

founder of the Appalachian Regional Commission, which has done so much to help not only the State he loved, West Virginia, but 12 other States in addition to that. He was a principal architect of the Interstate Highway System which helps to place him in time, because that was done during, as we know, the middle and late fifties.

I think the proudest of all of his achievements, or the one that caused him to talk the most and to be the most enthusiastic about, was the 26th amendment. He was the author and the driver of the 26th amendment which gave 18-year-olds the right to vote in this country.

He protected the environment with ferocity. He was tremendously interested in coal, as well as the environment, in worker safety and, as I have indicated, in aviation issues, and in just simply countless other areas.

He was prodigious in his volume of output. Of course, that was, in part, because he was chairman of a very powerful committee, and he was chairman of that committee for a very long time. That was in the days when the Senate tended to be more in control by one party than the other for a very long time. He worked with the Scoop Jacksons and the Lyndon Johnsons and all of the others. They were able to accomplish an enormous amount. He did that and he loved it—he simply loved doing that. He simply loved laying pavement out across the wide horizons of our country.

There was an interesting aspect to Senator Randolph. He was intense about all of his work, but he was very much of a U.S. Senator from the State of West Virginia. He accepted full responsibility for the title "U.S. Senator" and acted on all matters that related to that with incisiveness and careful thought. But he liked to say—and often said, and said with great pride—quoting him—"I essentially am a West Virginia Senator. I'm not what you'd call a national Senator or international Senator." I think if he were here today, I am not sure the words would be that different.

And to understand that one has to understand his roots. He was born in this tiny community of Salem, WV, which is now the home of probably as many Japanese students in a Salem-Tokyo University setting as reside anywhere else in this country. His father was the mayor of Salem. He was born with very little money, and he worked his way in farm jobs. He knew agriculture very well. He worked for anybody who would give him a job to put a few dollars in his pocket so he could further his education and improve his possibilities. I liked that about him, because he was utterly a rural Senator, but with an urban reach when it came to the national part of his responsibilities.

He started in journalism and was always a prolific writer. He married Katherine Babb and won election to the House of Representatives in 1932 at

the age of 30. One can do that these days, although one cannot go much younger than that legally. But then it was extraordinary, it was extraordinary to be able to do that. And I indicated he has two sons, Jay and Frank.

So more than 50 years later, I think the occupant of the Presiding Officer's chair will understand that it is quite a feeling for me to have succeeded him, to have been allowed to succeed him by his own gesture of generosity and, frankly, just to be able to succeed him.

He is long remembered in this body, as well as in the House, for the very exceptional nature that he had: High optimism, great confidence, enormous belief in country, and his absolute love for his State. He also—and I will say this in closing—he had a great love for his profession. And in that I think many of us join him. He was not one of those who felt being in public service was some kind of a second choice; I think he felt it was the best choice of all.

He was somebody who honored his craft, who brought great distinction to his craft, who never compromised on his principles. And when he faced a West Virginia audience or a Senate Chamber, he could stand tall and strong and broad shouldered, as he was, and do his work, because he knew he was doing work which was enormously important for helping the people that he so loved from the State of West Virginia.

So this is a day and a time that we have reason to reflect on Jennings Randolph and what made him an exceptional person. It is sad, I think, this tradition in the Senate when we do this about Senators when they die. It would be almost impossible to create a tradition where we did that while they were still living. But it would be nice if they could hear what it was that we say about them. And I suspect that Senator Jennings Randolph is able to hear and to know on this day, and days to succeed, what his colleagues think about him.

I personally am grateful to him for many reasons, as I think should be very obvious. I am not sure that I would be here if it were not for Jennings Randolph. And I know that my colleagues join me in our prayers and our thoughts for his family and in thanking Jennings Randolph for his enormous contribution to a craft which we call public service. And we do that with honor and pride.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. WYDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

Before the Senator from West Virginia leaves the floor, let me say I thought he was extraordinarily eloquent. I got a chance to know Senator Randolph a bit as a Member of the House. And the Senator's statement here today really sums up the extraordinary qualities of this great man. I am

very pleased to have been able to be here for a few minutes to hear the Senator's very fine speech.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business for as much time as I may need.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you.

TRIVIALIZING GOVERNANCE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we are not moving along too quickly this morning, so I thought I would take an opportunity to visit about an observation that I have made. We had a few moments ago the remarks by the good Senator from West Virginia about the passing of a former Senator from his State. He talked a bit about the past, a bit about the history of the Senate, and it was extremely interesting. This place, of course, is filled with history, it is filled with tradition, and that is good.

On the other hand, there are changes that have taken place, and one of them is a little troubling to me. It does seem as if we are increasingly moving governance into more of show business and into more of political spin, more of promotion, more of advertising than really dealing with issues based on the facts and how they impact us.

The basic principle, of course, of our historic democracy, thankfully, continues to exist, and we must insist that it does continue to exist—the idea of a government by Constitution and adhering to the basic tenets of the Constitution, the separation of institutions that provide some semblance of power division among the executive and the legislative and judicial branches; the idea of public access, that people have an opportunity to participate fully in government, that people have an opportunity to have the background and the facts that are necessary to participate; the idea of disclosure—we talk about that a lot—majorities deciding the direction that we take in this country based on facts, rule of law. In short, a government of the people, by the people and for the people, of course, and these are basic elements of democracy.

An informed public is essential to that government of the people. Ironically, technology, which has provided us with the greatest opportunity to know more about what is happening more quickly than ever—can you imagine what it must have been like 100

years ago to be home in Wyoming and wonder what is going on in Washington? I suppose there was some comfort in that, as a matter of fact, but, nevertheless, it is quite different than what we have now. We have now the greatest opportunity in history for people to know what is happening and to know instantly what is happening. If a decision is made in Israel this morning, minutes later, the whole world, of course, is familiar with it.

Unfortunately, the same technology that has provided us the opportunity to know so much more has accommodated and, in fact, I suppose, engendered some of the changes that are taking place in terms of the promotion of ideas and our method of governance.

Unfortunately, spinning, promotion, and media hype have replaced real debate based on the issues, and that is too bad. It seems to me that this administration and, I must say, my friends in the minority, have perfected the idea that success is not policy or success is not finishing the job; success is having an opportunity to spin an issue on the evening news; success is getting coverage on the 5 o'clock national report. If polls indicate there is an issue out there in which people are interested and it is currently being discussed, this administration is quick to describe the problem and promise a Federal solution with lots of Federal money—"We'll fix it for you."

Often there is no plan presented to deal with the problem. There is generally no real proposal to implement, nothing is laid before the Congress. Frankly, there is really no expectation that anything is going to happen; that the idea is, "Here's the problem, here's what the polls have said; we'll fix it." And if you don't agree with that, suddenly you are out of step with the world. So success is measured in media rather than solutions. Unfortunately, I think we see more and more of that.

It is interesting to me, because, depending upon your point of view about government, there are problems and there are appropriate ways to fix them and appropriate ways to deal with them. Of course, it is true that people have different views about that. There are those who believe the Federal Government ought to be the primary fixer of whatever the problem. That is a legitimate liberal view. There are those who believe that it is more likely to find satisfactory solutions if you go to the State, the local government, or the private sector. That, I guess, is a more conservative view. But more important than the philosophy, I think it is appropriate that when you have something you want to deal with, we ought to talk a little bit about where it can most appropriately be fixed.

Should it be done at the Federal Government level? Should it be the kind of program that is one size fits all? I am very sensitive about that, I suppose, being from Wyoming. We are the smallest, population-wise, State in this country. So things that work in Penn-

sylvania, things that work in New York, do not necessarily work in Wyoming or Nevada or Kansas. So we are better off, in many instances, to say, "Wait a minute. This service can better be delivered on the basis of a State solution, although the politics of it is, 'Let's get on TV and say we'll fix it for you,'" even with no expectation of having it happen.

So I think we are finding more and more of that. And it just seems to me that it is something we ought to really evaluate, this idea that we watch the polls, find an issue, go to the TV, say we will fix it, and then beat up on everybody who really does not agree with that, without having any genuine—genuine—debate or discussion or analysis of how we best deal with the problem and where it works.

Generally, these are things that are done certainly in a broad context. Everyone cares about children, so if you have a proposal on children—and to suggest that we do not is offensive to me. Everybody cares about child care, but where is it best dealt with? Everybody cares about health care. Where is it best provided? Everybody cares about secondary and elementary education. Where do we best deal with it? It is not enough just to say, "We've got a problem. I want 100,000 teachers; I want the Federal Government to pay for it. It will become a mandatory program, and we have more and more Federal control."

Those are the debates. Those are the debates. I guess it troubles me because we sort of trivialize governance with this business of applying the media technique. I understand that the minority—and Republicans have been in the minority, of course. For the minority it is easier to make proposals. It is easier to throw stones and things because you do not have the responsibility to finish it up.

So it is, I think, an interesting kind of thing and one that I believe has some bearing on us really solving problems here. I think it is something we all ought to give some consideration to so that we begin to say to ourselves, "Here's the problem. How do we best resolve it?" not just "How do we get the best 5 o'clock news out of it?" Success should not be how much media coverage; success ought to be dealing with the problem, trying to resolve it with real debate, real desire to put it where it belongs. Many problems are best solved in the private sector, best solved in State and local government, best solved—some—by the Federal Government. And those are the decisions that we should make.

So, Mr. President, as we move forward I hope that we do maintain the elements of democracy. I have had the occasion, being chairman of a subcommittee on Foreign Relations, to go some places where they do not have democracy. And obviously the things that keep them from that is not having a constitutional government to which people can adhere and a rule of law

which enforces it, an opportunity for people to voice their opinions and an opportunity for people to be informed as they form these opinions. These are the things that I think are important to our democracy and I am very interested in maintaining.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BENNETT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, am I correct that I am recognized by previous order for 15 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Chair.

THE Y2K PROBLEM

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I rise because this is an anniversary date, not an anniversary of something that happened in the past but an anniversary of something that is going to happen in the future. This is an anniversary that is counting backwards. Depending on how you count it, this is either day No. 599 or day No. 600; 599 to the 31st of December, 1999, or 600 days prior to January 1, 2000—the day of the great New Year's Eve party that everybody is reserving their time for in Times Square, in the various hotels in New York. But it is also a day that we need to look forward to with some concern because of what has come to be known as the millennium bug, the year 2000 problem, or, as the computer people abbreviate it, Y2K.

I used the phrase "Y2K," and my wife said, "What are you talking about? What does it stand for?" Well, the "Y" stands for "year;" "2" and "K," for "kilo" or 1,000 years—2,000—so it shortens it. Call it Y2K. She stopped and thought about it a minute, and she said, "Y2K or year 2000, you only save one syllable. What's the point?" Nevertheless, that is what it has come to be known as.

As the chairman of the newly created committee dealing with this challenge here in the Senate, I want to take this anniversary date to bring the Senate and any who are listening over C-SPAN out in the country as a whole up to date on where we are with the Y2K problem.

First, let me outline the dimensions of the problem. A lot of people say, "Oh, yes; we understand it. It is simply that computers are geared to handle the date with two digits instead of four." So 1998 would be in the computer as "98" instead of "1998." And that means when you get to the year 2000, the "00" to the computer means "1900" because the "19" is assumed in advance.

Actually, it is more serious than that. There are three areas of concern about Y2K.

The first one, of course, is the software concern that I have already mentioned. The software is programmed with two digits for the date instead of