as chairman of the Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee in the seventies. I remember serving briefly with him on that subcommittee. He was chairman of the committee, of course, after becoming ranking minority member. It is a distinguished career.

He was chairman of the full committee from 1986 to 1993 and now, in the last years of his career, again is the ranking member. I point that out because he was always, to the maximum extent possible by any Member of the U.S. Senate, bipartisan in his approach to the responsibilities of our committee and those issues that related to national security and foreign affairs.

He followed in the tradition of two great Georgia Members of the U.S. Congress, his uncle, Congressman Carl Vinson, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. I have a picture, which I treasure greatly, from when I was Secretary of the Navy. I recommended to the President of the United States, at that time Richard Nixon, that the tradition in the U.S. Navy that existed from the first day of a sailing ship should be broken and that the Navy should name a ship for a living individual.

The Secretary of Defense, Mel Laird, at that time, consulted with me. I took the decision to Mr. Laird. He said, "Let's give it a try."

Mr. Laird had been in the U.S. Navy in World War II. We went to see the President. The President had been in the Navy. He was an officer during World War II. Three sailors sat down and decided we would name a supercarrier the "Carl Vinson," on the occasion of his 50th year in the Congress of the United States and concluding many of those years as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

I mention that because we had a model of the ship built and the President of the United States, myself and Secretary Laird presented that model to Carl Vinson. SAM NUNN is in the picture. It is a remarkable picture, because Senator NUNN's sideburns were down almost below his jaw. I will never forget that. It hangs in his office.

Another distinguished Member of Congress, of course, was Richard Rus-

sell, who was chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee for 16 years. I will have further to say about that Senator as I close my remarks.

Senator NUNN quickly established himself as one of the leading experts in the Congress and, indeed, all of the United States on national security and foreign policy. He gained a reputation in our country and, indeed, worldwide as a global thinker, and that is where I think he will make his greatest contribution in the years to come, wherever he may be, in terms of being a global thinker.

His approach to national security issues has been guided by one fundamental criteria: What SAM NUNN believes is in the best interest of the United States of America.

As a junior Senator in 1978, he ultimately voted in favor of the Panama Canal Treaty because he thought—Mr. President, he thought—it was in the long-term national security interest of our Nation, even though he knew it was not a popular position, particularly in the South and most particularly in Georgia. He supported the policies of Presidents of both parties when he thought they were right, and he raised questions about the policies of the Presidents of both parties when he thought questions needed to be raised.

But, again, as we look back in the history of Congress and its constitutional role in foreign policy—and how many debates have I been in and Senator NUNN and others, for example, on the War Powers Act, on consultation? Just today in the Senate Armed Services Committee, and I think quite properly, questions were raised about the level of consultation between the President, President Clinton, and the Congress. But SAM NUNN, to me, applied what is known as the "Vandenberg rule," a very distinguished former Member of the U.S. Senate, recognized for his strength in foreign policy, who, to paraphrase his saying, always believed that partisanship politics should be checked at the water's edge, and that has been a guiding light for Senator NUNN.

SAM NUNN always worked, as I say, in a bipartisan fashion, almost invariably. His numerous initiatives and legislative accomplishments invariably have Republican and Democratic cosponsors. Senator NUNN is fond of saying that he has yet to see a problem or a challenge facing this country that can be solved by only one political party. How true that is in national security and foreign policy.

I started to go over his accomplishments and just selected a few, because I was involved. He was a tremendous supporter of the welfare of our men and women in uniform and their families. He helped restore quality of force, the total arms force, following the serious problems that we had in the aftermath of Vietnam; indeed, during Vietnam. He coauthored the Nunn-Warner benefits package of 1980, perhaps the first single piece of legislation for which I

have received, I think unjustifiably, but nevertheless some modest recognition.

He was a leader in establishing a program of transition benefits in the nineties to military and civilian employees of DOD who lost their jobs as a result of the downsizing of the defense infrastructure of the military services.

NATO was a very, very favorite subject. I traveled with him on many occasions to NATO, as I did through the capitals of the world, and sat with him when he, on a one-on-one equal basis shared views with heads of state, heads of government, world leaders in Europe, in Asia, and the Middle East.

He was a strong supporter of maintaining NATO as an active and energetic alliance. He wrote three reports to the Senate on the health of the NATO alliance. He is very highly regarded by political and military leaders throughout the NATO community.

If there were one subject to concern him the most—and, indeed, it does me and, I am sure, almost every Member of this body—it is the proliferation of the knowledge of how to construct weapons of mass destruction, proliferation of that knowledge and, indeed, the proliferation of the arming of the weapons themselves.

Senator NUNN, together with Senator LUGAR of Indiana, created the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program to help countries of the former Soviet Union dismantle their weapons of mass destruction and the facilities to produce such weapons.

He also offered legislation to improve our domestic capability in counter-terrorist use of weapons of mass destruction. I joined him. I happened to be the manager of the defense bill at the time that amendment was raised by Senators NUNN, LUGAR, and DOMENICI.

And I joined as a cosponsor in authorizing the Department of Defense and other Government agencies of the Federal Government to share with local law enforcement some of the basic knowledge of how to deal with the situation, should they be confronted with the threat of the use of, say, a crude weapon, chemical or biological weapon of mass destruction in any of our 50 States. I urge the communities to avail themselves of that authorization in our most recent 1997 bill.

We had our differences. We have fought toe to toe on this floor when I, together with Senator Dole and others, passed the gulf resolution, that resolution to authorize President Bush to utilize the men and women of the United States, a half a million of whom were in positions ready, together with perhaps the most magnificent allied coalition ever formed in the history of the world, to repel the invasion of Saddam Hussein.

But it was necessary in the President's mind to have the support of the Congress of the United States. And that is a chapter in history that should be studied carefully by all Presidents,

because when the men and women of the Armed Forces go forward beyond our shores, in harm's way, we want the total support of both the Presidency and the Congress and, to the extent possible, the people of the United States behind those troops, particularly when the risk of personal injury is very high.

We had our differences. We fought that battle. It was about a 5-vote difference in the outcome. But from the very moment of the decision of the United States to support the resolution, which I was privileged to draft under the direction of the then-leader, Senate Dole, from the very first minute of the vote by the Senate of the United States, Senator NUNN backed President Bush in his decision to use force and to turn around the situation that was tragic in the eyes of the world.

We had our differences on the interpretation of the ABM, the SALT, the START treaties, but always, once again, bipartisanship was foremost.

A moment ago Senator NUNN spoke about the staff of the Senate. One of his hallmarks was his ability to attract the finest people for professional staff, in the years particularly when he was chairman and ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and in the Governmental Operations Committee. And I think that is the hallmark of a great Senator, the ability to attract quality staff, to spend long hours of dedicated service to their Nation and to their Senate.

Mr. President, Senator NUNN always had a profound preference, as he should, for Senator Russell. He used to say from time to time that he only temporarily was the holder of the Senate seat from Georgia which was once held by Richard Russell. And I thought I would conclude my remarks by reading the remarks of our distinguished colleague, the Senator from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, at the unveiling of the statue in the Russell rotunda of Senator Richard Russell of Georgia. I ask unanimous consent to have the entire remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Jr. (D-GA, 1933-1971)

At the unveiling of the statue of Russell in the rotunda of the Russell Senate Office Building on January 24, 1996, Senator Byrd said of Russell:

"He was *the* senator, the uncrowned king of the southern block, and he was as truly a Senate man as was Henry Clay or Daniel Webster or John C. Calhoun or Thomas Benton or any of the other giants who had preceded him.

"Senator Russell's philosophy of government was rooted in constitutionalism. . . . He was always regarded as one of the most fair and conscientious members of this body.

"Through it all he served his nation well. Richard Russell followed his own star. He did not pander. His confidant was his conscience. He was always the good and faithful servant of the people. He was good for the Senate, and he loved it dearly. I can say without any hesitation that he was a remarkable senator,

a remarkable American, a remarkable man who enjoyed the respect and the affecting of all who served with him."

Mr. WARNER. But I shall read this one paragraph.

Through it all he served his nation well. Richard Russell followed his own star. He did not pander. His confidant was his conscience. He was always the good and faithful servant of the people. He was good for the Senate, and he loved it dearly. I can say without any hesitation that he was a remarkable Senator, a remarkable American, a remarkable man who enjoyed the respect and the affecting of all who served with him.

I think, Mr. President, certainly this Senator, and I feel most, can say that Senator BYRD's remarks capturing the magnificence of Richard Russell—SAM NUNN can return to Georgia with a clear conscience that he did his best to fulfill the reputation of Richard Russell of Georgia. I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

#### TRIBUTE TO RETIRING SENATORS

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I too join our many colleagues in wanting to say goodbye, good luck, and thank you to our colleagues. All of them are leaving this body. And as they leave they leave a mark of great distinction, each and every one of them.

I cannot help, Mr. President, as I review the names of those who are retiring—we have heard several comments from many colleagues about the names, and they are all familiar—but I cannot help but note that when you talk about people like Senator PELL, Senator HATFIELD, Senator NUNN, Senator KASSEBAUM, Senator JOHNSTON, Senator SIMPSON, Senator BRADLEY, Senator COHEN, Senator EXON, Senator HEFLIN, Senator PRYOR, Senator SIMON, Senator BROWN, this is a really distinguished group of people, Mr. President.

And when I think of what each of them brings to our deliberations, to the body, to the Senate, they have enriched us substantially, each one of them, some with longer lists of legislation than others, but each one with a unique character, and a list of people of principle, of integrity, of honesty. And one of the things I think that each of us has to consider is who is going to follow, who is going to follow over these next few years as we approach the 21st century. Is there going to be a sense of what this institution is about? Are they going to have respect?

Mr. President, as I said, the question as to those who follow, will they have the respect, the reverence, not only for this institution, but for the way we operate as a Government, with the respect that I think has been denied of more recent years by many, who choose to use this place often as a battleground, as opposed to a people's forum, trying to, in many cases, get the edge, get the leg up, get the publicity, get the press?

I do not want to be too nostalgic here. These are wonderful people who, with the help of good health, will go on to do many other things. It strikes me, at a particular time when things seem to be so unruly in our society, so much hostility, so much anger, so much confusion that we take the best of us in this group and say so long to them with not only respect and reverence for them but with some misgivings, some apprehension as to the ordinary citizens of our society who are not serving in this body as they greet the newcomers. There will be many of them—I do not know how it ranks in the numbers that have come in a single class.

Mr. President, I say goodbye to each of those individuals. I want to make particular note of the retirement of my colleague, Senator BILL BRADLEY, with whom I have worked very closely over these years, with whom I have shared prospects for what we can do for New Jersey, for the country, unity of opinion, and sometimes a different approach to how we got to these goals, Mr. President, but nevertheless someone whose friendship I treasure and whose presence will be missed here, in particular by me, because of our close association.

In particular, as I mentioned BILL BRADLEY, Senator MARK HATFIELD and others, who have served this body so well. I will miss them all and I know we will be a different place.

This body is far bigger than the total sum of the individuals who serve it, and we will continue on, God willing, with strength and with purpose and with comity and collegiality. That is my wish.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MARK HATFIELD

Mr. President, I rise to say goodbye, once again, to my colleague, MARK HATFIELD, who is retiring after serving the people of Oregon, and the United States, for 30 years as a member of this body.

Recently, I have been contemplating MARK' absence from the Appropriations Committee. Whether as chairman or ranking member, his leadership will be missed. And as I reviewed our contacts over the years, I wanted to acknowledge that, even given our different party affiliations, our relationship has been one of the most satisfying associations I've ever had in my life. This man has special qualities that endeared him to many, including this Senator.

Despite the constant fray, MARK was always true to his beliefs and was able to maintain and express his convictions, without confrontation or belligerence. His value system set standards in the Senate for all to admire, and perhaps emulate. Undoubtedly, his legacy of good will, honesty and integrity benefited all who served with him.

In the area of public service, Senator HATFIELD's career has been distinguished by an uncompromising commitment to improve the human condition and to address what he has so eloquently called "the desperate human needs in our midst." Among the many