

Chicago suburbs, the total swells to \$55 million.

Mrs. Pinnell was once secretary for a plumbing company. She owes her wealth to a grandson of 19th century cattle baron Richard King, Edwin Atwood, whom she befriended in his old age. In the early 1970s, she took over Mr. Atwood's King Ranch holdings and bought out another heir and a Chicago policeman who had been bequeathed part of the ranch by yet a third heir.

In Texas, Mrs. Pinnell has her own cattle brand, a big ranch house, plenty of cattle, a small field of oil wells pumping away and about 30,000 acres rented to cotton and sorghum farmers. Her land is bordered by the late Nelson Rockefeller's 6,000-acre spread, now owned by his two sons.

"TAKE-CHARGE" LANDLORD

"She hardly shows up down here," says ranch manager Jerry Taylor. But when she does, she takes charge. Says Max Dreyer, a retired farmer in nearby San Perlita, Texas: "When they're rounding up cattle, she won't even let the helicopter pilots fly over the house."

Here in Winnetka, Mrs. Pinnell and her husband, Curtis, a retired railroad freight agent, stay behind the double doors and two-story Doric columns of their immense brick house. Members of the Women's Garden Club of Woodley Road see them only in passing on the road. In her red Mercedes, Mrs. Pinnell scoots over to an office she keeps in the nearby suburb of Northbrook, sometimes to confer with her attorney, Richard Williams. While his client won't comment, Mr. Williams plays down the amount of the subsidies she gets, which include disaster assistance and conservation payments. "There are lots of people with smaller farm operations that get more subsidies," he says.

In New Mexico, Sam Donaldson passes for a big-time rancher, absentee or not. He is the third-largest recipient of wool and mohair payments in Lincoln County, where he runs flocks of sheep and Angora goats on his sprawling spread near Hondo, N.M., according to Allen (Bill) Trammell, the county executive director for the Combined Farm Services Agency. Over the last two years, \$97,000 in subsidy checks have gone to Mr. Donaldson's address in the Virginia suburbs of Washington. What's more, under an agricultural conservation cost-sharing program, Mr. Donaldson got \$3,500 earlier to defray the cost of watering facilities for his livestock.

An assistant to Mr. Donaldson says he isn't available for comment.

FIFTH AVENUE FARMER

New Yorker Roslyn Ziff, a retired actress and opera singer, adores her 67-year-old friend Henry Warren. "He's the only man I know who farms on Fifth Avenue," she says. For years, Mr. Warren has seen his psychotherapy patients, lived on the seventh floor of 27-story building at 1 Fifth Avenue and managed a Nebraska farm from afar. Told he was the biggest recipient of farm subsidies on Manhattan—\$558,000 since 1985—his reply was: "Good for me!" But he adds that "it's good for consumers" because farm programs help ensure a stable food supply at relatively low prices.

This year, the retired Mr. Warren is leasing his land in Holt County for cash, which means he will no longer get subsidy payments. But that doesn't mean he will have to go cold turkey. The Agriculture Department, because of a big corn surplus, is paying farmers to hold their corn off the market. Mr. Warren figures to collect about \$6,000 in storage fees this year, just as he got \$81,000 in the late 1980s.

"That's outrageous," Democratic Rep. Carolyn Maloney says of her New York constituent's diet of subsidies. "It points to the

hypocrisy of cutting Food Stamps and nutrition programs."

Another Nebraska farm-owning New Yorker is Daniel Lamprecht, an agribusiness dealmaker for ING Capital Holdings Corp.'s merchant banking arm. Living in midtown Manhattan, he has collected \$158,000 in payments over the last decade, mostly for keeping his hilly—and highly erodible—cropland in the Conservation Reserve Program. All along, he admits, he has dreaded being found out.

"I'm the fourth generation to own this property," he says. "I'm loath to give it up. It isn't a hobby. It's an economic enterprise." It would be unfair, he argues, for Congress to deprive his 1,060-acre farm of subsidies, either because of his off-farm income or his upscale New York address.

Far to the south, Jack Northington Shwab and his sister Clara Jane Lovell own 4,000 acres of farm land in Egypt, Texas, where their ancestor, Captain W.J.E. Heard, settled in the late 1840s and built a great plantation. Today, busloads of tourists and history buffs tour the old place and the museum in the rear. Meanwhile, three farmers till the land and share with the landlords rice and corn receipts as well as the subsidy payments. Over the last 10 years, Mr. Shwab and Mrs. Lovell have each collected \$344,000, he on Hilton Head Island, S.C., and she on Nantucket Island off Massachusetts, according to USDA payment data.

While calling himself "a retired investor," Mr. Shwab still looks after a portfolio of stocks and bonds as well as his Texas land holdings and natural gas wells. He, for one, is becoming alarmed about the antisubsidy rumblings on Capitol Hill. "I do intend to write my congressman," he says. But first he must figure out which one—his representative from South Carolina or his representative from Texas.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I was shocked to learn that Sam Donaldson, who happens to be one of the most highly paid journalists in the United States, earning millions of dollars, is collecting welfare—\$100,000 in welfare payments—from the U.S. Government. That is right. It is called the Wool and Mohair Subsidy Program. It is supposed to help farmers.

Sam Donaldson has received almost \$100,000 for a ranch in New Mexico while he lives right outside the Capitol here in suburban Washington, in Virginia. I think it is an outrage. It is wrong. It is wrong and it must be stopped.

Does anyone really believe that Sam Donaldson is a real sheep farmer? Really? I see him on TV all the time.

Sam, do the right thing. You know what that is. Give the money back.

Now, there are plenty of other examples of absentee landlords receiving these farm subsidies, but it is particularly glaring that millionaire Sam Donaldson is getting this taxpayers' money.

Sam Donaldson, give that money back.

It is my understanding that Mr. Donaldson is the third largest recipient of wool and mohair payments in Lincoln County, NM—not Virginia, or New Mexico. According to the Wall Street Journal, Mr. Donaldson received \$97,000 in subsidy checks over the last 2 years. And under another Government agricultural program—this time for conservation sharing—Mr. Donaldson got

\$3,500 to defray the costs of watering facilities for his livestock.

And here we have Sam Donaldson, the self-appointed conscience of America, who was said to be unavailable for comment. Can you imagine, Mr. President, if you were unavailable for comment?

I can imagine why.

Sam Donaldson, come out of hiding and give back to the American people—the taxpayers—that \$97,000.

There is one other question I would like to pose. This program is going to be phased out over the next 2 years. I want to know whether Mr. Donaldson is going to continue to receive those subsidies, or is he going to stop it? Americans have a right to know.

I hope, Sam, you give that money back.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as if in morning business.

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

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I might first announce that we believe there is just one additional speaker. Senator HEFLIN will be coming to the floor to speak. I will go forward here, as if in morning business, until he arrives, and then I will be happy to turn the floor over to him. Then it is my understanding the Senate will stand in recess for the weekend.

RESIGNATION OF WILLIAM A. GALSTON

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I noticed today a small item that appeared in the Washington Post, the news that the President's Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy, Mr. William Galston, had submitted his resignation, effective in May.

Mr. Galston is a Democrat. I am a Republican, but I have been an admirer of some of the work that he has done in the past. He played a prominent role—I believe he was executive director—in the Progressive Policy Institute, the arm of the Democratic Party that was looking for new and innovative ways to address, in particular, some of the social concerns, of the Democratic Party.

Mr. Galston said he is resigning because of his desire to strike a different balance between family and career. And I do not doubt that at all.

Mr. Galston has written eloquently, has done a great deal of research, and, I think, made a real effort in the administration to point out the importance of the family and American life in our society. He is going to return to teaching at the School of Public Affairs at the University of Maryland, where he is a senior research scholar at the university's Institute for Philosophy and Public Policy. He has been a prolific writer, author of five books and

numerous articles on political philosophy, American politics, and public policy.

He served in the Marine Corps, is a graduate of Cornell, with a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, and taught at the University of Texas for 10 years before coming to Washington in 1989.

Mr. Galston, along with Elaine Ciulla Kamarck, co-authored a policy paper criticizing liberal fundamentalism in the Democratic Party. Mr. Galston urged the Democratic Party to identify more with "middle-class values—individual responsibility, hard work, equal opportunity—rather than the language of compensation."

Those are phrases and words that, obviously, Republicans have been using for some time. We were encouraged when someone from the other party, who occupied an important position in the Clinton administration, used those terms and identified himself with that particular philosophy.

Mr. Galston has been, and I am very sure he will continue to be, an advocate of the importance of the family in the development of our children, an advocate of teaching individual responsibility and personal achievement as the means of success and as the real solution to the problems facing our society today.

We are at a crossroads, Mr. President. We are at a critical juncture. Our problems are great. Our society is laboring under the burden of a disintegrating moral and cultural fabric. To turn this tide, we will need voices of moderation, of reason. Voices such as William Galston.

I hope that Mr. Galston's resignation does not signal that voices of moderation, voices of reason, advocates for individual responsibility and moral courage are no longer welcome in the Clinton White House. This would be an ominous signal. I trust that is not the case.

But I want to wish Mr. Galston the very best and thank him for his contributions and his efforts to try to point out the importance of family, individual responsibility, the decline of the moral climate in this country, and the need to reestablish and restore the fundamental, basic institutions of our country—family, church, education, community service—that have been so important in transmitting moral values to our children and to the next generation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

SAINT PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, it is interesting to note that St. Patrick's Day is a special holiday which is only observed in Ireland and the United States. On this day, the color green is traditionally worn in both countries, by people from many different nationalities and backgrounds.

Ireland and the United States share many other strong bonds in addition to their unique celebrations of this day. There is a deep love for individual freedom and liberty today and throughout the history of both countries.

In America's early days, another bond which existed between the two lands was a common enemy—the English crown. Americans and Irishmen experienced the tyranny of the English king and the oppression of British troops. Our forefathers removed the yoke of British rule through the Revolutionary War and eliminated the continuing harassment by British through the War of 1812.

In 1798, in Ireland, there was a similar revolt. A group of men formed a resistance known as the "united Irishmen." To demonstrate allegiance to their cause and to each other, they wore the color green. While this band of Irishmen fought valiantly, they were defeated by the mighty army commanded by Gen. Charles Cornwallis.

After Cornwallis' victory over the united Irishmen, the British tried to break the Irish spirit by declaring the wearing of green against the law. Many songs and poems were written to protest this tyranny. I recall parts of a poem entitled "The Wearin' O' the Green":

O Paddy dear, an' did ye hear the news that's
goin' round?
The shamrock is by law forbid to grow on
Irish ground!
No more St. Patrick's Day we'll keep, his
colour can't be seen
For there's a cruel law again the wearin' o'
the green.

It is hard to fathom that just as our forefathers were embarking on the greatest experiment in democratic government known to man, and enjoying the rights and liberties for which they had fought, men and women in Ireland were being imprisoned and even executed for wearing green. Wearing of the green was symbolic of their resistance. Many were forced to flee their beloved homeland to escape death, imprisonment, oppression, and tyranny. They sought freedom in the United States, where our freedoms of speech, religion, expression, and assembly were secured by the Constitution, and where one of the purposes of government was the protection of the individual against government tyranny.

The final stanza of the poem I quoted from earlier, as paraphrased, reflects the fleeing Irishmen's dreams:

But if at last our colour should be torn from
Ireland's heart,
Her sons with shame and sorrow from the
dear old isle will part;
I've heard a whisper of a country that lies
beyond the sea,
Where rich and poor stand equal in the light
of freedom's day.
O Erin, must we leave you, driven by a ty-
rant's hand?
Must we ask a mother's blessing from a
strange and distant land?
Where the cruel cross of tyranny shall never-
more be seen
And where, please God, we'll live and die still
wearin' O' the green.

Although this is an Irish poem, it underscores the love of liberty that characterizes America. Because of the bravery, determination, and the sacrifice of our forefathers, the United States stands today as a citadel of freedom and liberty in a world in which a large part of the population is still burdened by totalitarianism and oppression. The green we wear today is also to remember them, wherever they might be.

The Irish have contributed so much to the history of our Nation. They have fought in our wars, they have served our communities. They have added to our enjoyment through their stories and funloving spirit, often giving light to the darkest days. They have become great Americans who still cherish and revere their Irish roots and heritage. The spiritual descendants of St. Patrick have reminded us of the true importance and value of individual rights and liberties, and have always been in the forefront of defending the rights and liberties that define this Nation.

So, on this St. Patrick's Day, a day when true peace for the Emerald Isle seems to be finally in its grasp, let us remember the Irish heritage and those who struggle in the old country for freedom and liberty. Let us wear the green and remain forever mindful of all that it represents. And let us never forget that above all else, we are Americans—Americans strong and free.

I yield the floor.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES!

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as of the close of business yesterday, Thursday, March 16, the Federal debt stood at \$4,840,322,581,646.83. On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,373.95 as his or her share of that dabt.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-543. A communication from the Board Members of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the ability to pay benefits; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-544. A communication from the Board Members of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for calendar year 1994; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-545. A communication from the Board Members of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of justification of budget estimates for fiscal year 1996; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-546. A communication from the Director of the National Science Foundation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Foundation for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.