

reasoned that the bomb could not be a dangerous weapon or a destructive device under the relevant Federal statute. Of course, had it detonated, I think probably they might have had a different indication.

The Solicitor General would normally intervene in such a case, particularly since the recipient of the letter bomb was a U.S. attorney. Yet Solicitor General Drew Days declined to do so. As Prof. Paul Cassel of the University of Utah has explained:

The . . . decision [by the Solicitor General's office] is truly hard to fathom. A ruling that otherwise dangerous bombs with defective igniters are not "dangerous weapons" could be expected to have serious effects on the Government's ability to prosecute a number of serious criminals under the relevant Federal statutes.

Fortunately, the Reagan-Bush judges on the entire fourth circuit stepped in, and on their own initiative, reversed the crazy panel decision. And yes, President Clinton's appointment to the fourth circuit, Judge Blaine Michael, joined a dissent insisting that the letter bomb was nonoperational.

In yet another case—United States versus Cheely—a panel of Carter-appointed judges on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals struck down the Federal death penalty statute. Despite the Clinton administration's professed support for the Federal death penalty, Solicitor General Days declined to appeal the ninth circuit panel decision.

Unfortunately, the Solicitor General's actions in the Knox, Hamrick, and Cheely cases appear to be part of a pattern. As Senator HATCH explained last week, and I quote:

The Clinton administration's Solicitor General generally has ceased the efforts of the Reagan and Bush administrations to vigorously defend the death penalty and tough criminal laws.

So, what is the lesson here? The lesson is this: Talk is cheap. The President may talk a good game on crime, but the real-life actions of Clinton judges and Clinton lawyers often don't match the President's tough-on-crime rhetoric.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my leader's time. I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be a period for the transaction of morning business.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DORGAN and Mr. CRAIG pertaining to the introduction of S. 1712 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

UNDERMINING THE PUBLIC TRUST

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, in the real world, when one of us makes a

promise, he is expected to keep it. Politicians are held in low repute precisely because people do not expect them to keep their promises, and herein lies the heart of President Clinton's problem.

The people elected him President in 1992 because of his promises and now find that he has repudiated them. President Clinton promised to "end welfare as we know it." He broke that promise. He failed to keep his promise to give the middle class a tax cut. He failed to keep his promise to reduce the size of Government. He failed to keep his promise to balance the budget in 5 years.

The consequences of the President's broken promises are grave, not just because the country is still stuck with a broken welfare system, a Tax Code that makes it hard for workers and their families to get by, and a rising national debt that threatens the future of our children and grandchildren but also because in failing to keep his promises the President undermines the public trust.

President Clinton, I fear, does not understand that when he breaks a promise, he contributes to the cynicism and anger of the public. The American people are by nature neither cynical nor angry, but who can blame them for their distrust of politicians in Washington, DC, when they are forever being disappointed by broken promises.

The people have demonstrated to us time and time again that they want welfare reform, they want a balanced budget, and they want tax relief. Most people, unfortunately, are not aware that Congress has passed all three, and President Clinton has vetoed every one. Welfare reform, indeed, he has vetoed twice.

I am reminded of T.S. Eliot's eloquent poem "The Hollow Man." In it he paints a dismal picture of politicians whose talk means nothing and actions meaningless:

Between the idea
And the reality
Between the motion
And the act
Falls the Shadow

There is, indeed, a shadow between the President's words and his actions. He can work wonders in front of a camera or before a live audience. When he is performing, he is good. But when the time comes to act to keep his commitments and make tough decisions, sadly, he comes up short.

Of course, the picture is not irredeemably bleak. There has been progress. Two years ago, most Washington, DC, politicians were talking more and bigger Government programs, not a balanced budget; midnight basketball, not welfare reform, and tax hikes, not tax cuts. Today, the picture is different. This Congress has changed the debate. We have not won on every point but progress, especially when one is dealing with such issues, is bound to be slow and a certain amount of time and patience required, but we are doing our level best to keep our promises.

So, we can ask that age old question: Is this glass half empty or is it half full? It is half empty if you want a balanced budget and do not have it. It is half full if you recognize that Republicans in Congress have accomplished what no Congress did for 30 years—we passed a balanced budget. President Clinton vetoed it.

The glass is half empty if you expected tax cuts for families and small businesses. It is half full if you remember that Republicans passed a bill to give just such relief but the President vetoed it. The glass is half empty if you see an unreformed welfare system continuing to undercut the American ideal of family responsibility and hard work, but it is half full if you credit a Congress that took seriously its commitment and the President's to end welfare as we know it. But Bill Clinton vetoed welfare reform—twice.

Republicans passed a balanced budget for the sake of our children and grandchildren. Knowing that every American's personal share of the debt is \$18,000, and that continued unrestricted growth in Government will add so much more to our national debt that a child born today can expect to pay \$187,000 in interest on that debt in his or her lifetime, Congress acted. We made some tough choices and hard decisions to cut Government spending, and we came up with a plan for a balanced budget. President Clinton vetoed it. He says he favors a balanced budget, and he uses all the fine words his political consultants advise him to use, but the bottom line is President Bill Clinton vetoed the only balanced budget Congress has passed in 30 years.

Republicans reformed Medicare to preserve and strengthen it for older Americans and for those who expect it when they retire, but President Clinton vetoed it. Just last week, his own Medicare trustees reported that Medicare's hospital insurance fund is approaching bankruptcy even more rapidly than we feared, but President Clinton will not budge.

Republicans also voted tax relief to American families and to those who provide jobs and opportunity for all Americans. President Clinton vetoed this tax cut as well. With hundreds of thousands of working families just barely making ends meet, with small businesses—the driving force of the American economy—increasingly burdened by heavy taxes and regulations, the President sent the message to taxpayers that the Federal Government wants more and more of their hard-earned dollars.

Republicans twice passed welfare reforms to require able-bodied people to work and to instill responsibility and dignity into the lives of those who are subjected to the destructive forces of the current system. President Clinton vetoed welfare reform bills not once but twice.

It is unfortunate but true that Bill Clinton is the President of the status

quo. He is the President of big Government, high taxes, and an unreformed welfare system.

We all must admit, of course, that President Clinton has some of the attributes of a great leader. He does an outstanding job when he makes a speech or brings the Nation together in times of tragedy. But there is much more to leadership than giving speeches, shaking hands, and acting well before the camera lens. Being a leader is not just eloquence. Being a leader is acting on that eloquence and keeping your word even when it is tough to do so.

Do the American people trust the President's word? Do we in Congress, even some in the President's own party, trust the President's word when he says something? When he makes a commitment, can we be sure that he means it now and will mean it in a week, a month, or a year?

One of my colleagues said recently, more in sorrow than anger, "My problem is I believe 90 percent of what he says and disagree with 90 percent of what he does."

When we look at the glaring difference between what the President says and what he does, our reaction can only be one of profound disappointment. So many chances we have had to set America on a new course, to change the way the Government works, and so many chances lost because the President will not stick to his word.

The President of the United States holds a special elevated place in the minds of the people. More than Congress, more than any other institution, the people look to the President for leadership. His words and his actions are of great importance, and have an immense impact.

The learned historian Donald Kagan, writing about the first great democratic leader who lived more than 2,000 years ago, Pericles of Athens, said:

Every leader who makes any impression at all acts as an educator for good or ill, knowingly or not. His people pay attention to his words and deeds as to few others, and he contributes to their vision of the world, their nation, and themselves and their relations among them.

The leader's vision may be confusing and chaotic, or it may be . . . clear and orderly; it may encourage or discourage; it may degrade or elevate the people.

How shall we assess the President's leadership by this standard? I am saddened, I am disappointed to say it has been confusing and chaotic—to the American people, and to us in Congress. It has been discouraging as well. The President has lifted our hopes by promising he is for welfare reform, tax relief, and a balanced budget, only to discourage us by going back on his word. Time and time again, the President has changed his mind. Things have come to such a sad state that we are no longer surprised when the President breaks a promise. We expect him to be inconsistent more than we expect him to be reliable.

I hope the President will decide that keeping his promises is better politics

than repudiating them. If he does, we can work with him on a balanced budget, tax relief, and welfare reform—all the changes the American people want, changes, indeed, they have wanted for a long time, and that will be of enormous help for the country.

I wish I could be optimistic in this hope, but based on his past record, I doubt President Clinton will sign a balanced budget, tax relief measures, or welfare reform legislation. I doubt he will work with Congress to reduce the size of the Federal Government or to get Government off the people's backs. This is an area, however, Mr. President, in which I hope against hope that the President will prove me wrong.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the impression will not go away: The \$5 trillion Federal debt stands today as an increasingly grotesque parallel to the energizer bunny that keeps moving and moving and moving on television—precisely in the same manner and to the same extent that the President is allowing the Federal debt to keep going up and up and up into the stratosphere.

A lot of politicians like to talk a good game—"talk" is the operative word here—about cutting Federal spending and thereby bringing the Federal debt under control. But watch how they vote on spending bills.

Mr. President, as of the close of business Friday, April 26, the exact Federal debt stood at \$5,096,090,106,286.92 or \$19,250.20 per man, woman, child on a per capita basis.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. VIRGINIA N. FOSTER

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a woman, Virginia N. Foster, who, through her 50 years of service to our Nation, has helped to keep the United States safe and secure, and is someone who is worthy of our thanks.

Many of you may already know Mrs. Foster from your dealings with the Air Force's Directorate of legislative Liaison, where she has worked for the past 21 years. Through 12 Congresses, the 93d to the 104th, she has dutifully and faithfully assisted Members and their staffs in resolving issues and questions concerning the Air Force. Due to her long tenure, she has become more than a valued employee, she has become an important asset to the Air Force, providing her superiors and co-workers with an encyclopedic knowledge of Air Force policy, and an institutional memory that is unmatched by anyone else working in Legislative Liaison Directorate.

What is perhaps most amazing about Mrs. Foster is not necessarily her impressive abilities as an employee, but that her 23 years of working with Congress does not comprise even half of her civil service career, which began in 1944 when she went to work at a Ger-

man Prisoner of War Camp in Texas. In subsequent years, she has held many positions, though since 1951, she has lived in the Washington, DC area where she has never been too far from either the U.S. Congress or the headquarters of the Air Force, both institutions which she has served with devotion and unflagging competence.

Mr. President, Mrs. Foster will mark her fifth decade of Government service on May 1 of this year. On that day, the Air Force will present her with the "Exceptional Civilian Service Award" in recognition of her dedicated work and support, a recognition of which she is truly deserving and in which she can take great pride. I know that those in this Chamber who know Mrs. Foster will want to join me in expressing our gratitude for her assistance to us over the years, and in congratulating her on celebrating 50 years of service to our Nation. We wish her great health and happiness in the years to come, and hope that she continues to be an important part of life on Capitol Hill.

TEXT OF EULOGY TO DR. I. BEVERLY LAKE, SR., BY DR. NORMAN ADRIAN WIGGINS

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, a couple of Sunday afternoons ago, several hundred of us gathered at the Baptist Church on the campus of what, until mid-20th century, was Wake Forest College, the marvelous institution that I attended and of which I shall always be proud. (Wake Forest College moved to Winston-Salem in 1954 and is now one of the Nation's prominent universities.)

The multitude came on April 14 to pay our last respects to a great American, Dr. I. Beverly Lake, Sr., who had passed away a couple of days earlier.

At the April 14 services for Dr. Lake, a eulogy was delivered by one of North Carolina's most prominent present-day citizens, Dr. Norman Adrian Wiggins, who, to all of us who know him, is simple Ed Wiggins, our friend.

Mr. President, as Ed Wiggins spoke that afternoon, I was both touched and inspired, yes, but I was also grateful for the blessings of having known both Dr. Lake and Ed Wiggins and for having them as treasured friends.

Dr. Norman Adrian Wiggins is president and professor of law at the rapidly growing Baptist institution in North Carolina, Campbell University, of which years ago, I was honored to serve as trustee.

But, Mr. President, my purpose today is to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the beautiful, caring eulogy to Dr. Lake delivered by Ed Wiggins on Sunday, April 14. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

EULOGY TO DR. I. BEVERLY LAKE, SR.
(By Dr. Norman Adrian Wiggins)

He is in His presence! He is in His presence! Dr. Isaac Beverly Lake is in the presence of the Master he served during life! All is well.