

pointed out in this article, which appeared in Roll Call:

People of this country are sick and tired of a Government that does not understand their problems or their neighbors' problems, sick and tired of politicians fighting over things that the rest of the country cannot understand, and, most of all, they are sick and tired of the fact that it seems impossible to get anything done in Washington.

Mr. President, I think that it is time, when we talk about the budget, for the moderates in both parties to come together and help resolve this problem. I am absolutely convinced that you cannot put people in a room who have visions of what the future of this country should be like that are as different as night and day. It is my opinion that the most difficult problems cannot be solved from the left working in, nor from the right working toward the center. I am absolutely convinced that you cannot take the fringes of any political party and try and use that methodology to solve difficult problems, such as a budget problem.

I know that all the folks that are working on the budget are people of good faith and have strong beliefs about what a budget agreement should accomplish and what it should contain. Mr. President, I am suggesting today that there are moderates on the Democratic side—moderates in the Democratic Party, both in the House and in the Senate, that really want to have a budget agreement. I think it is now time for the moderates on both sides of our political parties to try and band together to help resolve this problem. I am very concerned that as the days go by and hours keep ticking off the clock, that we are not making the progress needed and necessary in order to solve this problem before yet another deadline occurs.

As it was said in the Saturday article I quoted, the talks so far between Congress and the White House were a complete bust. Mr. President, we owe to the American people much more than that. We owe the best talent, the best minds, and the best dedicated public servants to work together across party lines to bring this debate to a closure. Let me suggest a couple of things I think moderates can agree to.

First, I think it is certainly possible that we can agree that there should be a balanced budget and it should be in 7 years. Point No. 1.

Second, I think that all of this debate about which economic assumptions we are going to use to help solve this problem almost border on the point of being ridiculous. The Congressional Budget Office has suggested that growth is going to be about 2.3 percent next year. The Office of Management and Budget suggested that growth rate will be about 2.5 percent. Is there not a middle ground between those two numbers, a figure between 2.3 and 2.5 that people with good intentions cannot agree to? I suggest that we split the differences between those, and I think that is something that can be done. I

think it can be done in a way that brings about the best economic assumptions that we need in order to fix this problem.

Third, I think people should be able to agree on a Consumer Price Index adjustment. The people who have looked at this issue have recommended that, clearly, the Consumer Price Index on which we base so many of our economic programs is overstating the cost of products that consumers buy and that an adjustment of somewhere up to 1 percent perhaps is a reasonable and rational adjustment.

I suggest that we could take a point, a percent adjustment, and by doing that really allow us a great deal more flexibility in solving this budget impasse.

Fourth, I think we ought to be able to agree on a tax cut that is reasonable and fair. Some have suggested no tax cut at all, zero. Some have suggested we absolutely have to have \$245 billion in tax cuts. Is there not, again, a middle ground that we could agree on that comes up with a reasonable tax cut and save somewhere in the range of \$100 to \$150 billion over the 7-year period? Is that not a fair compromise to those who say we should have none and those who say we should have the higher amount? I suggest it is.

The fifth point I think we should be able to come together on is the fact that the savings we have from these procedures I just outlined should be utilized to put back money in Medicare and Medicaid and the earned income tax credit and the welfare program, environmental programs, and yes, equally if not more important, the education programs which determine the future of the people of this country and use those extra funds to increase some of those drastic, suggested cuts in those programs.

Mr. President, I think reasonable people in both parties who could call ourselves moderate should be able to get together and do these things. I think it is more difficult when you have people who are on the left in their party, or on the right in their party trying to resolve these differences. Is it not better to have a group of people in the middle who are moderates who can agree, and once we get an agreement which I think is pretty easy to get to, work it out so that we then move toward the outside to solve the problem?

The way to solve this problem is working from the center out, not from the left end or from the right end, but, rather, working out the principles. These five principles I outlined I think give us the strong basis for trying to reach a balanced budget in 7 years, one that, hopefully, this President would be able to see meets the needs that he has outlined, solves the problem, and everybody comes away a winner.

I do not see how anybody wins if we have another stalemate. Everybody loses. Yet if we do reach an agreement, everybody should win. And winners or losers in the Congress is not really

what it is all about; it is whether we will craft a program that the American people can win with and the future generations can say that Congress did the right thing when they were called upon to meet this challenge.

I strongly suggest that now is the time for moderates in the Republican Party and the Democratic Party to start talking to each other. There is nothing wrong with that. That is what a democratic Government is all about—compromises, meeting together, solving the problems in the center, and then working it away, and these agreements are received by more people in order to reach a majority.

I am just very concerned if we do not do that, if we try and solve this problem from the left working in or from the right working in, we will just have a stalemate. I do not think there is any political capital in bringing this Government to a closure again because we at that time will be admitting once again we cannot make Government work. That is not why we were sent to Congress. Just the opposite is the reason we are here.

I call today upon moderates in both parties to start talking, to meeting, to see if we cannot agree on these five principles I have tried to outline and take it from there and see where it leads us.

I suggest, in conclusion, we might be very surprised that it leads us to a balanced budget agreement that the Congress can pass with great enthusiasm, and this President will find that he will be able to support it as well.

I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ALAN SIMPSON

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I was very saddened to learn of the retirement of Senator ALAN SIMPSON of Wyoming. He and I came here together in the class of 1978 and have served with each other on the Judiciary Committee, tackling some contentious nominations and other high-profile issues. He has emerged as a true leader on many issues including immigration and population issues. He is someone I would term a "character," for he is certainly one of the more colorful and humorous individuals to have ever served in the Senate. His quick wit is legend, and many of us—Democrat and Republican alike—have been victims of it at one time or another over the years, but, much more often the beneficiaries of it. He uses it both ways—to score a point but more often to break an unresolved impasse.

Senator SIMPSON is the son of former Wyoming Governor and Senator Milward Simpson and has been in and around politics all his life. Born in Denver, CO, in 1931, he earned both his bachelor of science and law degrees at the University of Wyoming in Laramie. He served in the U.S. Army from 1954 to 1956 and began his career as a litigator, raising his family in Cody, WY,

and serving as assistant attorney general of Wyoming and in the State legislature. He was elected to the Senate in 1978 and quickly became a rising star in his party. He was seriously considered for the Vice Presidential nomination in 1988 and has led the fight for passage of many major legislative efforts. His service as his party's whip was outstanding, but in matters of conscience, he never lost his independence.

Of course, our friend from Wyoming is best known here and throughout the country for his colorful personality. He is widely known for having one of the best senses of humor in Washington and one of its most acerbic tongues on occasion. He has entertained friends with his keen sense of comic timing, his witty delivery, and a standard portfolio of jokes and anecdotes, many of which could not be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or other reputable publications. When he leaves the Senate, he could pursue a number of different careers. He has the talent to be another Johnny Carson. He could successfully pursue many other fields, for he has a brilliant legal mind and has the ability to get to the core of an issue rapidly.

I count him as one of my closest friends. His beautiful, thoughtful, and gracious wife, Ann, is likewise a superb individual and my wife and I will never forget their genuine kindness and concern when Elizabeth Ann suddenly became ill on an overseas trip earlier this year.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to serve with Senator ALAN SIMPSON over the last 17 years, and I look forward to our last year here together. I congratulate him on an outstanding career, and hope that we have not seen the last of him in the public arena. We need his leadership, his passion for the issues, and his humor to help lighten our load.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MARK HATFIELD

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, while MARK HATFIELD's retirement announcement did not take me by complete surprise—for such decisions have become virtually a weekly event here in the Congress—I was nonetheless disappointed and saddened to learn that he would not be seeking reelection to the Senate next year. He is one of the senior Members of this body, and has been a national leader of uncommon earnestness, moderation, honesty, and principle. He is known for his lack of excessive partisanship and for always yielding to his conscience on the many difficult matters that come before us. He is thoughtful, deliberative, intellectual, and never fails to do what he believes to be right and in the best interest of his State and country.

The people of Oregon have entrusted Senator HATFIELD with its reins of leadership through State or national office since 1956, when he was elected secretary of state at the age of 34. In

1958, he was elected Governor, serving for 8 years. In 1966, he was elected to the Senate and has been here ever since.

He is a deeply religious man who has been a spiritual leader as well as a public one. His leadership of our Senate Prayer Breakfast group over the years has been nothing short of inspirational. I have also enjoyed working with him on the National Prayer Breakfasts each year, something he had been involved with even at the State level when he was Governor back in Oregon. Our friend from Oregon has led by example; his religious convictions and quiet, friendly manner have been a powerful demonstration of how an ideal public official should conduct himself. He has been one for us to look at and emulate, regardless of our own political views.

As a young serviceman, he was one of the first Americans to see Hiroshima after it was bombed. This experience left its mark, and Senator HATFIELD has been an unflinching leader on issues relating to nuclear deterrence and non-proliferation.

MARK HATFIELD was born in Dallas, OR in 1922, and graduated from Willamette and Stanford Universities. He served in the Navy during World War II, commanding landing craft at Iwo Jima and Okinawa. Early in his career, he was a teacher of political science and has written extensively on public policy issues. Since January, he has chaired the Senate Appropriations Committee, a daunting task in its own right, but particularly challenging this year. He had previously served in that capacity. His graciousness and earnestness have not been diminished by the fierce budget wrangling this year.

Senator HATFIELD and I will be leaving the Senate at the same time, so I will not be serving here once he is gone. But I do know that those Members who do remain after him will find it a much lesser place in his absence. I am proud to call him a friend, I congratulate him on his outstanding career and for the way he has always conducted himself, and wish him and Antoinette all the best for a happy, healthy, and lengthy retirement. I also look forward to serving with him over the next year.

Mr. 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.

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

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

THE RETIREMENTS OF ALAN SIMPSON, MARK HATFIELD, AND NANCY KASSEBAUM

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, three of our colleagues have just recently announced they are not running again for

reelection. The most recent is Senator SIMPSON.

I got to know AL SIMPSON when I was a State legislator and he was a State legislator. We were at a meeting that a foundation pulled together of what they, accurately or inaccurately, called the outstanding legislators from various States, and I got to know ALAN SIMPSON there.

I have worked with him over the years. He and I differ on some things, but he is a legislator's legislator. He really legislates. He sits down and works things out. He is a man of reason. He is not frightened by a new idea. I think he has made a tremendous contribution to the Senate, to his State of Wyoming, and to the Nation, and I am very proud to have served with him.

I will add, one of the things that characterize Senator SIMPSON, Senator HATFIELD, and Senator KASSEBAUM is something the Presiding Officer has heard me talk about before, and that is there is not excessive partisanship. One of the things that has changed in my 21 years, soon to be 22 years here in Congress, is that we have become gradually more partisan. Both parties share the blame on this, and it is not a good thing. It is like the budget process. We issue statements, we have press conferences, we denounce each other instead of sitting around a table, working things out. ALAN SIMPSON, MARK HATFIELD, and NANCY KASSEBAUM were the kind of people who worked things out.

I have, up until the last election, served as chairman of three subcommittees. I do not think we ever had a party-line vote in any of my subcommittees. That meant sometimes I had to give a little more than I wanted. Sometimes others did. But I think the net effect was a good one for the Nation and, strangely, I think, good for the two parties. I think the public senses that we are excessively partisan and there is a negative attitude toward both the Democratic and Republican Parties out there. I hope we can move away from that.

The second person who recently announced that he is retiring is Senator MARK HATFIELD. Most people think about MARK HATFIELD in connection with chairing the Appropriations Committee, or a hundred and one other things that he does. I think of MARK HATFIELD particularly for his leadership in the area of arms control. Long before others raised the flag that maybe we should not be spending so much money on arms, MARK HATFIELD was telling us that.

Even today we spend more on our defense budget than the next eight countries combined. It does not make sense. If we take the 1973 budget on defense and add the inflation factor, we are spending more today than we were in 1973. In 1973 we were involved in Vietnam, we faced the cold war with what was then the Soviet Union and a nuclear threat there. We ought to be paring it down. MARK HATFIELD has been a