

It doesn't stop. It accelerates! Just this month The Washington Post reported the resignation of senior diplomats, the suspension of another, the firing of a further two over security matters.

J. Stapleton Roy, one of the nation's two most senior foreign service officers and a three-time U.S. ambassador, has resigned in protest after Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright suspended his deputy without pay and fired two other long-time State Department officials over a missing top-secret laptop computer. . . .

The departure of Roy and the reassignment of [Donald] Keyser will rob the department of two of its top China experts. The son of a missionary, Roy grew up in China, returned to the United States to go to Princeton University, then joined the foreign service. He later served as ambassador to China, Indonesia and Singapore. Keyser had served in Beijing three times, had been the State Department's director of Chinese and Mongolian affairs, and most recently held the rank of ambassador as a special negotiator for conflicts in Nagorno-Karabakh and former Soviet republics.

"That's a lot of brainpower suddenly removed from the State Department," said William C. McCahill, a recently retired foreign service officer who served as the deputy chief of mission in Beijing. "Keyser is a brilliant analyst and a person of great intellectual honesty and rigor. Stape is the kind of person you want in INR, someone who can think beyond today and tomorrow, who can think beyond established policy."—The Washington Post, December 5, 2000.

With some hesitation I would call to mind the purge of the "China hands" from the Department of State during the McCarthy era. As our Commission established with finality, there was indeed a Soviet attack on American diplomacy and nuclear development during and after World War II. There were early and major successes. The design of the first atom bomb. But not much else, and for not much longer. The real damage—the parallels are eerie—to American security came from the disinclination of the intelligence community—then largely in the Army—to share information with "civilians." Specifically, documents obtained from the F.B.I. indicate that President Truman was never told of the Army Signals Security Agency's decryptions of Soviet cables during and after the war. He thought the whole business of Communist spying was a "red herring." In 1953 he termed Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley "a crook and a louse." American diplomacy and the Department of State in particular were for years haunted by charges they could readily have dealt with had they but known what their own government knew. And who issued the instruction that the President was not to be told? General Omar N. Bradley whom the President had made Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. (Admittedly it is hard to prove a negative.) But I was reassured by an article in the Summer edition of the "Bulletin" of the CIA's Center for the Study of Intelligence. In it, Deputy CIA historian Michael Warner votes with the judgment I offered earlier in my book "Secrecy."

What might it be that Secretary Albright needs to know today but has not been told? A generation hence we might learn. If, that is, the current secrecy regime goes unaltered.

For the moment, however, I have further distressing news for Ambassador Stapleton if he should have occasion to return to the Department of State main building for one or another reason. I have just received a copy of a letter sent to David G. Carpenter, Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of Diplomatic Security. Another recently retired Ambassador, a statesman of large achievement and impeccable reputation recently called at Main State, to use their term. He was frisked at the entrance. He was allowed into the building, but assigned an "escort," who accompanied wherever he went. Including, the ambassador writes, "the men's room."

It is difficult not to agree with the Ambassador's assessment that "the 'escort' policy is insulting and totally out of proportion to any desired enhancement of security." But then so is so much of security policy as it has evolved over the past sixty years.

What is to be done? Surely we must search for a pattern in all this. Our Commission proposed a simple, direct formation. Secrecy is a form of regulation.

In the previous Congress, legislation was prepared to embody the essentials of the Commission recommendations. All classified materials would bear the name and position of the person assigning the classification and the date, subject to review, that the classification would expire. It is not generally realized, but apart from atomic matters, under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and a few other areas there is no law stipulating what is to be classified Confidential, Secret, Top Secret—and there are numerous higher designations. It is simply a matter of judgment for anyone who has a rubber stamp handy. Our bill was unanimously reported from the Committee on Governmental Affairs, under the fine chairmanship of Senator FRED THOMPSON, with the full support of the then-ranking Committee member, our revered John Glenn. But nothing came of it. The assorted government agencies, covertly if you like, simply smothered it. The bureaucracy triumphed once more. Thomas Jefferson's dictum that "An informed citizenry is vital to the functioning of a democratic society" gave way before the self-perpetuating interests of bureaucracy.

I am pleased to report that this year's Intelligence Authorization bill, which is now at the White House awaiting President Clinton's signature, includes the Public Interest Declassification Act. The measure establishes a nine-member "Public Interest Declassification Board" of "nationally recog-

nized experts" who will advise the President and pertinent executive branch agencies on which national security documents should be declassified first. Five members of the Board will be appointed by the President and four members will be appointed by the Senate and the House.

The Board's main purpose will be to help determine declassification priorities. This is especially important during a time of Congress' continual slashing of the declassification budgets. In addition to the routine systematic work required by President Clinton's Executive Order 12958, the intelligence community is also required to process Freedom of Information Act requests, Privacy Act requests, and special searches levied primarily by members of Congress and the administration.

There is a need to bring order to this increasingly chaotic process. This Board may just provide the necessary guidance and will help determine how our finite declassification resources can best be allocated among all these competing demands.

My hope is that the Board will be a voice within the executive branch urging restraint in matters of secrecy. I have tried to lay out the organizational dynamics which produce ever larger and more intrusive secrecy regimes. I have sought to suggest how damaging this can be to true national security interests. But this is a modest achievement given the great hopes with which our Commission concluded its work. I fear that rationality is but a weak foil to the irrational. In the end we shall need character as well as conviction. We need public persons the stature of George P. Shultz, who when in 1986 learned of plans to begin giving lie detector tests for State Department employees, calmly announced that the day that program began would be the day he submitted his resignation as Secretary of State. And so of course it did not begin. And yet with him gone, the bureaucratic imperative reappears.

And so Mr. President, I conclude my remarks, thanking all my fellow Senators present and past for untold courtesies over these many years.

#### RETIREMENT OF SENATOR DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, it saddens me to note that the Senate will soon lose one of its most visionary and accomplished members, a great American, Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN.

It boggles the mind just to think of all of the important positions that PAT MOYNIHAN has held, including cabinet or subcabinet posts under four presidents: John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon, and Gerald Ford. He served as Ambassador to India in the 1970's and then as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. He came to the

United States Senate in 1977 already a scholar, author and public official of great distinction and renown. In the 24 years he has spend here, he has only greatly expanded his enormous reputation and body of work. PAT MOYNIHAN is a Senator's Senator. Over the years, he has earned the respect of every member of the Senate.

PAT MOYNIHAN is a person who has shown tremendous vision throughout his life. He has shown foresight about the importance of a strong family and about the importance of strong communities in America. He raised the critical important of these basic values and concerns about the deterioration of these family values, long before others. He has shown great foresight about our Constitution. One of the highlights for me in my service in the Senate was joining Senator MOYNIHAN and Senator ROBERT BYRD in fighting against the line item veto as a violation of our Constitution. And, he has shown great foresight about the world and the role of the United States in international affairs. His work at the United Nations and in the Senate, as a former Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and as Chairman of the Finance Committee have been marked by his perceptive, analytical, and worldly view on trade, foreign policy, and intelligence matters. Long before others, Senator MOYNIHAN was speaking of the economic and ultimately military weaknesses of the Soviet Union and predicting its collapse.

It is virtually impossible to list all of PAT MOYNIHAN's accomplishments in the U.S. Senate. Among the most lasting, however, will be his efforts on behalf of architectural excellence in the nation's capital. He was a crucial force behind the return to greatness of the Pennsylvania Avenue corridor between the U.S. Capital and the White House, the restoration of Washington's beautiful, elegant, and historic Union Station, and the construction of the Thurgood Marshall Judiciary Building here on Capitol Hill.

The author or editor of eighteen books, Senator MOYNIHAN has been at the forefront of the national debate on issues ranging from welfare reform, to tax policy to international relations. His most recent book, written in 1998, "Secrecy: The American Experience" expands on the report of the Commission on Protecting and Reducing Government Secrecy of which he was the Chairman. This is a fascinating and provocative review of the history of the development of secrecy in the government since World War I and argument for an "era of openness".

At home in New York, in a state which is known for its rough and tumble politics, he has shown leadership again and again, demonstrating the power of intellect and the ability to rise above the fray. That has been a wonderful contribution not just to New York but to all of America.

As they leave the Senate family, which will never forget their huge contribution, we salute PAT and Elizabeth MOYNIHAN.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, in the 211-year history of the United States Senate, the State of New York has one of the richest and most storied legacies.

Since 1789, New York has sent to the Senate 63 Senators. I have had the distinct privilege of serving with four of them, most memorably, Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN.

When the people of New York elected PAT MOYNIHAN to represent them nearly 25 years ago, they sent to Washington a uniquely gifted and talented man. Those are the reasons, Senator MOYNIHAN is one of only two, out of 63 Senators from New York, to have been elected to four consecutive terms in the United States Senate.

Senator MOYNIHAN began his service to this nation more than 50 years ago when he served in the United States Navy from 1944-1947—and he never stopped being "Mr. Public Servant." He served one governor, New York's Averell Harriman, and four United States Presidents: two Democrats, Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and two Republicans, Presidents Nixon and Ford.

What a record. PAT MOYNIHAN has given more than three quarters of his life to his nation and his state. This country, the United States Senate, and New York are joyously thankful.

He has been a leader in so many areas that it challenges one to list them all. But his impact on public architecture, monuments for future generations, are the hallmarks which this quiet gentleman reveres.

For over fifteen years now, I have had the privilege of serving with PAT on the Senate's Environment and Public Works Committee. I have been fortunate to work closely with him and observe his tireless effort and commitment to maintaining the architectural integrity of our great public institutions.

Some 40 years ago, the Kennedy Administration made the decision to revive Pennsylvania Avenue and restore the Federal Triangle. It was an extraordinary stroke of fortune that PAT MOYNIHAN, a deputy to Labor Secretary Goldberg who played a primary role in the effort, had the responsibility to draft a report that contained core ideas for redevelopment. The Federal Triangle, including the Ronald Reagan Building, and the Judiciary Building—to mention just a few—are dramatic evidence of his contributions that will live for years to come in the foundation of these magnificent buildings.

I cannot resist the temptation to recall that Senator MOYNIHAN was fond of noting that it was Treasury Secretary Andrew Mellon who initially championed the idea of reviving the Federal

Triangle and establishing it as an international trade and cultural center. It took a man of PAT MOYNIHAN's talent, character and foresight to pick up and finish that vision, started in the early 1930s, in such a grand manner.

I would be remiss were I not to take a minute to thank Senator MOYNIHAN for his leadership and the personal courtesies he extended to me, as he took the initiative to name the departmental auditorium at the Commerce Department building, the Andrew Mellon Auditorium. It truly is a remarkable structure and aptly named.

Over 200 years ago, Pierre L'Enfant, as he laid plans for the new United States capital, could only hope that a man like Senator MOYNIHAN would one day work with such compassion and perseverance to keep alive the true spirit and design envisioned in the original blueprints of George Washington's federal city.

One of the most rewarding assignments in my own career in public service, has been the opportunity to serve with Senator MOYNIHAN as a member of the Smithsonian's Board of Regents. The talented men and women who have served on the Board are unquestionably committed to the arts and preserving this nation's cultural heritage. And I am certain, that all of them who have served with him would agree that PAT MOYNIHAN's leadership and guiding wisdom have been indispensable.

Beyond the physical monuments to his achievements, I will always remember PAT MOYNIHAN for his humor, his intellect, his grace, his eloquence, and his humility.

All of us here, before we cast the first vote, before we discharge the first responsibility, take the oath of office. We solemnly commit "to support and defend the constitution. . . ." "Against all enemies. . . ." we commit "to bear true faith and allegiance" and we undertake "to faithfully discharge" our duty. Senator MOYNIHAN was a man of his word and here in the Senate he has always been true to his principles and true to his oath.

PAT MOYNIHAN has been a giant in the Senate for some time. I only hope that the years ahead give him the time he has always wanted to do those things he has never quite had the time to do.

The Senate and the nation know Senator MOYNIHAN as a true patriot, a gentleman, and a statesman. His legacy is a remarkable gift we will benefit from for years to come.

In closing, I would like to submit for the RECORD two articles that appeared in the Washington Post—one, written by George Will and the other by Benjamin Forgery. I ask to have printed in the RECORD these articles, so all citizens can read of the enormous contributions Senator MOYNIHAN has made to this institution, his home State of New York, and, indeed, this country.

The Nation's Capital—in the words that Navy men and women understand—bids you a final “Well done, Sir. We salute you as the L’Enfant of this century.”

There being no objection, the material ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 17, 2000]

FAREWELL, MR. MOYNIHAN

(By George F. Will)

When this Congress ends, so will one of the broadest and deepest public careers in American history. Daniel Patrick Moynihan—participant in John Kennedy's New Frontier, member of Lyndon Johnson's White House staff, Richard Nixon's domestic policy adviser, Gerald Ford's ambassador to India and the United Nations, four-term senator—will walk from the Senate and political life, leaving both better for his having been in them, and leaving all who observe them bereft of the rare example of a public intellectual's life lived well—adventurously, bravely and leavened by wit.

The intellectual polarities of his life have been belief in government's ameliorative powers—and in William Butler Yeats's deflation of expectations for politics:

Parnell came down the road, he said to a cheering man:

Ireland shall get her freedom and you will still break stone.

Having served four presidents, Moynihan wrote that he did not remember ever having heard at a Cabinet meeting “a serious discussion of political ideas—one concerned with how men, rather than markets, behave.” Regarding the complexities of behavior, Moynihan has stressed the importance of ethnicity—the Balkans, the Bronx, come to that. Moynihan knew how wrong Marx was in asserting the lost saliency of pre-industrial factors, such as ethnicity and religion, in the modern age.

His gift for decorous disruptions was apparent early, when, during a 1965 audience with Pope Paul VI, at a time when the Church was reconsidering its doctrine of the collective guilt of Jews for Christ's crucifixion, Moynihan, a Catholic, shattered protocol by addressing the pope: “Holy Father, we hope you will not forget our friends the Jews.” Later, an unsettled member of the audience, the bishop of Chicago, said, “We need a drink.” Moynihan said, “If they're going to behave like a Medieval court, they must expect us to take an opportunity to petition him.”

During his U.N. service he decided that U.S. foreign policy elites were “decent people, utterly unprepared for their work” because “they had only one idea, and that was wrong.” It was that the bad behavior of other nations was usually a reaction to America's worse behavior. He has been a liberal traditionalist, keeper of Woodrow Wilson's crusade for lawful rather than normless dealings among nations.

“Everyone,” says Moynihan the social scientist, “is entitled to his own opinion but not his own facts.” When in 1993 the Clinton administration's Goals 2000 asserted that by 2000 America's high school graduation rate would be 90 percent and American students would lead the world in mathematics and science achievements, Moynihan acidly compared these goals to the old Soviet grain production quotas. Of the projected 2000 outcome, Moynihan said: “That will not happen.” It didn't.

Moynihan has written much while occupying the dark and bloody ground where so-

cial science and policymaking intersect. Knowing that the two institutions that most shape individuals are the family and the state, he knows that when the former weakens, the latter strengthens. And family structure is “the principal conduit of class structure.” Hence Moynihan's interest in government measures to strengthen families.

Moynihan understands that incantations praising minimalist government are America's “civic religion, avowed but not constraining.” Government grows because of the ineluctable bargaining process among interest groups that favor government outlays that benefit them. And government grows because knowledge does, and knowledge often grows because of government.

Knowledge, says Moynihan, is a form of capital, much of it formed by government investment in education. And knowledge begets government. He says: Behold California's Imperial Valley, unchanged since “the receding of the Ice Age.” Only God can make an artichoke, but government—specifically, the Bureau of Reclamation—made the valley a cornucopia. Time was, hospitals' biggest expense was clean linen. Then came technologies—diagnostic, therapeutic, pharmacological—that improved health, increased costs and expanded government.

“Not long ago,” Moynihan has written, “it could be agreed that politics was the business of who gets what, when, where, how. It is now more than that. It has become a process that also deliberately seeks to effect such outcomes as who thinks what, who acts when, who lives where, who feels how.” Moynihan appreciates the pertinence of political philosopher Michael Oakshott's cautionary words: “To try to do something which is inherently impossible is always a corrupting enterprise.”

The 14-year-old Moynihan was shining shoes on Central Park West when he heard about Pearl Harbor. In the subsequent six decades he has been more conversant with, and more involved in, more of the nation's transforming controversies than anyone else. Who will do what he has done for the intellectual nutritiousness of public life? The nation is not apt to see his like again, never having seen it before him.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 7, 2000]

MOYNIHAN'S LEGACY IS WRITTEN IN STONE

(By Benjamin Forgey)

Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, on the edge of retirement as the 106th Congress argues its way to a finish, tells the story whenever he feels the audience is right. And why not? It is a true-life Washington legend.

Time: Summer 1961. Place: The White House. Scene: A Cabinet meeting with President John F. Kennedy. The nation's chief policymakers are busily deliberating foreign affairs but pause, Moynihan says, “when the next-most-important issue in government comes up—which, of course, is office space.”

That line always gets a laugh. Moynihan knows Washington and knows what people think about Washington—one-liners at the expense of the bureaucracy never miss. But what comes afterward is the true beginning of the legend.

The president appoints Labor Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg to co-chair “something with the unpromising title of Ad Hoc Committee on Federal Office Space.” To Moynihan, then Goldberg's 34-year-old deputy, falls the duty of finding out exactly how much space is needed, and writing the report.

It is far-fetched to imagine a 15-page committee report about government office space

having much significance for even 38 minutes after being written. This one, completed in the spring of 1962, has had a far-reaching impact across 38 years, for it contained, improbably, the genesis of a plan to redevelop Pennsylvania Avenue.

The opportunistic idea was Goldberg's—he had decided to try to do something about the avenue when surveying its fragmented, decaying north side from a slow-moving limousine during Kennedy's inaugural parade. But the brilliant words were Moynihan's.

He vividly sketched the “scene of desolation” on the northern side, opposite the impressive classic revival buildings of the 1930s Federal Triangle. He sensitively summarized the avenue's history, showing a rare understanding of the crucial role assigned to it in Pierre Charles L’Enfant's 1791 plan—“symbolizing,” Moynihan wrote, “at once the separation of powers and the fundamental unity in the American Government.”

Above all, Moynihan showed that he understood cities. The avenue's poor state meant that private capital soon would begin the process of tearing down and building anew. The opportunity had arisen, he wrote, “to design and construct what would, in effect, be a new avenue,” and the federal government had a historic duty “to maintain standards of buildings and architecture in the nation's capital.”

Moynihan's vision was humane and, for its time, exceptionally urbane. “Care should be taken,” he admonished, “not to line the north side with a solid phalanx of public and private office buildings which close down completely at night and on weekends. . . . Pennsylvania Avenue should be lively, friendly, and inviting, as well as dignified and impressive.”

More than any other American politician of the second half of the 20th century, Moynihan has engaged the issue of architecture, urban design and infrastructure. He has used his intellectual prowess, political skills and sheer power to establish meaningful rules, to save historic buildings, to improve federal architecture, to get buildings built. Washington has been the great beneficiary of these involvements—most dramatically on the section of the great boulevard linking the Capitol and the White House.

There is a sense in which the rebuilding of Pennsylvania Avenue became Moynihan's destiny. Partly by chance, partly by design, he has been around to persuade, push and prod a vision into reality. And, for the last 10 years, he has been able to watch it happen with his wife, Elizabeth, from their apartment above the Navy Memorial and Market Square, on the avenue between Ninth and Seventh Streets NW.

Soon after the report was published, Goldberg was appointed to the Supreme Court. Moynihan thus inherited responsibility for shepherding the avenue dream in the Kennedy administration. He became great pals with Nathaniel Owings, the celebrated architect Kennedy chose to come up with a plan. The pair would walk the avenue in the evenings and talk excitedly of its past and future while sitting, recalls Moynihan, on “those nice, strong benches next to the National Archives.”

Then, after Kennedy was assassinated, Moynihan helped keep the project alive during the Lyndon Johnson presidency—nothing had been built. He had the enthusiastic collaboration of White House counsel Harry McPherson Jr., and an invaluable plug from Jacqueline Kennedy, who “saved the undertaking in a farewell call on President Johnson,” Moynihan recalls. Thereafter, he says,

Johnson "took Mrs. Kennedy's wishes as something of a command."

Moynihan admits that, as much as he liked and admired Nat Owings, he did not care for Owings's formidable first plan. It was a "terrible plan," he now says, though he did not say so at the time. The young politician was perhaps a bit in awe of the elder Great Architect—lots of people were. The firm that Owings had started in the 1930s—Skidmore, Owings & Merrill—was by then world-renowned.

How flawed was that first plan? Well, typical of its time, it called for massive demolitions—including the National Press Club building and the Willard and Washington hotels. These were to be replaced by an impressively bloated National Square or by massive buildings all in a row.

Fortunately, time was not kind to this vision. We can judge how lucky we are by pondering the one building that actually got built: the FBI headquarters, that odd-looking, off-putting giant facing the avenue between Ninth and 10th streets NW.

It is possible that, even then, Moynihan suspected he was in this for the long haul. As it happened, he left Washington in 1965 but was backed by 1969—shockingly, to his liberal-Democrat colleagues—as top urban affairs adviser to Republican President Richard Nixon.

Once again, Moynihan had lots to say about Pennsylvania Avenue. It is no coincidence that during Nixon's first term the avenue plan was given real teeth in the 1972 legislation creating the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corp. And it was a very different, less destructive plan—much more in keeping with Moynihan's original admonishment to be "lively, friendly and inviting."

Nothing much got built during the '70s, but the PADC was quietly preparing the groundwork. By the time building got started in the early '80s, Moynihan was back in town, this time as a senator from New York. Since then, he has been there tirelessly for the avenue—out front or behind the scenes, in large matters or small.

How large? The Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center—the big mixed-use federal building at Pennsylvania and 13th Street NW—is one of his enthusiasms. Back in the Kennedy years, Moynihan's Labor Department office in the Federal Triangle had looked out on parking lot of "surpassing ugliness." He never forgot, and that lot is where the Reagan Building stands.

How small? Moynihan never forgot, either, that the Ariel Rios Building, at 13th Street, had been left incomplete when work on the Federal Triangle ceased; its brick sidewall was left exposed "just like an amputated limb," in the words of J. Carter Brown, chairman of the federal Commission of Fine Arts. Moynihan, Brown believes, was the "eminence grise who was able to shake the General Services Administration by the lapels and get that thing finished."

But if in one way or another Moynihan had a hand in practically everything that was built—or saved—on this crucial stretch of Pennsylvania Avenue, he also worked for Washington in other ways. He helped mightily to preserve and find new uses for three of Washington's most notable historic structures—the Old Patent Office (now housing two Smithsonian museums), the Old Post Office (a mixed-use building because of a law Moynihan pushed through) and the Old Pension Building (now the National Building Museum).

Just about single-handedly did Moynihan arrange for the construction of the distin-

guished U.S. Judiciary Building next to Union Station. He was a crucial negotiator in the brilliant deal by which New York and Washington each get a share of the National Museum of the American Indian. Moynihan fought to get cars off Frederick Law Olmsted's Capitol grounds. He continues to wage an enlightened campaign for reasonableness about security in federal buildings. The list could go on.

Of course, it isn't simply Washington that has benefited. As might be expected, Moynihan's own state has profited immensely as well.

The new Penn Station—a complex, ongoing project involving federal, state and city bureaucracies and private enterprise—is just the latest of dozens of important examples. There's much talk of calling it "Moynihan Station" because he was its "guiding light and soul," says chief architect David Childs.

Nor is it just Washington and New York. It is the nation. Two examples of many: The Intermodal Surface Transportation and Efficiency Act of 1991 and its successor, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century ("Ice Tea" and "Tea 21" for short), are Moynihan bills through and through and through. By encouraging mass transit and loosening the highway lobby's decades-old stranglehold on the nation's transportation policy, these laws do the country an estimable service.

And then there are his "Guiding Principles of Federal Architecture." They are straightforward and smart: There should be no official style; the architecture should embody the "finest contemporary American architectural thought." Regional characteristics should be kept in mind. Sites should be selected with care. Landscape architecture also is important.

The principles take us back to that committee report of 38 years ago. Nobody asked for a Pennsylvania Avenue plan and no one asked for architectural guidelines. Moynihan simply invented them and attached them to the report, and they have functioned as a beacon for high-quality federal architecture ever since.

Moynihan's act is almost impossible to follow. In the phrase of Rep. Earl Blumenauer (D-Oregon), another architecture fan, Moynihan possesses "a bundle of qualities" seldom found in a single politician: a good eye, a first-rate mind, a passion for the subject, lots of power, long experience, a certain flamboyance, a canny sense of timing.

Nor is there likely to be another politician alive whose favorite quotation is Thomas Jefferson's statement: "Design activity and political thought are indivisible."

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, today, I wish to pay tribute to the very distinguished Senator from New York, who will be retiring at the end of this Congressional session.

Senator MOYNIHAN, as his recent biography makes clear, has been an intellectual giant in the Senate and throughout his service to our nation. The breadth of his interests—and his knowledge—is extraordinary. From questions about the architecture and urban development of Washington, D.C. to the problems created by single parent families to the workings of the International Labor Organization, Senator MOYNIHAN has thought deeply and designed policy answers. I don't think there's a Senator who hasn't learned something from Senator MOYNIHAN'S

vast stock of personal experience, understanding of history, and ability to draw parallels between seemingly unrelated topics to enlighten our understanding of both.

I have had the particular pleasure of serving with Senator MOYNIHAN on the Finance Committee for eight years. As Chairman and as ranking member of the Finance Committee, Senator MOYNIHAN has been a true leader. Starting in 1993, when I took Senator Bentsen's seat on the Committee and Senator MOYNIHAN claimed his chairmanship, Chairman MOYNIHAN successfully guided the 1993 economic plan through the committee and the Senate. That budget, which I was proud to help shape and support, laid the foundation for our current record economic expansion. That same year, we worked together to expose the shortcomings of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

After Republicans took control of the Senate in the 1994 election, Senator MOYNIHAN was a fierce critic of their excessive budget proposals. We joined in opposing shortsighted proposals to have Medicare "wither on the vine," turn Medicaid into a block grant, and destroy welfare rather than reforming it. Senator MOYNIHAN was, as always, an especially passionate defender of teaching hospitals, warning that the plan to slash spending for Medicare's graduate medical education would threaten medical research in this country—a fear that has proved well-founded as teaching hospitals have struggled to survive the much smaller changes enacted as part of the compromise Balanced Budget Act that emerged in 1997.

The Finance Committee—and the Senate—will not be the same without him. Who else will be able to gently tutor witnesses on the importance of the grain trade in upstate New York in the early nineteenth century to a current debate about health care policy? Who else will call for the Boskin and Secrecy Commissions of the future? And who else will educate his colleagues on the inequitable distribution of federal spending and taxation among the various states?

Mr. President, I will miss PAT MOYNIHAN. But I have no doubt that he will continue to be part of the debate. As Senator MOYNIHAN retires to his beloved farm in upstate New York, I join my colleagues in looking forward to more and more insightful treatises on new and complicated policy issues.

#### RETIREMENT OF SENATOR J. ROBERT KERREY

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, when the Senate adjourns Senator BOB KERREY will be retiring from the Senate.

BOB KERREY served his beloved state of Nebraska as a highly popular and successful governor from 1982 to 1987. As governor, he was widely credited for his efforts to balance the budget and