

our responsibility to see that we assist and work with local and State governments and the business community to do just that.

The Congress and the President both agree that reform is long overdue. Less than 1 year ago, as I said, we passed this with overwhelming bipartisan majorities. Last October, the ranking member of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, Senator KENNEDY, remarked that "this is an area of public policy which is of great significance and importance to working families in this country and of great significance and importance to the United States as a nation and its ability to compete." That was true then and is even more true now. With ever rapid advances in technology, workers will have to constantly change and upgrade their skills in order to compete.

The importance of training and education were also central to the debate and passage of the welfare reform legislation this summer. In order for welfare recipients to successfully make the transition to work, they must have the training, education, and job skills that will help them get in jobs and stay in jobs. That is what this legislation is all about.

It is not about programming a child from kindergarten clear through high school in a career path. It is about giving our States and our local communities the resources to help design flexible programs that will meet the needs of Kansans, or meet the needs of those who live in New Hampshire or Maine or California. There are differing needs in differing States and at different times in a person's progress through school and work.

Again, that is what this legislation is all about. It would allow the States the flexibility to design integrated systems where services are delivered on a one-stop basis. No longer would an individual have to go to several different offices for help. With a one-stop system they could get job counseling, skills training, and other services all in one place. That is what the administration said they wanted as well.

Meeting these challenges will not be an easy task. One possible response might be to increase funding for education and training. We are on the way to doing just that. I am troubled, however, that we would pursue this course while leaving in place the same old programs which we all recognize do not work. More funding, I would argue, will not advance the type of major structural overhaul and consolidation of training and education programs that is needed to create a workforce system that can serve the local needs of job seekers and employers alike. It is a Band-Aid approach that deals only with the symptoms and not the underlying causes of the problem.

This bill would consolidate over 90 programs of various job training efforts scattered among 15 different agencies. It really does take us in a new direction that I think offers positive assist-

ance. So, it is with enormous disappointment that I see these efforts may now be wasted—but I hope not—as we complete the 104th Congress. For those who will remain, because I will be retiring, it is my hope that what we have laid out here in months and months of work can provide a background for further efforts in the 105th Congress.

This legislation has been strongly supported by the National Governors' Association, both Democratic and Republican Governors. They believed this was one of the most important pieces of legislation that could be passed in this Congress.

The workforce development conference report that is now on the calendar is a result of 2 years of bipartisan work to develop a vision of a workforce development system for the 21st century. The elements of this common vision include:

Flexibility for the States to design systems that meet their own needs, while preserving the core activities traditionally supported by the Federal Government;

Greater coordination among educators, trainers, and the business people who create the jobs for which individuals are being trained;

Innovative strategies like vouchers to improve training; and

Improved effectiveness of programs by focusing on results, not bureaucratic redtape.

This conference report, I think, deserves the full support of all those, both Republican and Democrat, who were committed to achieving broad job training reform less than 1 year ago. One of the staunchest supporters of this effort is on the other side of the aisle, Mr. President, Senator KERREY of Nebraska.

Some have complained the conference report does not go far enough in preserving a Federal role in job training. Others claim it creates too broad a Federal role. I do not believe that any of the specific criticisms that were leveled against this bill are significant enough to bring down such a solid piece of legislation which has been years in the making.

I had hoped that what began as a bipartisan effort with passage of the reform efforts in both the Senate and House would come to completion in a bipartisan vote of support for the conference report. We are faced with a challenge of creating a new and coherent system in which all segments of the workforce can obtain the skills necessary to earn wages sufficient to maintain a high quality of living. In addition, American businesses need a skilled workforce that can compete in the world marketplace. I believe this legislation gives the States the necessary tools to meet those challenges.

We should not have allowed the distractions of an election year to detract us from moving forward in a bipartisan fashion on this legislation, which I believe is so important.

Mr. President, I conclude by saying it is my hope that in the 105th Congress it will be one of the top priorities as we recognize how extremely important it is for us to address our skilled workforce for the 21st century.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

LEAVING THE SENATE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, it is altogether fitting that I follow the remarks of my colleague from Kansas. I think those who have been watching have seen just an example of the kind of passion that she has brought to public service, the kind of strength and integrity that she continues to display even in the waning moments of this session. I know the country is going to miss her service. I am certainly going to miss being a partner in so many endeavors that we have had over the past 18 years in the U.S. Senate.

I must say, this is both a sentimental and a sweet moment for me. It shortly will mark 24 years of serving in both the House and the Senate. It is a mere blink of the cosmic eye of time, and it has all been telescoped into these final few moments as we conclude this session. So it is sentimental in that sense, but it is also sweet in another, because I have been standing in the glow cast by so many friends and their kind remarks. Last evening, Senator BYRD took the floor and gave an encomium to me. I was pleased that I was not here to hear it, because, had I been here, I would have been too embarrassed to have remained on the floor.

If someone throws rocks at me, I am quite accustomed to throwing them back. But if you hurl a bouquet, then I am usually undone.

So, I thank Senator BYRD for his gracious comments last night, along with those of Senator NUNN, who also was most kind. He and I have served on the Senate Armed Services Committee for the past 18 years. I must say it has been truly an honor for me to have served with such a distinguished, intelligent, and dedicated individual, one who has dedicated his life to promoting a sound and responsible national defense policy, foreign policy, and, indeed, economic policy. It is my hope that sometime in the future we will be able to continue efforts in all of these areas.

While I have been caught up in the golden afterglow of the accolades of my colleagues and those of the editorial writers in my home State, I have always been mindful of Dr. Johnson's observation that: "In lapidary inscriptions, men are not under oath." I suspect there may be some truth to that as far as the editorial comments are concerned or final tributes to our parting Members. I might say, for my own part, I have been little more than Aesop's fly on the wheel of history's chariot, marveling that I could kick up so much dust in a period of 2½ decades.

I have also been deeply humbled by the experience. I think it is a testament to the openness of the people of this country, especially the people of Maine, that a boy who was born in the bed of his mother on the third story of a tenement building on Hancock Street, in Bangor, ME, just a block away from what used to be described as the "Devil's half acre" could, in fact, be elected to the greatest elective body in the entire world.

Maine people have always demonstrated a generosity of heart and, also, I believe, self-serving as it may sound, a great soundness of mind, to judge people not on their origins, not on their economic status, ethnicity or race, but on merit, and that is why, historically, we can point to people like Margaret Chase Smith, who stood on this floor so many years ago and delivered her "Declaration of Conscience."

It is why the people of Maine elected Ed Muskie, whom we lost just a few months ago who demonstrated his commitment to this Nation's interest in helping to clean up our waterways, improve the quality of our air and became known as Mr. Clean, then Mr. Budget, and the enormous contribution he made through public service to the entire country. The people of Maine are very, very proud of him and are working to memorialize all of his work.

They elected George Mitchell, who, in a very short period of time, became the Senate majority leader and one of the most effective in the history of this body.

They elected OLYMPIA SNOWE to replace Senator Mitchell when he decided to retire. Soon I believe they are going to send Susan Collins to sit beside OLYMPIA SNOWE. Governor King, who is an Independent Governor of the State of Maine, made the comment when I announced my retirement, "What do you do? What does a State do when it loses Babe Ruth and Lou Gehrig?" I suspect he was referring to Senator Mitchell as being Babe Ruth and me as Lou Gehrig. But what do you do?

I might say the same for Kansas. What does Kansas do when it loses a Bob Dole and a NANCY KASSEBAUM? What the people of Maine will do is do what the Yankees did. They will go out and recruit Mickey Mantle, which they have done in OLYMPIA SNOWE, and Roger Maris, which they will have in Susan Collins.

I think all of us feel the sense of loss that so many are leaving—some 13 now, with Bob Dole, 14—the U.S. Senate at the end of this term. We feel that perhaps things won't go on as they should. People talk about the "center no longer holding, of things falling apart." But I believe it was Charles De Gaulle who said "That our graveyards are filled with indispensable people." There will be others equally qualified, if not more qualified, to take our place in this distinguished institution.

I had occasion to travel out to Ann Arbor, MI, yesterday afternoon to par-

take in a conference that was held at the Gerald Ford Library. The moderator of the panel, which consisted of Tom Foley, Bob Michel, and myself, hit me with a question the moment I arrived. He said, "Why are you leaving? Why are you and so many others leaving?"

Of course, I could have given a glib answer and said, "Well, I'd rather have people wonder why I'm leaving than stay and have people wonder why I'm staying." But it was a serious question that required a serious answer.

Each of us are leaving for different and profoundly personal reasons. Some are departing the Senate at the end of this session because of age. Some are departing because of health factors. Some are departing, like my colleague from Kansas, for family reasons, of wanting to be at home with her children and grandchildren.

For me, I must say, there is never a good time to leave the best job in the world. There is never a good time to do that. But for me, it is the best time. I have what I would call a Gothic preoccupation with the relentless tick of time. I served almost a quarter of a century on Capitol Hill now representing the people of Maine, and I know had I chosen to run one more term, the pressure would have been on to say, "Well, now that you are chairman of one of the various committees on which you serve, we need to keep you where you are, so run again." So it would be 12 years from now I would then still be running after Senator STROM THURMOND, whom I am sure by that time would have renounced his late-blooming support for term limits and decided he wanted just one more term.

But the subject of term limits, of course, raises another issue. The people of Maine passed by way of referendum a proposal to place a two-term limitation on those who serve in the U.S. Senate. It was not binding, as such. It was not retroactive, and so it never would have applied to me or, indeed, to Senator Mitchell. But it basically said something about the mood of the people of our State; that they feel, or have come to feel, at least those who voted, that 12 years is long enough.

I must say, in the back of my mind, that weighed rather heavily; that even though it did not apply to me in any legal sense, in spirit, some were at least saying, you have been there twice as long as we would like to see people serve in the U.S. Congress.

I think it is a mistake. It is open to, obviously, a difference of opinion, with good will on both sides of this particular debate. But I think it is a mistake to suggest that people should only be here 12 years and move on. It will only, in my judgment, continue the churning of people moving in, moving out, and we lose a sense of history that a Senator ROBERT BYRD possesses and that of Senator MOYNIHAN and others. I can go down the list of people who serve with great distinction, who bring such

a wealth of information, a sense of history, a sense of reverence for the finest institution in the world.

That is a personal judgment on my part, but I think we should be wary of just pushing people in, pushing them out, relieving people of their responsibility of voting. We have term limits. We have them now. They are called elections. If you don't like what your elected official is doing, then go to the polls and vote them out. But, no, it is an easy way to say, "We don't even have to think about it, it is automatic. You have done your 12 years; now move on."

So that was something that weighed at least in the corners of my consciousness as to whether I should stay or leave.

I must say to my colleagues that my goal in politics has always been quite modest, and that is to help restore a sense of confidence in the integrity of the process itself, to help bring Washington a bit closer to the main streets of my home State. I have always tried to bring a sense of balance and perspective and, yes, let me use the word, moderation. It is not in vogue today to talk about being a moderate. We are frequently depicted as being mushy or weak-principled or having no principle, looking for compromise—another word which has somehow taken on a negative tone.

I recall after supporting the crime bill 2 years ago, a call came into one of my district offices, and a man was very angry. He said, "I am angry with your boss," to one of my staffers.

I said, "Why was he angry?"

He said, if you excuse the expression, "He's too damn reasonable."

Perhaps that will be the epitaph on my gravestone.

I believe it is essential to have passion in politics, provided that passion doesn't blind us to the need to seek, find and build consensus. Republicans and Democrats have different philosophies. We are different. We see the role of Government in different ways, of either the need for its limitation or expansion. But we have the same goal, and that is to provide the greatest amount of good for the greatest amount of people in this country. I also think it is sheer folly to believe that either party holds the keys to the kingdom of wisdom, and I think the danger to our political system is that each party is going to plant its feet in ideological cement and refuse to move.

The Senate has changed since I first came here. The personalities have surely changed, and that is to be expected. It was inevitable. We had people of such stature like Senator Ribicoff, Senator Baker, Senator Javits, Senator Tower, Senator Jackson, Senator Rudman, Senator Danforth, and the list goes on. They have all departed from this institution, and we lost a great deal when they retired or passed away.

So the personalities have changed, but the process has also changed.

Toffler wrote a book some years ago in which he said we were entering the age of future shock, in which time would be speeded up by events and our customs and culture would be shaken in the hurricane winds of change.

Those hurricane winds of change have been blowing through this Chamber over the past three decades as well, and has changed, fundamentally, the operation of the Senate itself. The introduction of cameras into our Chamber has changed it, some for the good and some not for the good.

The House has always been able to act differently than the Senate. The House is a different body, a different institution with a different history. I served there for 6 years.

I recall reading that Emerson with a visitor in the gallery, pointed to the House floor, and he said, "There, sir, is a standing insurrection." And that is what it is. It is far more energetic and boisterous and full of passion because that is the House of the people. That is where they are closest to the people that we serve.

The House undertook a 100-day march at the beginning of this session. They passed some major legislation. The pressure immediately was on the Senate: "Why can't you do the same? We did all of this in 100 days. Why can't you do the same?" And the answer is, the Senate was never designed to act in 100 days, to take up the same agenda in the same period of time. We were designed to slow down the process, to be more thoughtful about exactly what we were about, to take up major issues and to ventilate them, to debate them at length, if necessary, to allow the public to understand exactly what we were undertaking, to express their approbation or disapproval.

But now the pressure is on to move faster and faster, to become more like the House. That is a great institution, but we should not merge the two identities.

I think there has been a loss of reverence for our institutions. In fact, if you look, perhaps the Supreme Court may be the only institution for which there is a deep sense of respect and reverence, and perhaps that is because the mystique that surrounds it has yet to be torn away and shredded.

I find it troubling that we see shoving matches outside committee rooms in the other body. While poets have asked, "What rough beast slouching its way toward Bethlehem," we have to ask, "What rough beast slouching its way toward the Potomac?" Is it the Russian Duma? Have we come to shoving matches to make our points? It was discouraging to see that passions are so high that we have to resort to fisticuffs.

Perhaps there is a recognition that we have gone too far. We can take some hope that Members in the other body are now holding retreats and actually socializing. Think about that. They are deciding to socialize, Democrats and Republicans, something un-

heard of for the past 2 years, and now starting to socialize to get to know each other a little bit better so that perhaps during the height of those passionate debates, they might still maintain a sense of order and respect.

I remember during the Watergate process I served on the House Judiciary Committee that was debating whether to bring impeachment articles against Richard Nixon. It was more than 22 years ago. And I raised a question. I said, "How did we ever get from 'The Federalist Papers' to the edited transcripts? How have we come that far?" And I wondered yesterday, in the same vein, how did we ever get away from the kind of relationships that Gerald Ford and "Tip" O'Neill and Tom Foley and Bob Michel had with each other where they could vigorously debate their philosophical differences but go out and play a round of golf or have a drink after debate ended that day, and now we find ourselves filing ethics complaints against each other, a volley going back and forth to see who can make the strongest charges against the other?

Mr. President, there are many reasons why this is taking place. It would take a full day and longer to analyze them from a sociological point of view. I would prefer to defer to someone of Senator MOYNIHAN's stature and knowledge, to talk about social issues. But I think radio and television has contributed somewhat to that stripping away of reverence for our institutions. We now have journalists who are heralded as celebrities. They have radio shows and television programs though which they have achieved a great deal of notoriety.

Some of them achieve notoriety by taking the most extreme positions possible and using the most inflammatory rhetoric they can, and, of course, as the rhetoric becomes more extreme, their popularity tends to soar. As their popularity soars, the invitations for them to come and address various conventions and groups also continues to escalate, as do their speaking fees.

Somehow, all of that excessive, inflated, and sometimes outrageous rhetoric starts to get recirculated back into the congressional debates, because then Members of Congress are invited to participate in those very shows and programs. They are then prone to come up with something equally extreme or quotable so that they can continue to be invited back on the programs.

So a little vicious circle has been set up and set in motion, people then vying for the best quote, the most inflammatory, provocative thing they can say in order to make the news on that program or another.

There is also the hydraulic pressure that everyone in this body and the other body faces from the endless quest for raising campaign funds.

There is the rise of the negative attack ads. It is a sorry spectacle that we have been witnessing all too much. We all say that they are terrible, but all of

the consultants say, "But they work." So we have allowed ourselves to lower the sense of decency and civility in this country by attacking character, trying to portray our adversaries, our political adversaries as enemies, as evil-minded people who are set out to destroy the fabric of this country.

We have witnessed the rise of special interest groups. There have always been special interest groups, but today they are far more organized, they are far more technologically advanced than ever before, and they have a greater capability than ever before of blunting and stultifying any attempt to forge legislation in the Congress.

John Rauch wrote an article for the National Journal some time ago—I think since has been expanded into a book—but it referred to the process as "demosclerosis," that the arteries of our democratic system have become so clogged with special-interest activities and organizations that it is virtually impossible to work any kind of change because single-minded groups have more at stake in preventing legislative changes than the general public has in supporting them. So there is that intensity of interest, and they are able to hit a button and suddenly flood our offices with 5,000 letters overnight or several hundred phone calls in the matter of a few hours.

There is also, I must say, a reluctance on the part of the Members of this body and the other body to touch the so-called third rails, to touch politically volatile issues like Social Security and Medicare and entitlements. All of us have been shying away from these issues.

We have to rethink exactly what the role of a U.S. Senator is. I always felt that it was the responsibility of Members of this body who are elected to come to Washington, to become as informed as they possibly could, to have an open door to all special interests—and everyone in this country has a special interest—to be open to all issues and arguments and advocates, and then to weigh the respective merits of those arguments, to sift through them and come to a conclusion and vote, and then go back to our constituents and explain exactly why we voted as we did, not just react to or appease the most vocal among our citizenry.

Some of that has changed. We do not quite do that anymore. Today, we are being driven by overnight polls. Today, we are lobbied intensively by various groups. Today, everything has become compressed.

Margaret Chase Smith, I mentioned her earlier. She used to sit over here to my right. She never announced a vote until the roll was called—never. And that was her particular mark, saying, "I want to hear what all the arguments are before I make my decision." Most people cannot do that today. Most people are not allowed that luxury of waiting until debate is concluded before announcing their decision. Those who do

run the risk of being criticized editorially or otherwise as being indecisive, possessing a Hamlet-like irresoluteness. You mean you do not know how you will vote on a bill that may come to the floor a month from now? Have you not thought it clearly through?

We even get ranked by various groups on legislation that we do not cosponsor, so that you have black marks listed next to your name if you refuse to cosponsor a bill that may never come to the Senate floor.

I have on occasion taken this podium and announced that the mail coming to my office and phone calls coming to my office were running heavily against the position I was about to take. Having said that on the Senate floor, my office would then be flooded with immediate calls saying, how dare you indicate that your mail is running two or three or four or five to one but you are going to vote the other way? How could you possibly be so arrogant? Well, of course, those callers presume that that body of mail and that volume of calls received reflect the will of the people of Maine, which may or may not be the case. Much of the time it is so highly organized it does not reflect the general will of the people of the State.

But it also presumes that we serve no function other than to tally up the letters and to tally up the phone calls. You do not need us for that. You do not need a U.S. Senator to do that. All the people have to do is just buy a few computer terminals and put them in our office, have the mail come in, count the phone calls, and then push a button and have a vote. You do not need us for that.

So we have to restore the sense of what the role of a Senator is. We have to really work to persuade our constituents that this is not a direct democracy, it is a republic. It is what Benjamin Franklin said: "We have given you a republic, if you can keep it."

So we have to dedicate ourselves not to a direct democracy, or to voting according to the passions of the moment of what an overnight poll may or may not show, but to consider thoughtfully and weigh the merits of the opposing arguments and then take a stand on an issue and try to persuade our constituents we have done, if not the right thing, at least a reasonable thing. If we cannot do that, we do not deserve to be reelected. That is the way the system should operate—not, take an overnight poll and formulate our policy to comport to what the overnight poll shows. Polling is now driving our policies, driving it in the White House—this is not the first White House—and it is driving it in Congress as well.

Mr. President, I am fond of quoting from Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. and the Presiding Officer as a very gifted attorney, I know, is familiar with his writings and his works.

He wrote at one point:

I often imagine Shakespeare or Napoleon summing himself up and thinking: "Yes, I

have written 5,000 lines of solid gold and a good deal of padding—I, who have covered the Milky Way with words that outshone the stars, yes, I beat the Australians in Italy and elsewhere, and I made a few brilliant campaigns, I ended up in a cul-de-sac. I, who dreamed of a world monarchy and Asiatic power. Holmes said, "We cannot live our dreams, we are lucky enough if we can give a sample of our best, if in our hearts we can feel it has been nobly done."

During the past 24 years, I have tried to give a sample of my best. I will leave it, of course, to the people of Maine to judge whether it has been nobly done. I mentioned a sample of the best, because yesterday for me was a very momentous day. I had the great privilege of cochairing a hearing held by the Senate Aging Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee. For the first time in 18 years, I had the honor of sitting beside Senator MARK HATFIELD, a man whom I admire enormously, someone who stands as tall and straight and tough as any individual that has ever occupied these desks.

We held a hearing to deal with the issue of providing in some fashion more funding for research for medical technologies and developments. We had quite a remarkable group of people testifying before that joint committee. We had General Schwarzkopf who, having defeated Saddam Hussein's army on the battlefield, waged another kind of battle against prostate cancer. He was successful, and he is now waging a campaign on a national level to educate the American people of what the dread disease really entails and how it needs to be combated.

We heard from Rod Carew who talked about losing his 18-year-old daughter Michelle to leukemia, a very painful experience for him, and the television program that was shown to demonstrate her lightness of being, her generosity of heart and spirit was moving to all of us.

We heard from Travis Roy. Travis Roy is a young man from Yarmouth, ME. He was a great hockey player. He lived for the moment that he would take to the rink and play for Boston University. He suited up, stepped on to the ice, and 11 seconds later he became a quadriplegic, having been shoved head first into the boards. But to listen to him talk about what his aspirations are, that he wanted one day to have the kind of help, medical help that would allow him to get married, to hug his wife, to hug his mother, to teach his son how to play hockey, as his father had taught him, was quite a moment.

We had Joan Samuelson who has been waging a 9-year battle against Parkinson's disease. She talked about the day-to-day struggle that she has to encounter, and so many others, hundreds of thousands if not millions of others, have to confront every day of their lives, just to carry out functions that we take for granted.

We heard from a young woman from Oregon who is dedicating her life to become a research scientist but does not know if she will be able to complete

that kind of education or whether the funding will ever be available to carry on medical research.

It was a momentous occasion for all of us. But what was equally poignant for me and memorable was the reaction of our colleagues. I paraphrased a poet during the course of the morning, and I said each of us, every one of us, here in the galleries, here on the floor, we all prepare a face to meet the faces that we meet. Every one of us puts on a mask every single day. But for at least a moment yesterday, every one of the Senators who were there dropped the mask of being U.S. Senators and revealed the pain and suffering that they, too, have known.

We had Senator PRYOR who talked about his son's illness, having cancer of his Achilles tendon and what that entailed. We heard from Senator CONNIE MACK who talked about the loss of his brother and his wife's fight against breast cancer. CONRAD BURNS, HARRY REID, BOB BENNETT, HERB KOHL—each one of them told a personal story of their own pain and suffering of that of friends and family members.

It was not, Mr. President, an adversarial hearing. It was a bipartisan meeting, a realization that we have to dedicate ourselves to defeating on a bipartisan basis common enemies that assault us daily. Yesterday we spoke of disease, but there are far more enemies that await us as we rocket our way into the 21st century.

There is something called a balanced budget. We can work toward a balanced budget on a bipartisan basis. This is not a political statement. This is a moral imperative. This is something that we have an absolute obligation to our children and our grandchildren to do. It does not matter whether you are a Republican or a Democrat or Independent. We have to balance the budget within a reasonable timeframe if there is any hope for ever solving this country's fiscal crisis.

Mr. President, we can have and we have to have a bipartisan consensus on the need for a strong national defense and a coherent and consistent foreign policy. I say this not as partisan, but we have lacked coherency, we have lacked consistency, and it has been to the great detriment of this country's credibility as the only superpower in the world.

I am fond of thinking back to a time when Churchill was being served his breakfast by his man-servant and, as the breakfast was being delivered to him, he said, "Take this pudding away; it has no theme." Well, we have been lacking a theme in foreign policy for too long.

You cannot pick up today's paper without being disheartened, if you look at what is taking place in Israel today, or Russia, or Bosnia, or Iraq, or China, or Japan. You cannot adopt the policy or the position that, well, I am just going to focus upon domestic issues.

You can't focus just on domestic issues. You have to focus on foreign policy because foreign activities can overwhelm your domestic concerns and considerations.

We need to develop a strong bipartisan consensus on what the role of the country is to be in the next century. We have to do so and put aside those differences that we may have on other issues. Everyone is fond of saying, "We can't be the world's policeman." I agree, but we can't afford to become a prisoner of world events either. It requires us to be engaged, and requires us to be engaged not only with the President, which we have yet to be engaged fully, in my judgment, on a number of key issues; we have to be engaged with our allies and, indeed, even our adversaries. We have to have a world view. There is no such notion of coming back to America, of zipping ourselves in a continental cocoon and watching the world unfold on CNN. We have to be actively and aggressively engaged in world affairs. History has shown that every time we have walked away from the world, the world has not walked away from us. The history of the 20th century has been one of warfare. What we need to prevent the 21st century from descending into warfare is an active, aggressive engagement in world affairs.

Mr. President, we need to have a restoration of individual and community responsibilities. We don't need to debate that issue as Democrats or Republicans. We have to return to the stern virtues of discipline and self-reliance. That should not be a matter of partisan debate. Everyone understands what has happened in this country by simply turning to Government to solve our problems. We have to get back to a sense of moral responsibility, fiscal responsibility, self responsibility, to be accountable for our own actions, and, yes, turn to the Government and have that Government care for individuals who are unable to care for themselves, be they poor, disabled or elderly.

We also, Mr. President, must work very hard on a bipartisan basis to heal the racial divide in this country. The words "affirmative action" are no longer in vogue; it is distinctly out of fashion to talk about affirmative action in America. Many people say it is the obligation of Government—if not the reality—to be colorblind. Well, we don't live in a colorblind society. It is a fiction. We live in a society in which racism is still very much alive. It is an evil that we have to rise up and confront day in and day out.

The notion that we are all starting from the same line, the same end zone, running a 100-yard dash, is pure folly. Can you imagine suggesting that we are starting out equal, when you have some young children in suburbia who go to bed with their laptops and teddy bears at night, and children in the urban areas who go to sleep still ducking bullets that are fired by gangs? Are they starting off equally in our society?

Affirmative action may not be the answer to these problems, but we cannot adopt a position of indifference or hostility to recognizing the need to overcome barriers that have been erected for centuries against people who have been deprived of their opportunity to participate fully in the American dream.

Mr. President, I could go on at length about the subject of the need to heal the racial divide, or the wound that has been opened up in our communities. I will save it for another time in a different forum, obviously.

I would like to conclude my remarks by referring to a book that was written many years ago by Allen Drury. If ever there was an author who captured the essence of what this institution at least used to be like, it was Allen Drury in his novel "Advice and Consent," written and published in 1959. He said something which I have carried around with me from those very days when I first read the book. He said about us:

They come, they stay, they make their mark writing big or little on their times in a strange, fantastic, fascinating land in which there are few absolute wrongs or absolute rights, few all-blacks or all-whites, few dead-certain positives that won't change tomorrow, their wonderful, mixed-up, blundering, stumbling, hopeful land, in which evil men do good things and bad men do evil things, where there is a delicate balance that only Americans can understand, and often they, too, are baffled.

It was a wonderful description of Washington itself. But I have gone further back into the past in Mr. Drury's writings, and I found something even more pertinent and important to me. He kept a journal. He used to sit up in that press gallery and look down upon the workings of the U.S. Senate. He kept a journal between 1943 to 1945. It is a remarkable piece of writing. It is so brilliantly and eloquently expressed, I don't think there has been a better piece of writing since that time. He said something about the Senate which I would like to repeat for my colleagues, because I am sure that the book is not on the shelves of all of us. He said:

You will find them very human, and you can thank God that they are. You will find that they consume a lot of time arguing, and you can thank God that they do. You will find that the way they do things is occasionally brilliant, but often slow and uncertain, and you can thank God that it is. Because of all these things, they are just like the rest of us, and you can thank God for that, too. That is their greatness and their strength, and that is what makes your Congress what it is—the most powerful guarantor of human liberties free men have devised. You put them there, and as long as they are there, then you can remain free because they don't like to be pushed around any more than you do. This is comforting to know.

I don't know, if Mr. Drury were sitting up in the gallery today, that he would look down and find as much comfort as he did in 1943 through 1945. But I must say that I do.

After all that I have said in pointing out all the difficulties and all the prob-

lems that confront us as an institution, I take hope. I look at people like BOB KERREY of Nebraska, JOHN BREAUX of Louisiana, KENT CONRAD, JOHN CHAFFEE, OLYMPIA SNOWE, SLADE GORTON, who is sitting in the Chair, BOB BENNETT, PAT MOYNIHAN, and they are just a few—in spite of all of the difference, all of the criticism we have witnessed in the past—and JOHN GLENN who just walked through the door. I include him by all means in that category of people that I look to the future with great hope and encouragement.

I want to just point out that, several years ago, when Senator SAM NUNN and Senator PETE DOMENICI—two more giants in this body—offered an amendment to curb the growth of entitlements, I thought they came up with a very rational, responsible proposal. It said, let us take the entitlement programs that are growing at such a dramatic rate and see if we can't rein in those spending programs a little. Everybody who is entitled to enter a program can still come in and we will provide a cost-of-living adjustment, a COLA, every year, and for the next 2 years we will even add 2 percent, and then we will cap it at that rate. It sounded eminently reasonable to me. But what happened? How many people voted for that? I think it was 26. Only 26 Members were prepared to stand up and endure the wrath of our constituents, for fear that we were taking away something that they were entitled to. Well, that has changed.

Mr. President, thanks to people like you, the senior Senator from Washington, and thanks to the others I have mentioned, and so many more, we had a vote recently in which we presented a balanced budget that included some very difficult choices. It included reductions in the growth of Medicare. It included some tax cuts—not as much as many had hoped but more than perhaps many believe we are entitled to at this moment in time, but, nonetheless, tax cuts; Medicare reductions; reductions of a half of a percentage point in the Consumer Price Index. Some would like to have at least 1 percent, but half a percent is a very courageous thing from Members to do in an election year. Forty-six Members of the U.S. Senate went on record in favor of that. That is why I am encouraged that we will find men and women succeeding those of us who are departing and who will look into the eyes of their constituents and say, "This is something that is right for us to do."

The Social Security system eventually will go bankrupt, the trustees say by the year 2029. Around 2015, revenues collected will be exceeded by payments to beneficiaries. Medicare will be broke in 6 years.

It is a tragedy that the White House has absolved itself of this issue and has refused to come to the grips with the issue of Medicare solvency. I know what is going to happen. They will wait until the elections are over, and then, whoever wins at that time—if it is

President Clinton who wins reelection, I can almost guarantee that the first thing he will do will call for the creation of a blue ribbon commission to resolve the Medicare crisis. It is an issue that should be debated this year. It should have been resolved this year, but it will not be.

I take hope, Mr. President, when I look at leaders such as TOM DASCHLE and TRENT LOTT. I know, again, what the reaction was when Senator Mitchell, my colleague from Maine—again, I point out he was one of the most effective majority leaders in the history of this body—when he left, there was a great expression of woe. “What will we do?” When our distinguished colleague, Bob Dole, left, all of us felt the pang and the anxiety of saying, “What are we going to do now?” Bob Dole is no longer with us—a master at bringing people together.

I believe that we are still in good hands. I am impressed with the majority leader, with his drive, intelligence, and determination and, yes, his pragmatism, his willingness on key issues to reach across the aisle, and to say, “Can’t we work this out? We have our differences, but can’t we at least come to some kind of consensus on the major issues confronting this country?” I am enormously impressed with his talents, and those of Senator DASCHLE as well, both men of outstanding ability and good will.

To those people who declare that “the center can no longer hold; things are going to fall apart; the best are lacking in conviction while the worst are full of passion and intensity,” I say nonsense. There are going to be people who will come to this Chamber who will be filled with passion, to be sure, who will argue strenuously for their positions. But I believe it is inevitable that they will come back to the center.

The center may have shifted slightly to the right. People are more conservative today than they were 10 or 20 years ago. But the center has to hold. If the center does not hold, then you will have stagnation. If the center does not hold, then you will have paralysis. If the center does not hold, you will have Government shutdowns. When that takes place, the level of cynicism that currently exists will only deepen to a point that is so dangerous that it will afflict us for generations to come.

Mr. President, Alistair Cooke summed it up for me in his wonderful book called “America.” In one of his chapters, he made the inevitable comparison between the United States and Rome. He said that we, like Rome, were in danger of losing that which we profess to cherish most. He said liberty is the luxury of self-discipline; that those nations who have historically failed to discipline themselves have had discipline imposed upon them by others. He said America is a country in which I see the most persistent idealism and the greatest cynicism, and the race is on between its vitality and its decadence. He said we have—paraphras-

ing Franklin—a great country, and we can keep it, but only if we care to keep it.

I believe based upon the many friends that I have made here—the people that I admire and who are leaving with me, but those, more importantly, who are staying and those who will come—that there is a genuine desire to keep this the greatest country on the face of the Earth, a country that is still a beacon of hope and idealism throughout a world that is filled with so much oppression and darkness, and this will remain the greatest living institution in all of the world.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SENATOR BILL BRADLEY

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to my friend, colleague, and the senior Senator from New Jersey, BILL BRADLEY, as he leaves the U.S. Senate. I have served with BILL BRADLEY for nearly 14 years, my entire tenure in this body, and it is difficult to imagine what it will be like without him. Although we have different styles, rhythms, and backgrounds, we formed an effective team which fought together for our State’s and our Nation’s interests.

Throughout his life, BILL BRADLEY has achieved remarkable success as a scholar, an athlete, an author and an outstanding public official. And whether he was helping his team to championships at Princeton University, the Olympic arena, or the floor of Madison Square Garden, or helping to pass landmark legislation on the floor of the Senate, BILL BRADLEY always strives for the best. He has performed always as a rising star, and I know that this is not his apex.

Mr. President, in the Senate, BILL BRADLEY concentrated on a few areas and helped to translate his own vision into public policy. As a member of the Finance Committee, he continually fought for fair tax policy, honest budgeting, and economic policies that enhance growth. He is widely known as the author of the fair tax, which was the foundation of the Tax Reform Act of 1986.

BILL also knew that the single best economic advantage is a good education. So he designed a new way to help pay for college. His self-reliance loans give all students, regardless of income, the chance to borrow money from the Federal Government.

He has been a strong voice against gun violence and crime in our communities and a creative thinker in developing opportunities for urban youth.

His efforts are reflected in the enactment of community banking and urban enterprise zone legislation, educational reforms and community policing programs.

But what many of us will remember most is BILL’s passion when it comes to issues involving equality. BILL established himself as a serious and badly needed voice in the national dialog on racism, pluralism, and discrimination. He has challenged every American to confront the festering sore of racism. In his keynote at the 1992 Democratic convention, he warned that “We will advance together, or each of us will be diminished.”

One of his most powerful moments in the Senate, and one which I will never forget, was his denunciation of the horrifying beating of Rodney King. I will always remember BILL standing at his podium, pounding it 56 times with a bunch of pencils. His blows were meant to represent the beating administered by the police to Rodney King. The sound, resonating through the Senate Chamber, was a powerful reminder of just how far we need to go on the road to equality.

In the international arena, BILL BRADLEY was so energetic and committed that he traveled to the former Soviet Union for a weekend—to try to facilitate understanding between the superpowers, and to foster peaceful co-existence through economic cooperation.

With all of his achievements, BILL’s chief goal in the Senate was to further the interests of New Jersey. He has written that he once received a special gift, a collection of every variety of rock found in our Garden State. I, too, think that it is the perfect gift, because what could better symbolize a man whose commitment to New Jersey’s interests and her people was always rock solid?

His hard-working schedule would, on occasion, take BILL to New Jersey twice in a single day, in order to fulfill his obligations to meet with constituents, to help solve a problem, to deliver a talk to students, or to simply stay on top of the Garden State’s needs. And his famous New Jersey beach walks, which he took during every one of the past 18 years, are symbolic of BILL’s constant presence and consistent commitment to our State.

BILL has written that he prefers moving to standing still, well I know that wherever his journey takes him, his ultimate destination will be success, and all of us will benefit from his efforts. To my friend, colleague, and fellow New Jerseyan, I thank you for the contributions you have made, and for those yet to come. I offer my wish for continued success and happiness.

Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

REVISION AND EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, on Wednesday, September 25, 1996, notice