diligently, and continued his efforts upon his election to the U.S. Senate in 1978.

Mr. President, Senator COHEN has remained a moderate and thoughtful voice in a Senate that is increasingly marked by strident and partisan debate. Senator COHEN has attempted to rise above partisan politics to accomplish what is best for the people of Maine and the Nation. In 1991, Senator COHEN voted to override a veto of an extension of unemployment benefits, at a time when America's families were beginning to feel the effects of an economic recession. In the 103d Congress, Senator COHEN participated in a bipartisan coalition that attempted to overhaul the U.S. health care system, after the administration's efforts were not successful.

During the 104th Congress, I have had the distinct pleasure of working with Senator COHEN in the Centrist Coalition. A group of about 20 Senators, the Centrist Coalition worked to reach agreement on a comprehensive budget alternative to those put forward by President Clinton and the Republican leadership. The plan we developed built upon the suggestions of the National Governors' Association with respect to the Medicaid and welfare programs. It also built in needed flexibility for States, while preserving the social safety net for our Nation's most vulnerable populations. It was the only bipartisan budget alternative that received significant support in the 104th Congress, and I am proud to have been part of that effort.

Mr. President, throughout his political career Senator COHEN has held government officials accountable to the high ethical standards that people expect of their elected leaders, regardless of party affiliation. This was evident during courageous votes he made during Watergate and the investigation of the Iran Contra affair.

Senator COHEN also helped create the independent counsel law, which mandates the appointment of an independent counsel to probe allegations against certain high executive branch officials. Further, Senator COHEN sponsored legislation to require that contacts between lobbyists and Members of Congress are officially reported.

Mr. President, we are all grateful for Senator COHEN's dedicated service and tireless efforts in the U.S. Senate. Senator COHEN's distinguished Senate career is a testament to his hard work on behalf of the people of Maine and the Nation. His insightful approach to the challenges we face as a nation will be greatly missed.

FAREWELL ADDRESS TO AMERICA

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, all Members of the Senate are faced with difficult decisions almost on a daily basis. The day of my announcement not to seek a fourth term in the Senate—March 29, 1995—was one of the most difficult of my life. By that day, I had been wrestling with this decision for some time. There had been some health problems, but I was fully confident of running for and winning a fourth term. I have always loved campaigning, and getting back on the trail was a powerful temptation. The reality was, however, that another term would have taken me well beyond the normal age for retirement. I am 75 and would have been 81 by the end of another term. Ultimately, the decision was that the time had come to pass the torch to another generation.

Anyone who has ever held a Senate seat understands the magnitude of this great constitutional responsibility. The Senate is an awesome institution, and the opportunity to serve there is one of the highest honors that can be bestowed upon any individual. For anyone in public life who has attained the confidence of the people to carry out such a responsibility, the decision to leave voluntarily is a difficult one, even when we know that it is best for ourselves, our State, and our Nation. It is a bittersweet decision that stems from a solemn responsibility. Those returning to the 105th Congress already know this; those who will be joining that Congress in the coming days will soon come to that realization.

As Senators, we have to be students of the issues. It is important to be impartial, fair-minded, and willing to listen to opposing views. My decisions and votes have been based upon conscientious beliefs motivated by what I thought was in the best interests of my State and Nation, but sometimes tempered by the views of a sizable portion of my constituency. No doubt, Alabamians and my party were confounded at times, but hopefully, they understood that my positions were based on what I believed to be right.

One of our responsibilities as Senators is to sometimes take stands and positions with which the majority of citizens in our States do not agree. The difficulty of taking such unpopular stands and decisions cannot be overestimated. It can be a wrenching experience, as was the vote on the 1993 budget reconciliation legislation which raised taxes—even though primarily on a small number of wealthy individuals—but which also headed us in the right direction in terms of deficit reduction. This 1993 budget reconciliation bill had been grossly distorted and mischaracterized by its opponents almost beyond recognition. Several courageous Members of Congress who supported it were defeated in the next election. Since then, the economic and budgetary figures and forecasts show that supporting that bill was the right thing for the Nation.

In any case, since our first duty under the Constitution is to our country as a whole, these times and politically difficult situations will inevitably arise. Rather than running away from these stands, Senators have to meet them directly, stand firm, and explain to our constituents why we believe we are right. Although they might never agree with us, over time, they will understand and respect us for assuming responsibility. This will be even more true in the new Congress, the Congress whose leaders, along with the President sworn in on January 20, 1997, will take the country right into the new century and millennium.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have had to oppose Supreme Court nominees I thought to be ill-suited by temperament or background to serve on the Nation's highest court. On other occasions, I have supported nominees whom I knew not to be popular among my constituents, but who deserved my support.

Despite criticism that the Senate is no longer the great forum for debate and policymaking established by the Founders, there have been many examples of such debate during my tenure. These are times when the Senate as an institution soars, when Members are the statesmen they are elected to be.

One such time was the debate on the resolution authorizing military action in the Persian Gulf in early 1991. It was one of those rare moments when each and every Member had to look deep within his or her soul and go on record telling the American people either why they would allow young men and women to be sent into harm's way without a declaration of war, or why they could oppose the President of the United States and an entire world coalition poised to thwart aggression. As each Senator spoke, you could see and feel the deep emotion that seemed to emanate from the very heart of each speaker. Each decision, each vote, was profoundly personal. Many of us had served in the military and knew something of the horrors of military operations, even if those operations were successful. I know of no one who did not understand the gravity of what we were deciding.

Ultimately, the Senate voted narrowly, 52 to 47, to authorize the use of force to eject Saddam Hussein's army from Kuwait. Despite reservations and uncertainty, I was one of a few from my party who supported the authorization. All we could draw from in making this decision was our own experience and knowledge, our faith in the American Armed Forces, and the collective will of the civilian and military leaders to ensure victory. I would venture that most of us said a private prayer before casting our votes, hoping that we were doing the right thing and that events would vindicate us. I was struck at the sincerity and emotion surrounding this debate, and, as a Senator, was proud to have taken part. I thought to myself that this was the kind of debate the Founders envisioned.

Another one of these dramatic and emotional debates took place on the Senate floor on July 22, 1993. One Senator had offered an amendment to pending legislation to grant an extension of the United Daughters of the Confederacy patent outside the normal

process established by the Patent and Trademark Office. Only a very small number of organizations had ever been granted patents by the Senate, with the United Daughters of the Confederacy being one of those. This extension by the Senate would place that body's stamp of approval on the group's patent. Part of its insignia is a Confederate national flag.

Freshman Senator CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN of Illinois, the only black Member of the Senate and the first-ever female black Member in all its history, came to the floor to oppose the amendment. She spoke eloquently on the floor of the issue of race, of symbolism, of division, and of intolerance. Her passion, candor, spirit, emotion, and determination moved the Chamber in a way that I have rarely witnessed. One by one, Members began articulating very personal statements about their feelings on race relations in this country and the lingering symbolism and emotions that complicate those relations.

As I listened to the debate, I felt a deep personal conflict as to how I should vote on this amendment. I was torn between my love for my native South and the racial conflicts which remain in America today.

I come from an ancestral background deeply rooted in the Old Confederacy. One of my great-grandfathers was one of the signers of the Ordinance of Secession by which the State of Alabama seceded from the Union in 1860. My paternal grandfather was a surgeon in the Confederate Army. History always provides perspectives on a particular time in the life of a nation, and I have always had a firm belief with regard to my family's background that they did what they thought was right at that time and in those circumstances. I have always revered my family and respected those who thought what they were doing at that particular time in our history was morally correct.

Ultimately, it became clear that the issue was primarily one of symbolism. By adopting this amendment, which would put the Senate's stamp of approval on an insignia carrying the Confederate flag in a very special and honorific manner, we would not serve the causes of advancing race relations or healing wounds. It would not be a step forward. I felt that if my ancestors were alive today and witnessing that debate, they would stand for what is right and honorable and would want to take a symbolic step forward.

In this case, one Senator, acting upon the courage of her convictions and her unique perspectives as an African-American, helped reverse a decision of the Senate. I thought again about how the Senate as an institution was fulfilling the promise of the Founders. New and returning Members of this body, as well as the House of Representatives, will no doubt face similar debates and issues which will test and challenge the Congress.

Despite these proud moments in the life of the Senate and Congress, there is still the perception among the vast majority of Americans that the system as a whole does not work as it should. They feel strongly that government does not respond to their needs. In many cases, they view it as being totally irrelevant to their daily lives and experiences. Ironically, as more and more information about government has become available over the last decade, the alienation of the citizenry has increased. Despite the C-Span cameras, the proliferation of constituent-service staff, and the plethora of news, both written and broadcast, people still feel that they are somehow cut out of the political process. This is one of the gravest problems the new Congress and administration will face as they approach the next century, since it undermines the very legitimacy of our democratic form of government.

There are any number of reasons for this ongoing alienation. Gridlock between the two Houses of Congress, between the political parties, and between the Congress and White House is most often cited as the primary reason for the public's disgust. A certain amount of what is called gridlock, however, is built into the system by the Constitution. Congress is, by design, an institution which moves rather slowly in making law. This is especially true of the Senate, where the wishes of a cohesive minority hold considerable sway. This is so the passions of the moment are allowed to cool before laws are passed. Careful deliberation, analysis, and long-range thinking were important to the Founders, and these are usually necessary ingredients in legislating. If anything, the Congress which will be sworn in shortly will not have enough of these ingredients. Few in their right mind will argue that it suffers from too much deliberation, analysis, or thought. In fact, it will need more.

If we look back over the last few years and compare passed conditions with those in mid-1996, we see that we have made tremendous strides. We won the cold war; our economy is healthy; we have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years; the budget deficit is decreasing even faster than rosy projections earlier predicted; and our national defense and international diplomatic structure are strong. Millions of new jobs in basic industries like automobiles and construction have been created and for 3 years in a row, we have had a record number of new businesses started in our country. More and more businesses are making capital investments, a strong sign of economic prosperity. The rate of violent crime is coming down all across America, although we still have a long way to go to make our streets safe. Race relations are still not anywhere near what they should be, but civil rights laws have helped secure the promise of America for more of our citizens than ever. The road toward equal opportunity for all persons, regardless of race, color, gender, creed, or other station in life has many miles to go, but we should be proud of the progress we have made and build upon it for the future.

In terms of the institution of Congress itself, there is no doubt that it has made great strides in terms of ethics and behavioral standards. People might not want to hear it or believe it, but the people we have serving in Congress today are the most ethical and least corrupt of any in its history. I served on the Senate Ethics Committee for a total of 13 years as either chairman or vice chairman, and can say definitively that the vast majority of Members tried their best to comply with ethical standards and rules. The perception that they are here to enrich themselves at taxpayers' expense is simply false. Senators were always coming to the Ethics Committee trying to comply with the rules, not to get around them. Of course, there are inevitable lapses, as would be the case with any large organization made up of people from all over the country and from all kinds of backgrounds, some of low standards of integrity. From the perspective of ''how it used to be,'' the taxpayers are vastly better off now than in decades passed, regardless of the perceptions and media distortions.

We have accomplished a great deal and have made tangible progress. Why don't people recognize these areas of progress? Part of the answer undoubtedly lies in the fact that we no longer have a common, external enemy at which to direct our considerable energies. For the first 40 or so years after World War II, communism was our greatest threat. It caused the Government and the public to rally together toward its ultimate defeat. In the early 1990's, as that promise was realized, people seemed to turn toward one another and ask ''What now?''

As I watched in amazement as the Berlin Wall fell in 1989, I couldn't help but feel that somehow, many Americans were missing the event's true significance. Our victory in the cold war did not seem to have the resonance around the country that one would expect. For decades, our entire defense and foreign policy had been formulated around the goal of fighting communism. It was truly astounding that our resources could now be channeled elsewhere. And yet, the passion, the excitement, the relief just didn't seem to be there. Almost immediately, a sizable segment of the population seemed to begin searching for another enemy. Unfortunately, there are those whose primary motivation is the hatred of an enemy. There was talk of a peace dividend. Various special interest groups staked their claims to pieces of that dividend, while others wanted to substantially reduce taxes. New enemies were found within our own borders as the competition arose for still-scarce resources.

As the cold war ended, the mounting budget deficit and national debt became a policy issue. There would really

not be a peace dividend, as such, since our fiscal house was not in order. I had long supported a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget, but by the mid-1990's, it had gained broad public support and majority support in Congress, but still not the two-thirds needed to send it to the States for ratification.

Sadly, what brought us to such a serious budgetary state was a failure on the part of our Government to address our fiscal problems before they nearly spiralled out of control. It was the fault of the political parties, the Congress, and the President. But it was also the fault of the public for expecting and demanding so much, much of it contradictory to the long-term health of our economy. Government leaders should have had the courage to say no much more often than they did. We all have to accept responsibility for our mistakes if we are to move forward and continue to bring down the deficit. It does no good to blame each other; it does profound good to acknowledge mistakes and collectively dedicate ourselves to fiscal discipline and the modest sacrifice it requires.

Regardless of the legitimacy of public perceptions, the alienation and frustration with our Government are real threats to the stability of our Nation. Unless they feel like they are a part of the process and able to influence its outcome, the alienation and frustration will only grow and intensify.

For much of our history, our national leaders and political parties adopted mainstream, centrist policies aimed at securing economic security and promoting opportunity. Of course, there are times when this has not been the case, but Government has worked best when it has operated from the center of the spectrum. Only when we have strayed too far to the left or right have we fallen so out of favor with the citizenry. To a great degree, that is what has happened over the last few years, with Democrats becoming more liberal and Republicans becoming more conservative. Since the vast majority of the people are politically moderate in their beliefs and values, they have become, in a sense, alienated from both sides, not comfortable with the extreme views the parties have adopted. The bipartisanship that is so crucial to the operation of Congress, especially the Senate, has been abandoned for quick fixes, sound bites, and, most harmfully, the frequent demonization of those with whom we disagree.

It is supremely ironic that as we try to foster democratic principles throughout the rest of the world and have seen democracy make great strides in many areas, we seem to face our strongest threat from within. Some elected officials, media personalities, extreme elements within political parties, and single-issue organizations strive to pit one group of Americans against another. The focus on divisive issues has increased the alienation and driven us farther and farther apart.

In my judgment, much of the answer to this alienation lies in what I call compassionate moderation. Instead of being so concerned with policies which are left and right, Government should be concerned with the principles of right and wrong that come from approaching issues in measured, moderate, and compassionate tones. Both compassion and moderation must be seeded in basic conservatism and responsibility, rooted to induce individualistic growth and opportunity. Even where voters opt for change, they do not favor extremism; instead, they want carefully crafted and nuanced policies that address the concerns of the majority and, where needed, the disadvantaged in our society. This is the kind of responsible and compassionate moderation upon which our Nation was founded. Our Constitution itself came about through a series of great compromises; it was not written by ideologues who clung to their way or no way. Compromise and negotiation—the hallmarks of moderation—aimed at achieving moderate, centrist policies for our country should not be viewed as negatives. They should be valued, for that is the only way to reach consensus on complicated issues and problems that face us.

By being compassionately moderate in our attitudes, we can govern ourselves responsibly and reach the potential which we have yet to attain. Thomas Jefferson demonstrated a belief in the concept of compassionate moderation when he called for basic republican simplicity in institutions and manners. He knew that a limitation on Government did not mean the abdication of the Government's responsibility. Similarly, in his own farewell address to the Nation, President Eisenhower said that:

> It is the task of statesmanship to mold, to balance, and to integrate forces, new and old, within the principles of our democratic system—ever aiming toward the supreme goals of our free society.

Both of these great leaders envisioned a strong, but limited, National Government which could balance competing interests in the pursuit of overall liberty and equality.

During his term as Vice President, Jefferson once asked for a room in Baltimore's preeminent hotel. Not recognizing the Vice President, who had shown up alone and in soiled working clothes, the owner turned him away. Shortly after Jefferson's departure, the owner was told that he had just sent away the Vice President of the United States. The horrified proprietor immediately dispatched some of his workers to find Jefferson and offer him as many rooms as he liked. The Vice President had already taken a room at another, more modest, hotel, and sent the man who found him back to the owner with this message:

> Tell [the owner] that I value his good intentions highly, but if he has no room for a dirty farmer, he shall have none for the Vice President.

Our Government's greatest successes have come about precisely because it has made room for dirty farmers and all kinds of hard workers. It has made room for those who want to work hard, but who might be disadvantaged by poverty, injustice, or oppression. It has never been the task of Government to guarantee success to everyone across-the-board. Instead, it has been to ensure, through responsible sensitivity and compassion, that everyone has the opportunity to work toward the kind of life and success for which we all strive given the same opportunities. When we fall short, it should not be because Government has done the wrong thing, whether too much or too little—it should be only because we as individuals did not take advantage of the opportunities afforded by our free society through our Constitution and backed up by representative, democratic Government.

The extreme elements of our Government must realize that compromise is not bad, that we can be compassionate and responsible at the same time by being moderate in our approach to public policy. No one of us can remake Government or society in our own image. With 535 Members of Congress, thousands of executive branch officials, constitutionally mandated checks and balances, shared power, and a strong two-party political system, compromise is an inherent necessity. If compromise is abandoned for rigid ideology, the system cannot work as it was intended. Frequently, it becomes a hostage to gridlock and inaction.

If we look back over history, we see that moderation and centrism in Government have led to some rather remarkable achievements. As we ponder the cynicism and disfavor with which the Government is viewed today, it occurs to me that we may have, in some ways, become victims of our own successes. As more and more is taken for granted, standards are set higher, often unrealistically so. This results in recurring disappointment.

In 1954, ours was a country where poll taxes separated millions of citizens from their basic right to vote. Restaurants, hotels, schools, and neighborhoods were totally segregated by race. Through the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Voting Rights Act of 1965, and subsequent legislation, these Americans have been brought into the process and enfranchised. The Head Start Program, for example, remains one of the single most effective program ever designed for keeping high-risk children in school.

My own civil rights record is one of which I am exceedingly proud. It has been publicly stated by black leaders that I was the first Senator from my State who believed in and supported the civil rights movement. I worked to secure the extension of the Voting Rights Act; to appoint African-Americans and women to the Federal bench and other Federal offices; to support historically black colleges; to ensure passage of the civil rights restoration bill; to help pass the fair housing bill;

and to establish a national holiday honoring the late Martin Luther King, Jr. My philosophy on the issue of civil rights has always been one of moderation, of trying, where possible, to get people to lower their voices and work together for progress. Again, by avoiding the lightning rod rhetoric of the extreme positions, we can successfully move forward.

In 1955, only 63 percent of our high school students graduated. Those who did stay in school did not have access to advanced science or math courses in a majority of school districts until passage of the Defense Education Act of 1958. Higher education had traditionally been the preserve of the well to do. A full decade after the GI bill was signed into law, there were still only 430,000 college graduates each year. Following passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965, college enrollment increased by 300 percent.

Perhaps the largest public construction project in American history began with the Interstate Highway Act of 1956, which ultimately doubled the Nation's highway system and provided new corridors of growth. The National Highway System of today is the envy of the world and is a growing testimony to the strong, steady leadership of President Eisenhower, who did not shy away from the moderate label. Indeed, he eloquently championed the concept of balance in public affairs throughout his January 1961 farewell address to the Nation. Other legislation and policies guided technology into the marketplace. The leadership and vision of President John Kennedy in terms of space exploration led to the lunar landings, the commercialization of space, and numerous scientific advances. These projects were not advanced in the pursuit of a party's retaining power or in the interest of a particular ideology being thrust upon the American people. They were advanced because there was a bipartisan consensus that they were good for the future of the country. They came from the center, not the extremes.

In the America of 1954, poverty and age were often indistinguishable, especially in parts of the South. The average monthly Social Security benefit was only $59. A child was three times less likely than today to survive its first year of life. The success of the Social Security Program has helped lower poverty rates among senior citizens to the lowest level in the population. The Medicare Program brought 32 million seniors into the health care system. The Women, Infants, and Children Program began to reduce infant mortality and aid to families with dependent children brought vulnerable children basic sustenance. Revelations of child hunger during the 1960's gave rise to the school lunch program. Later, deregulation of the airline, trucking, and telecommunications industries produced millions of new jobs and lowered prices for transportation and telephone services.

The agricultural community is considerably better off today than when I came to the Senate in 1979. We have strived to craft farm policy which provides market stability and allows American farmers to aggressively pursue international markets. At the same time, these farm programs have dramatically reduced the cost to the U.S. Treasury.

When I came to the Senate, one of my major goals was to help modernize and reform our Federal courts, much as we had done on the State level while I was on Alabama's Supreme Court. My efforts were focused on improving the Federal judicial system and relieving court congestion in criminal and civil cases. We were successful to a large degree, particularly in the areas of criminal justice and bankruptcy, although much could still be done.

Today, our system of civil justice faces one of the greatest tests in its long history. The very foundation of our civil justice system and more than 500 years of the development of common law are under attack, including the right of trial by jury. We must continue to face these assaults by improving the administration of justice and maintaining its historic role in protecting the weak and disadvantaged.

Of course, the programs mentioned above, as well as many others, are in need of reform. We all agree they should be streamlined and made more efficient. We should implement incentives for those on public assistance to work and become self-sufficient. The task of government, however, should just that—reform, streamlining, and improving efficiency. It should not be to tear down, eliminate, and dismantle just for the sake of reducing government.

These government success stories and others are the result of compassionate, moderate, democratic government aimed at securing opportunity for and promoting responsibility among all Americans. No, these accomplishments did not result in the Great Society as envisioned by President Johnson and much-maligned in some political circles today. Some want to label all the Great Society programs as failures. It is fashionable to make them euphemisms for liberal big-spending government.

Some of these programs were indeed disappointments worthy of the criticism they receive today. Certainly, there was some idealistic overreaching, which resulted in a pattern of dependency we are trying to combat through current welfare reform efforts. Even so, many good things came about, resulting in a better society, one that has come about due to more Americans than ever having basic opportunities to succeed and pursue their dreams. Instead of focusing on our failure to reach some sort of utopia, or unduly blaming each other for the overreaching that led to dependency among some segments of the population, we should take enormous pride in the fact that when it has been needed, our Government has usually done the right thing for our people.

At the same time, we cannot rest on our laurels, but must learn from success—and from our failures—in order to reach even greater success and avoid the same shortfalls in the future. In this way, personal initiative can be enhanced where it is needed. In an era of shrinking government, programs designed to provide incentives for the private sector to search for solutions to public problems will become increasingly important.

What can we do specifically to enhance the concept of moderation and promote its ability to yield the kinds of centrist government actions that help the vast majority of our citizens? How can the leaders of the next American century put aside personal ideology and work for policies and programs that promote opportunity and individual initiative, and that promote the public good? What can the new Congress do to change public perceptions about government?

To begin with, bipartisanship should be one of the most used—if not the most used—guide for Congressmen and Senators when they initiate and pursue legislation. The lessons of the 1993 budget debate, health care reform in 1994, and most elements of the Contract With America in 1995 and 1996 point to the obvious pitfalls of one party trying to govern by itself.

To promote more bipartisanship, ways should be found to bring about more informal togetherness among Members of opposite parties. One of the wonderful byproducts of the weekly Senate Prayer Breakfast gatherings has been the friendships forged across party and ideological lines. These friendships have led to more openness and willingness to discuss issues on a cordial basis. They promote the identification of common ground. This informal togetherness concept could be expanded to Senate standing committees like Agriculture, where I serve. Members could hold regularly scheduled luncheons and dinners among themselves and occasionally with their spouses.

Another way to foster bipartisanship would be to have more committee hearings outside Washington in various regions of the country. These should be scheduled during recess periods, when Members are usually out of Washington anyway, or during extended weekends. Committee members traveling together get to know each other on a personal basis much better. Friendships and better understanding will no doubt be among the results.

Issue discussions in informal settings should be frequent occurrences, particularly between the leadership of the respective parties and should, on occasioin, include White House leadership. Similar informal togetherness gatherings should occur among staff members. Such recommendations to enhance a spirit of bipartisanship and

to foster personal relations among Members of Congress might seem to be stating the obvious, even trivial in light of all the challenges we face. This spirit and these relationships have suffered greatly in recent years, however, and can only be restored through focusing on them. Congress, and especially the Senate, is only as strong and effective as the links between its Members. Newcomers to the institutuion will soon learn the importance—the necessity—of working together and compromising. The basic point is to soften the lines of partisanship and division that often impede the legislative process.

Along with sincere efforts to increase bipartisanship, overall expectations must be lowered. There is a consensus in both parties and among the public at large that Government cannot be expected to do all things for all people. Constituents cannot continue to make contradictory calls for a downsizing of Government and a lowered deficit while at the same time demanding more services and benefits. Members must have the political courage to tell this truth and to point out this reality.

The realities of our two-party system dictate that there will be issues upon which the parties will never agree. After all, the parties do hold competing views for the future of the country. This is not necessarily bad. It creates alternatives and requires leaders to articulate a vision. But, there are enough large issues that confront us that bipartisanship is the best way—perhaps the only way—to achieve success. By focusing on broad goals that come about through compromise, Members do not foresake their parties or philosophies.

Where bipartisanship and working together are not possible, perhaps it is best to pull back and perhaps wait for another time to pursue action. This is in stark contrast to the tendency in recent Congresses to forge ahead, even where failure is certain, and then blame the other side or party for the failure. Sometimes legislation and ideas need to simmer and gel before being acted upon.

There should be a ladies' and gentlemen's agreement making it a taboo to demonize your political opponents. Far too much of today's debate consists of trying to promote one's position through the character assassination of an opponent. Even in circumstances where this tactic succeeds, the victory is inherently hollow and will not stand the test of time. Both major parties could have their campaign committees designed to work together to create less negativity and friction in political campaigns. The first agreement should be to ban negative campaign ads.

In the spirit of President Eisenhower, the status of his self-proclaimed moderation should be returned to that of a political virtue rather than a governing liability. Regardless of the personal ideologies and views of individual Members of Congress, the national legislature should reflect the moderate course of a moderate populace. This does not mean that ideology and political passion do not or should not count; it does mean that sometimes they should be suppressed in the best interests of the Nation as a whole. In such a complex, diverse, and large country as ours, extreme, rigid views on either side can only perpetuate alienation from and dissatisfaction with Government.

It has always struck me as rather interesting that the vast majority of the policy foundations, issue study centers, and think tanks are either identifiably conservative or liberal in their orientation. There are very few that are seen as centrist in their outlook. Perhaps private sources could establish an Institute for reason and moderation or a center for responsible government to review and monitor legislation under broad guidelines designed to produce a scholarly moderate approach to and evaluation of issues.

As I leave the Senate and public service, I want to thank the people of my State for their faith and trust over the years. As I pass the torch to a new generation, I also want to thank my Creator for the blessing of health and energy during my lifetime so far, and for giving me the opportunity to serve our great Nation and my fellow citizens.

As my time in the Senate draws to a close, I am reminded of the fact that our Nation—the United States of America—is not based on any one language, culture, or geographic area as are most older nations. Instead, it is based on a set of ideals, which, while relatively few in number, really encompass all the elements that constitute the core of who we are as a people. These are liberty, freedom, democracy, equality, opportunity, human dignity, and respect for others. These are the great ideals that brought us to these shores in the first place, and which will take us into the next century.

Since our country is still so much a work in progress, I still believe that our best years are ahead. Sure, growing pains, in the nature of social problems, world threats, and ideological divides, will continue to occur. But by weathering these storms and finding remedies for them, we become stronger and better able to meet and adapt to changing demands and conditions. This adaptability and resourcefulness—benefits resulting from the genius of our Constitution and the Government it charters—have served us particularly well during the last several decades of intense social and technological change. This ability, with which America is uniquely equipped due to the ideals upon which it is founded and the Constitution which enshrines those ideals, can continue to guide and serve us well and will continue to be our greatest natural resource.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRING SENATOR MARK HATFIELD OF OREGON

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise today to bid farewell to our distinguished colleague from Oregon, Senator MARK HATFIELD. Senator HATFIELD's career in the Senate has spanned three decades, a record of service that the State of Oregon, as well as the rest of the Nation, should be proud of.

Senator HATFIELD has devoted his entire adult life to serving the people of Oregon, as an educator, a statesman, a public servant of the highest caliber. Senator HATFIELD's long and distinguished career began as college professor and dean at Willamette University. He has served in both the Oregon House and Senate, as Oregon's youngest secretary of state, its Governor, and, since his election in 1966, as the longest-serving U.S. Senator from the State of Oregon. Senator HATFIELD's commitment to the people of Oregon is unquestionable. In announcing his retirement, Senator HATFIELD explained, ''Thirty years of voluntary separation from the State I love is enough.'' As I am sure my colleagues will agree, Oregon's gain is the U.S. Senate's loss.

Senator HATFIELD served as the chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee from 1981 to 1987, and in 1995 he returned to the helm of that committee. As chairman and in the Senate as a whole, he often helped fashion bipartisan compromises, putting the good of the country ahead of partisan politics. I had the good fortune to work with Senator HATFIELD as part of the Mainstream Coalition, which tried to break the gridlock surrounding health care reform.

Senator HATFIELD is not afraid to stand up for what he believes is right, even when it means going toe-to-toe with his own party or disregarding popular public opinion. In 1995, during the fight over the balanced budget amendment, Senator HATFIELD stood by his beliefs, in the face of enormous pressure from his own party, and voted against the amendment.

In addition to his tenure in the U.S. Senate, MARK HATFIELD also served his country as a Navy Lieutenant in the Pacific theater in World War II. He was at the battles of Iwo Jima and Okinawa, and served in the occupation of Hiroshima after the dropping of the atomic bomb. This experience gave him a deep and unshakable commitment to peace, leading him to vigorously oppose war and nuclear proliferation. As Governor of Oregon, he spoke out against Lyndon Johnson's policies on Vietnam. He helped author legislation passed by the Senate in 1992 calling for an end to U.S. nuclear testing, legislation that I supported. He also helped found the Oregon Peace Institute and the U.S. Institute for Peace.

Mr. President, I have the deepest respect and admiration for our friend and colleague from Oregon, and I say with confidence that he will be deeply