

Resolve to negotiate firmly with the White House over the debt ceiling, but be realistic about what we want and what can be achieved. We Republicans are leading the way against government as usual. Do not get snared in a political trap by recycling old arguments that make us look like we are returning to the old way of doing business.

I say again. We are changing the way government governs. This is the track of the Republican train. There will only be a wreck if we turn our back on the progress we are making.

ST. MARY'S CATHOLIC PARISH

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise paying tribute to Saint Mary's Catholic Parish in historic Old Town Alexandria. Tomorrow, September 30, 1995 marks a true milestone, its 200th anniversary. Saint Mary's stands as the oldest Catholic church in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Saint Mary's has called Alexandria home for two centuries and is an institution whose presence has extended over many generations. The actual parish was founded in 1795 at a time when the seeds of Catholicism were just planted: Virginia was home for only 200 Catholics at the turn of the eighteenth-century.

Led by Colonel John Fitzgerald, then the Mayor of Alexandria and military assistant to General George Washington, Saint Mary's was erected. In 1869, the Sisters of Holy Cross School pioneered Saint Mary's School, which is still in existence and filled to capacity.

The Reverend Stanley Krempa currently serves pastor to Saint Mary's, which boasts a membership of over 3,200 families. Its "church family" is fervently committed to taking on the twenty-first century with great energy and zeal. Saint Mary's family not only intends to expand, they are preparing for tomorrow, today: the church just successfully concluded an amazing fundraising drive that will build not only classrooms for the school, but assists with other renovation efforts associated with the church.

I join the many friends and families in wishing well to Saint Mary's Catholic Parish. As we stand in the threshold of the twenty-first century, Saint Mary's stands as a body with tremendous outreach, Saint Mary's stands as a credit to its church body and its locality. Saint Mary's can stand tall.

SENATOR MARK HATFIELD: RECIPIENT OF 1995 ALBERT LASKER PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I rise today to extend my congratulations to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, Mr. HATFIELD, upon his receipt of the 1995 Albert Lasker Public Service Award for his "energetic leadership and enduring advocacy in support of biomedical research."

I can think of no Member of the Senate more deserving of this recognition. Senator HATFIELD has been unflagging in his dedication to the cause of biomedical research—recognizing the importance it holds for Americans today and the promise it holds for Americans in the future.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, Senator HATFIELD is keenly aware of the competing demands upon dwindling federal resources. Establishing priorities among a series of worthy causes is a difficult task. I believe it is a tribute to his judgment and his vision that he has always assigned the highest priority to biomedical research efforts.

In addition to protecting the current federal investment in this area, Senator HATFIELD has also sought creative ways to expand the pool of funds which can be made available to it. I was pleased to have been counted among the supporters of the biomedical research trust fund proposal he put forward during the last Congress and of his efforts to restore National Institutes of Health [NIH] funding in the budget resolution this year.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, which I chair, has authorizing and oversight responsibility for the NIH. Senator HATFIELD has consistently offered his support and suggestions for NIH activities, and I look forward to continuing to work with him.

The Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation has made a wise choice in selecting Senator HATFIELD for this prestigious award.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the award citation be printed in the RECORD.

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

1995 ALBERT LASKER PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD THE CITATION

As an energetic advocate in support of biomedical research, Senator Mark Hatfield has made outstanding contributions. Dedicated to the proposition that the health of Americans is a national priority, Mark Hatfield has continually fought to increase research appropriations for the National Institutes of Health, and he has succeeded.

During the six years of his Chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, funding for the National Institutes of Health increased by over \$2.5 billion, an average of almost 10% per year. These funds enabled 107,000 research projects to receive NIH grants, supported an expansion of the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, and substantially increased the allocation for research on Alzheimer's Disease.

Senator Hatfield's vigorous leadership has been crucial in the battle against proposed cuts in the NIH budget. Affirming the central role of the National Institutes of Health in the mission of biomedical research, he declared that, "The NIH is the cornerstone of improved quality of life in this nation."

Throughout his career, Mark Hatfield has sought to reorder our nation's research priorities to focus on activities that enhance life. Taking the time to become informed about particular diseases has led him to in-

troduce legislation to create a National Advisory Council on Rare Disease Research, which would formulate a strategic plan and establish a national research database. He has also emphasized the need to support research on Parkinson's Disease, Epidermolysis Bullosa, and Sudden Infant Death Syndrome.

During the 103rd Congress, Senator Hatfield achieved enactment of a National Center for Sleep Disorders Research within the National Heart Lung and Blood Institute, and introduced a bill to create a permanent bioethics advisory board as a forum for discussion of ethical issues in biomedicine. In a period of dwindling resources, his most far-sighted piece of health legislation is the Hatfield-Harkin bill that would establish a Fund for Health Research, a stable, non-appropriations-based source of additional research dollars, from tax checkoffs and insurance premiums.

Mark Hatfield believes that funding for medical research not only improves quality of life, but offers our nation the highest rate of economic return of any other federal program. If health is wealth, then biomedical research is the best investment our nation can make in its future.

To Mark O. Hatfield, for energetic leadership and enduring advocacy in support of biomedical research, this 1995 Albert Lasker Public Service Award is given.*

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE FULBRIGHT PROGRAM

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the importance of international exchange programs at this particular point in history. I would particularly like to highlight the Fulbright program and its enormous contribution to the enrichment of our society. The Fulbright program was created in 1946 largely with the efforts of the Senator from Arkansas from whom the program derived its name. Since that time the program has sent 75,026 United States students to study in foreign countries and has brought 127,093 foreigners to study in our country.

Forty-five years ago they sent me off to the London School of Economics where, for the first time, I learned a dictum of Seymour Martin Lipsit, who has put it so nicely. He said, "He who knows only one country knows no country." If you use the simple analogy of eyesight, it is two eyes that provide perspective.

My experience in London was certainly eye-opening. As a New Deal Democrat I was surprised to find how extraordinarily suspicious of the United States they were in London. I wrote back to a friend, in a letter that Douglas Schoen had preserved in his book:

I get the impression Americans are not generally aware of just how fundamentally we are being opposed by a small but enormously vital element in British society, or just how much we are being disagreed with by British society in general. I respectfully submit that we had damned sure better get off our intellectual asses but quick.

A point that was perhaps never fully appreciated. I only wish that there were more Fulbright opportunities so that more students might have the enlightening experience that I enjoyed.

Perhaps at no time in our history have we needed an increase in international exchange programs. We find ourselves in a world that in many ways is more complex than when it was dominated by two ideologies. International exchange programs are necessary to give our students an appreciation of our country and its place in the world.

The Fulbright program has been administered by an even older institution, the Institute for International Education [IIE]. Last year I had the honor to address the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary Forum of the IIE. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks from this event be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

OPENING REMARKS

(By Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan)

Andrew Heiskell began by noting the setting we're in, the New York Public Library. I was brought up in this library in a very important way. I was brought up into an understanding of what the United States could provide for people.

In the 1930s, in the midst of the Depression, I shined shoes, pretty much for a living. But it was a living that was fair enough. I would work between Sixth and Seventh Avenues at the Wurlitzer Building, in a little territorial space of my own. When I had earned \$1.10, which was five cents up in the subway, five cents back, and a dollar for the day, I'd come over here as a shoe shine boy, with a black box. I'd take it in the Fifth Avenue entrance and bring it to the check-in desk. It would be accepted, without comment, as if it were an umbrella being presented in the lobby of a Pall Mall club. I'd be given a ticket by a man in a brown cotton jacket. I'd go up in that great room. I was a citizen of the world and of literature. And indeed, for those purposes, I was, I can never repay that debt.

I'm here to talk about the Fulbright experience and the Institute of International Education. IIE sent me off 44 years ago, in 1950, to the London School of Economics. There, for the first time, I learned a dictum of Seymour Martin Lipset, who said, "He who knows only one country knows no country."

If you use the simple analogy of eyesight, it is two eyes that provide perspective. And it was a perspective enormously striking to me at that time—1950, the United States in good condition, untouched by war, and, indeed, enlivened by it. The recovery was extraordinary, and Europe was just climbing out of the ruins. We were victorious allies. I found, though, on arriving at the London School of Economics as a person of liberal disposition, a New Deal democrat, if you like, how extraordinarily suspicious of the United States were most folks there, the academics in particular, and the Left, to be specific.

And then came the Korean War. I was called back. We mustered in Grosvenor Square, got on a train at Waterloo, and in the late afternoon we were crossing the Netherlands on our way, as it would turn out, to Bremerhaven, which was a submarine base the Nazis had built.

I had brought along a library habit that had been imbued here, made possible largely through the GI bill and its book allowance. I brought an enormous volume of Hannah Arendt's, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, just then published in Great Britain. This

was her masterwork. I brought it along, not to read, really, but to be seen reading. So, I got in this compartment, as they then had in European railways—there were six of us—and I opened it up. Here was the first paragraph. "Two world wars in one generation, separated by an uninterrupted chain of local wars and revolutions, followed by no peace treaty for the vanquished and no respite for the victor, have ended in the anticipation of a third World War between the two remaining world powers. This moment of anticipation is like the calm that settles after all hopes have died."

I read that. Then I read it out loud to the compartment. No one demurred. Finally, a commander, who had a Navy Cross and was the senior officer present afloat said, "There must be a bar car on this train somewhere." And that was that.

I began to sense then the power of Marxism as an idea, the inevitability of the clash of civilizations—the totalitarian, the liberal—you could read it either way, and some did. And some looked both ways simultaneously. The first thing I ever published was a letter from London in *The Nation*, in response to an article by G.D.H. Cole, who suggested that the Korean War was an act of American aggression, intended to invade China and the Soviet Union. I said, "No, no, no, surely that's not so." I got a surprising amount of mail from the British, Londoners, who said that's obviously right, but that's what they all think.

But having had this experience of the power of Marxism, it became possible for me years later, in different circumstances, to see its decline. Having seen it at the flood tide of its strength, you saw it recede. You couldn't have done that absent the international experience. And it was startling to be in Washington, and see how little this was understood.

In 1979, *Newsweek* had an issue on "what will happen in the 1980s," and I wrote a small piece that said, "Well, in the 1980s, the Soviet Union will break up. That's obvious." And will the world blow up as its constituent parts start using their nuclear weapons one on the other? This issue is not yet resolved. I'm not aware if anyone read the article, but I was then on the Intelligence Committee, and I would make this argument, an argument impenetrable to the intelligence community. They didn't know what you were talking about.

I was once, for a long period, an observer to the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, the START talks. I remember asking the negotiators, when we were finished with the mind-numbing details of this treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, what makes you think there will be a Union of Soviet Socialist Republics?

Well, to them this question was not a question. They had never heard it before and went right by it. When the treaty did arrive at the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which I am a member, it was between the United States of America and four countries, of which I think I'd only heard of two. They were Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan.

I had the doubtful pleasure of asking the ambassadors who were presenting this to us. "It says here it's a treaty between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., and then yet it says, no, no, it's these four other countries. How do you know it's with these other four countries?"

They said, "We have letters." I said, "Well where did you get them?" They said, "We got them in Lisbon." It sounded like a World War II Humphrey Bogart movie. Oh. Got them in Lisbon. I see.

In fact, had we had a better feel for what you could have learned in those years, we

might not be in such straitened circumstances as we are today. That failure of understanding of international politics came about because of an insularity about the essential fact, the opposition of ideas, and then a pre-occupation with the minute, mechanical fallout of those ideas.

This clash of ideas is not over. It now assumes yet another phase. At the beginning of this century, there were two commanding, universal ideas. You could call them liberal, if you like, and Marxist, if you choose. The liberal idea, in the general usage in nineteenth-century England, was that the group identity that was called nationalist, or ethnic, was preindustrial and would simply disappear as it became more and more outdated and irrelevant. The other side, the Marxist view, was that economic processes determine all identity, that the class structure determines all social struggle, and that it would be universal in its nature. The red flag is red because the blood of all men and women is red. And that is the universality of the class struggle.

Well, both ideas were wrong. Deeply wrong. And we enter into an age subsequent to that, in which not the only, but the most painful, the most immediate source of conflicts is ethnic. It is ethnic conflict as a post-industrial phenomenon—ethnic conflict as a mode of aggregating interests that is far more effective than any other mode seen on earth just now.

If you look around the world, that is what you mostly encounter. We are two or three generations behind any understanding of it. Just as the American political establishment had no real understanding of Marxism in 1950, it has no real understanding of ethnicity today. We're as unprepared for Bosnia as we were for Leningrad.

And there's one answer to it, if there's any answer. That is to go abroad and study it, and see it, taste it, touch it, feel it. And there's one institution singularly devoted to just that purpose. And that is the Institute of International Education.

You were welcoming to me, a gawky and half-formed youth, nearly half a century ago. There will be others like me coming, possibly to your embarrassment. But with any luck, it all works out, and I'm here to thank you and wish you another three-quarters of a century as successful as the last.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF FARM AID

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, this Sunday will mark the 10th anniversary of Farm Aid. This remarkable organization, born of the farm crisis of the 1980's, has stood on the front lines with America's family farmers as farming, ranching and the rural way of life have been under attack. Through the vision and effort of founders Willie Nelson, Neil Young, and John Mellencamp, millions of dollars have been raised to assist farm families beset by disaster, fund legal assistance programs for rural citizens and increase national and international awareness of the plight of America's family farmer.

At the same time we are celebrating the achievements of Farm Aid, the Republican-controlled Congress is making the deepest cuts to farm programs in history—at the same time they are funding tax breaks for the wealthiest citizens in the country. Make no mistake, a workable farm program cannot be crafted under a mandate to cut \$13.4