

is the Member of the Senate, or perhaps an observing staffer, who found at Senator COHEN's seat, more often at a committee hearing, a doodle. I am not much for doodling, but he is an expert, and it is not some scribble.

What surprises me, having studied engineering and particularly engineering drawing and architecture drawing myself—I am a man who observes a straight line or the French curve or whatever—these are drawings that challenge the best of engineering drawings, very precise, a balance, perspective, and I defy anyone to interpret the meaning. And therein is the real genius.

He is able to take these drawings and capture the meaning of the debate in the committee hearing. I have never seen him doodle in the Senate—maybe he has—not in the Chamber, but certainly as I sat next to him in the Armed Services Committee, the Select Committee on Aging. They are absolutely magnificent.

I asked him one time, "Are these your ideas of caricatures of other Senators?"

"No. They are caricatures of the debate that is taking place, and how I see that debate, where it starts, where it goes, whether it is conclusive or inconclusive, whether it is fair and whether it is objective."

I have one or two, and I treasure them.

He is a meticulous researcher. Perhaps above all, that research to bear on legislation that he sponsored—and for a while I was not totally in favor of that legislation—but it was legislation that eventually put into law the special operating forces of the United States.

Much of the work of those forces is highly classified, and therefore I cannot discuss it on the floor of the Senate. But the essence of his legislation was to enable our Nation and our Armed Forces to have a cadre of men and women in uniform who were able to perform the most difficult of military tasks, whether it is a task that challenges two or three or a task that challenges a company-sized group of military. And those challenges could come at any time, any moment, anywhere on the globe.

Because of this man's foresight, we have that capability here in the United States. My only suspicion at the time that we used to debate it was whether or not it was not already present in the Armed Forces of the United States and whether or not the command and control should be under, say, the Chief of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps. And he was right; this should be a separate CINC, a separate four-star officer, whose sole responsibility was not to the other services, but to see that this cadre of service persons had the equipment, had the training, had the skills and the fortitude to take on any challenge anywhere in the world.

So I join the others who expressed a note of sadness of his departure, but

also a sadness of joy that he and his lovely wife have reclaimed—reclaimed—their lives from public service. He, with nearly a quarter of a century, 24 years in the Congress of the United States, has reclaimed it to go on and have other challenges. I do not doubt for a moment that he will accept the challenges which will enable him to enter into the global policy discussions and other forums of the world as it relates to foreign policy and national security, but also to reclaim perhaps a little more time to spread his genius upon the paper that all of us can share, be it fiction, be it prose, be it poetry, or be it a foreign policy decision. I wish him well.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RETIRING SENATORS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I intended to address the Senate and I shall address the Senate with respect to the distinguished Senator from Alabama who has joined the ranks of those reclaiming his balance of time pursuant to a manner that most befits the desires and the goals of the Senator and his lovely wife.

I did not realize you would be here, Senator. I would not suggest that you deviate from whatever you intended to do while I just have a few words here about my dear friend, but I envy you in many ways.

We could always start out with the thought that he brought to the Senate and to public service for his Nation and his State a knowledge of the law and a respect for the law and an understanding of the law, and an understanding that the Congress of the United States has the responsibility under the Constitution to enact the law. How many times have I heard him say, and others have heard him, that enacting the law is our responsibility—not that of the bureaucrats, the vast army of bureaucrats—to write the regulations. Tenaciously, he has fought for strict adherence of the Constitution in the law of the land and not to delegate it to the army of bureaucrats. Yes, I admire him for that, but I suppose I admire him because of the tremendous admiration and warmth of feeling that other Senators have for him.

I have enjoyed several trips to remote places of the world in connection with military matters, I think, on most occasions, the focal point of the trip. Perhaps that focal point was generated by the somewhat disproportionate size and stature of this great Senator, but more often than not it was because of his display of intellect and

grasp of the mission on which we were sent to some remote place on behalf of the interests of the United States and the Senate.

I was always interested when he would come to the floor in connection with appointments to the Federal judiciary, particularly as it related to the Supreme Court of the United States. He, in a very tough, I believe, fair, and objective manner, laid out the qualifications or the absence of qualifications, in his judgment, and the Senate listened. The Senate listened out of profound respect for our colleague. There were times when his great sense of humor and his sense of camaraderie would give away to a parochial interest.

I have seen him exhibit such fervor, particularly in the well of the Senate, as to alarm other Senators to the point that they would go in opposite directions rather than confront him. That happened, Mr. President, more often than not on peanuts. No one in the contemporary history of the Senate has fought harder for the peanut farmer than the distinguished Senator from Alabama. He would seize us by the arm and make certain that we had commitments from fellow Senators as related to peanuts. I enjoy eating peanuts, but there were times in the intensity of that debate that I lost all interest and appetite for peanuts. But there he was, and for good reason. The peanut farmers are small. Nobody has made a fortune in peanuts; never have and never will, in my judgment; that is, the farmer. It represents to him the spirit of American agriculture.

He has served on the Senate Agriculture Committee throughout his entire career in the U.S. Senate. He has a great respect for those who till the soil and love the land that produces the bountiful harvests that we all enjoy, and really accept almost as a matter of right, in this country.

Agriculture is our principal export as it relates to improving the balance of trade.

There sits a Senator like a stone wall to defend the role of the American farmer and the agriculture of this great land. There sits a Senator like a stone wall to protect the freedoms of people, especially those freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

We will miss you, my dear friend. And I thank you for the opportunity to have spoken a few words from the heart in the deepest of gratitude for your friendship and your wisdom that you have so willfully given this country during your distinguished career.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am deeply humbled to hear the kind words of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia—and he is truly a gentleman from Virginia. I appreciate them very deeply.

My mind goes back, as I think about our friendship, to the early days when we both came to the Senate. On one snowy day in which there were 24 inches of snow on the ground, the scheduled speaker for the reading of George Washington's Farewell Address was Senator JOHN WARNER of Virginia. In order to be here, he had to walk some 2 miles in the snow to get here. I was the Presiding Officer of the Senate on that occasion. I got a ride in a jeep and came about a mile. But Senator WARNER walked all of that way.

Since that time I have been following in his footsteps. He has trod through many minefields, and he has always come out with a great sense of feeling for his fellow man and for his State of Virginia.

So I appreciate very deeply his remarks. I know that he is going to have a long career here in the Senate. I hope that when he does leave, there will be another Senator who will speak words pertaining to agriculture concerning him because he has been a true champion of agriculture and a true champion of Virginia peanut farmers, too.

So I deeply appreciate everything that he said, and I will look forward to many days in the future of having some sort of way of having a connection with him.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if I may slightly revise and correct the record of my good friend, the distance was 4 miles. But, more importantly, the last one-tenth of a mile I was on the back of a tractor. You may recall that the farmers of America had assembled between the Capitol and the Washington Monument and were encamped in that snow with their tractors here on a protest. As I came along Pennsylvania Avenue, one spied me, not knowing I was a Senator but in the true spirit of an American farmer just extended a hand to help, and he put me on the back of the tractor and drove me up the Hill. I arrived in front of the Capitol of the United States on the back of a farm tractor to walk into a Chamber, Mr. President, that was totally empty. No one came from afar except my dear friend from Alabama to hear me deliver George Washington's Farewell Address.

I thank the distinguished Senator for commenting on my career, which I fervently hope is not a farewell address.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR NANCY KASSEBAUM

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, for many years I was privileged to sit in

the back row of this side of the Senate next to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, NANCY KASSEBAUM. That was a privilege for this Senator because, as one knows, you often have the opportunity in the course of debate and other times in the Senate to engage in conversation with your colleague that adjoins you. Senator LUGAR was there.

I shall most dearly miss her departure from the Senate. We came to the Senate together. She virtually decided to reclaim her life from public service after a long and distinguished period in the Senate and other responsibilities. I have to recount with some reluctance a story about my first encounter with the distinguished then junior Senator from Kansas. I had been in the Senate only a year or so, and she approached me one day and asked if I would travel to Kansas to give a speech to a local university or college, as the case may be. Memory dims, but memory does not dim on the events of that visit because I was looking forward to meeting her distinguished father, Alfred M. Landon, who was the nominee of the Republican Party for the Presidency of the United States in 1936.

So I had done my homework about her father and very much looked forward to meeting that historic figure. We arrived. I do not recall much about the speech, but we were invited to have lunch with her father.

Now, I have to add that at that time I had a very unusual and beautiful wife, and upon arriving at the KASSEBAUM-Alfred M. Landon household, it quickly became evident to me that I was not invited to come to Kansas to give a speech; it was immaterial whether I was to come or not. What Alfred M. Landon wanted was to meet my wife. That was his sole ambition, sole reason that Senator KASSEBAUM invited me out there.

We stepped on to the front porch of that wonderful, old, quaint house, very unpretentious. The candidate, the Presidential candidate, came out, greeted us and then he took command of the situation. He pointed his finger at me, and he said, "You sit there on the front porch," and pointed his finger at his daughter and said, "You sit there and entertain the Senator. I'm going inside and I'm going to visit with a really historic figure, his wife."

The two of them disappeared. So Nancy and I engaged in some idle conversation, and pretty soon we heard the level of laughter rising steadily to where it was a roar. The noise was rolling out the door of the house, and Nancy said to me, "Something unusual must be taking place." And she walked in to find that—I hesitate to tell the story but it is a true fact—Alf Landon had secreted, shall we say, a bottle that contained certain vapors, certain elixir of life, which he was precluded from enjoying but he secreted for this occasion, and both had taken liberally and were enjoying the benefits of a very excited conversation.

I shall always remember that day. I hardly got a word into the conversa-

tion and went back home thinking that perhaps I was not a very important U.S. Senator. But I remember that warm greeting of her father and how well she handled it, and we have been close friends all these many years in the Senate.

I was proud to join other Senators when she broke the logjam and put through historic legislation time and time again relating to matters within the purview of her expertise, particularly the health legislation.

What a gentle person; what a thoughtful person; what a sensitive person. I do not think I ever saw her without a smile on her face. Maybe once, but that was her hallmark, civility—civility that she felt so important for this Chamber and for personal relationships. Yes, a very distinguished legislative career, set of accomplishments, of which her father would have been very proud had he lived to see this, her last day as a U.S. Senator.

We say a fond goodbye to our colleague and wish her well in the next chapter of challenges of life, and hopefully she will, like others, reclaim a little bit of that personal life to share with others of her family, to pursue some joys she has earned through her contributions to our country and to the great State of Kansas.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been noted. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST— S. 2187

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2187, which was introduced earlier today by Senator BROWN.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, there also is an Ashcroft amendment that would have been in order on this bill if there had not been objection.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 2187 regarding the Civil Rights Commission, that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration, the bill be advanced to third reading and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.