

lease of the National Airport and Dulles airport, and the autonomy it provided for the Airport Authority.

I do not quarrel with the characterization of the distinguished Senator from Georgia as to some of the Federal strings that remain attached to that particular legislation. We seldom really ever turn loose anything in its entirety in this body, and I understand that.

But the bottom line is, in my judgment, this legislation disregards the views of local officials and business leaders, and thrusts the central government upon a local authority that was divorced from the federal government by President Reagan himself.

The amendment I have sent to the desk simply creates an advisory group which would take into consideration the views of the local community, and the history of a particular facility, before any renaming occurs.

There may be other approaches to this particular challenge, and in listening to the distinguished minority leader, I believe his approach would be entirely appropriate.

The problem here is that we are taking up and considering legislation that has not been considered by any committee of the Senate, that has not had any hearing. Indeed, when we have been able to ascertain the views of those who would normally be considered most interested, they have expressed reservations in various degrees. I think it would be appropriate under the circumstances, since the legislation before us today purports to honor the 40th President, if the views of either the President or Mrs. Reagan, who speaks so eloquently for him, were known on this matter. I think that would be helpful to many Members in considering this issue.

It may be entirely appropriate, after appropriate consultation, to go ahead and rename Washington National Airport.

In any event, the haste with which we move is designed, I believe, to reflect the coming birthday of President Reagan. And I would simply suggest that some consultation with the family—and specifically the President, or speaking for the President, Mrs. Reagan—might very much be in order.

A very nice ceremony, I am informed, has been planned for the dedication of the Ronald Reagan Building on May 5. The former First Lady is planning to participate, and I think all the Members of Congress will certainly be there, if not in body, then in spirit.

So I ask my colleagues to think about what we are doing, and think about whether or not this properly honors the man it is designed to honor.

The amendment I have sent to the desk will be taken up tomorrow. Again, it would create an advisory group that would deliberate on some of the issues I have raised, and report back to Congress in a timely fashion. It would not preclude any action by the Senate or the House. It would simply provide

input from some of the local governments and communities that President Reagan so strongly defended during his long and illustrious tour as President of the United States.

Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays on the amendment I have sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, unless the Senator from Georgia wishes to take the floor at this point, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, once again this argument, which I just simply do not understand, suggesting that the President's family somehow has to come here and seek homage, or lobby the Congress—it is an incredible argument. That family would never do that. Anybody waiting for some communique or something of that nature—I would not hold my breath.

As I said a moment ago, this is something the Nation has to feel it needs to do. It is a "thank you" that they need to express; our country, our citizens. There is no way that family would come here lobbying for this kind of thing. I am always surprised when it is suggested that we have not heard or something. That is disappointing.

Mr. President, again I want to make it clear, the sponsors are going to oppose any of these amendments that change the rules retroactively, that impose some new constraint on this redesignation or some new constraint on the Congress. The concept of putting something in place prospectively may be laudable. There are several amendments here by Members on the other side who have declared they are going to vote for the redesignation but they have another issue that they are bringing forward. I think that is appropriate. But the amendments that reach backwards are not acceptable on our side.

The argument that a local city or authority has jurisdiction here is, in my judgment, a specious argument. The Federal Government's relationship with Washington National Airport is indisputable. You cannot go to that airport without seeing the presence of it any day or any night. And the law is very clear, in terms of the Federal role in that facility. I will read the short version rather than the elongated:

The Federal Government has a continuing but limited interest in the operation of the two federally owned airports which serve the travel and cargo needs of the entire metropolitan Washington region as well as the District of Columbia as the national seat of Government.

As I said, municipalities are creatures of State governments and chartered by State governments and the Governor of the State of jurisdiction is in support of the redesignation.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The nomination received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT OF DEFERRALS OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 89

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, to the Committee on Appropriations, to the Committee on the Budget, to the Committee on Finance, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report eight new deferrals of budgetary resources, totaling \$4.8 billion.

These deferrals affect programs of the Department of State, the Social Security Administration, and International Security Assistance.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 3, 1998.

REPORT CONCERNING FISHERIES OFF THE COASTS OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 90

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; referred jointly, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1823, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), I transmit herewith an Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Latvia extending the Agreement on April 8, 1993, Concerning Fisheries Off the Coasts of the United States, with annex, as extended (the 1993 Agreement). The