

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.

This is the day the Lord hath made, let us rejoice and be glad in it!

The apostle Paul said, "I have fought the good fight. I have finished my course, I have kept the faith" (II Timothy 4:7).

This towering figure and one of North Carolina's most outstanding sons whose life we honor today never made such a claim. But we who have known him best can testify to the appropriateness of this description. Few, if any, have fought the fight, finished the course or kept the faith better than the one we honor today. And today we come to celebrate his victory and final graduation.

I count it a great honor to participate in this service of my teacher, mentor, colleagues and longtime friend. What a wonderful gathering of family and friends. It is a splendid testimony to the life of one who could talk with crowds and not lose his virtue and walk with kings and not lose the common touch.

When asked by a mother what advice he could give her for the rearing of her infant son, General Robert E. Lee, then President of Washington and Lee, replied, "Madam, teach him to deny himself."

So it was with the life of the one we remember today. Few were ever so dedicated to the principle of self denial and duty.

It accounts in part for his outstanding success as practicing lawyer, brilliant legal scholar, both in the classroom and on the Bench of the North Carolina Supreme Court, outstanding Deputy (then Assistant) Attorney General in a critical time in the life of our state and as a dedicated Churchman.

If time permitted, we could study, with profit, the many facets of Dr. Lake's career. But these have been recalled frequently in the news media in recent days. They are well known. I shall not repeat them. Instead, I want to speak about what I have observed of this man of Impeccable character and invincible integrity.

In addition to his devotion to duty and self denial, the guiding light of the life of Dr. Issac Beverly Lake was his belief in and devotion to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Whenever he spoke, he almost always used the occasion to advance the Kingdom of God here on earth. Although conservative in philosophy with a brilliant mind that could cut through and define an issue with great clarity when explaining "truth," he would go back to that greatest teacher in history who told his students, "If you continue in my word . . . ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," and again he said, "I am the way, the truth and the life,"

And then Dr. Lake would lead us to see that truth is a seamless web, woven together by God, that there are no inconsistent truths or portions of truth. And then he would strongly declare: "Jesus's definition stands alone, uncontradicted and complete—"I am the truth." This was his north star!

In addition to his faith in God and his passion for truth, Dr. Lake had an unshakeable faith in the importance of Christian higher education. This personified his education at "Dear Ole Wake Forest" where his father was a great teacher of Physics and where he was surrounded by loving parents and great Christian teachers. Always willing to acknowledge with gratitude the education he received at two other great universities, he reserved his greatest appreciation for that school where students, without sacrificing the knowledge of material things and values, were encouraged to learn and appreciate the values of the spirit and character. It was there where students were taught that as the poet said, "one must know, but to know is not enough. One must will, but to will is not enough. One must act!" (Goethe)

In William Ellery Channing's charge on the ordination of the Reverend J. S. Dwight, he

urged the young minister to remember that: "The fewer the voices on the side of truth, the more distinct and strong must be your own." Dr. Lake always had a distinct and a strong voice for truth, even when others chose to remain silent.

Like John Ruskin, Dr. Lake believed that education was not so much teaching the young to learn what they previously did not know, but to teach them to behave in a way they did not previously behave. In other words, academic achievement and Christian commitment were expected to go hand in hand. And it was the teaching of these principles that elevated him to the class of the four or five greatest classroom teachers of his day.

It was bad for physics but good for law when Dr. Lake decided to study law. He said, "I had no higher ambition than to be a member of the Wake Forest Law School faculty. In speaking of the great 'faculty of Gulley, Timberlake and White,'" he could say "I was grandson of Gulley and son of Timberlake and White." The faculty proved that you could have a great law school notwithstanding modest facilities (one room) and a weak library.

In speaking of the Wake Forest College faculty he described them as the finest collection of scholars, teachers and men with whom he was ever associated.

In traditional Christian fashion, the family came next to Dr. Lake's devotion to God. His first wife and the mother of his son, Associate Justice Beverly Lake Junior, was Gertrude Bell. Some years after her death, he married Kathleen Robinson Mackie, the widow of Dr. George Mackie. Dr. Mackie was and still is known as Wake Forest's most famous college physician. Mrs. Lake was and Mrs. Kathleen Lake is a complete homemaker. Beautiful in appearance, highly capable intellectually, the lives of both ladies have been characterized by a sense of calling and duty. Without their inspiration, daily encouragement and wise counsel, Dr. Lake could not have accomplished so much. It is a great credit to both ladies and to his devoted and distinguished son, Beverly Junior, who followed his father as Associate Justice of the North Carolina Supreme Court, that they sensed Dr. Lake was called to perform a special service and were willing to help him render it.

As you know, Dr. Lake was tremendously proud of his son. Early in Beverly Junior's life he and his father were in Raleigh to view a political parade. Dr. Lake turned to Beverly and said, "I want you to promise me that you will stay out of politics and I will promise you I will do the same."

Later on I questioned Dr. Lake about this advice and asked him how he came to get involved in politics. He replied, "I guess I just drifted into it." Notwithstanding the humorous reply, I realized that like the late Justice Arthur Vanderbilt, he came to see that the holding of political office and service to country is the lawyer's most noble service.

Speaking of family, in characteristic humor, when receiving the Medal of Honor from the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for leadership, trustworthiness, service and patriotism, he stoutly disclaimed his worthiness, but declared he would take it so the "grandchildren and great grandchildren might possibly see that there were some good qualities about the old man after all." This was typical of the good humor and wit he exhibited all during his life.

Dr. Lake's entire life was characterized by his love for God, family and country. He often spoke about how his mother taught him "to love and honor his country and to learn about his country and its heritage."

"A person with no pride of heritage is a pathetic individual," said Dr. Lake.

Time and time again, as he expressed concern about the political direction of our country, he made it clear that "Whatever may have been true of Tsarist Russia, this country (the USA) needs no new foundation." He wanted everyone to know the noble purposes upon which the government was founded. While we have yet to attain them (the founding purposes) he strongly contended that "no nation on earth, past or present, ever got closer to them."

Dr. Lake wanted the Supreme Court of the United States to return to its original moorings—the Constitution. Twice Dr. Lake sought the office of Governor without success. Of course, he, the family, and all of us and especially "his boys" who supported him were disappointed. Did it impair his enthusiasm for his country? You be the judge.

Speaking at one ODK meeting held at Campbell some years after the unsuccessful campaigns and with a Supreme Court that was continuing to move from the foundation upon which the country had been founded, it could have been "pay back time." He could have weakened the faith of the young people in their country. What did he tell them?

"So often I hear thoughtful people say 'It's too late. We have already lost our way. America has passed beyond the hope of rescue.'"

"I do not believe that," said Dr. Lake with that strength of conviction for which he was famous.

But then he went on to say, "But if you are going to be a leader and going to change things, you must be willing 'to speak to your contemporaries truths they do not perceive and often do not want to hear.'"

Dr. Lake's life was characterized by enthusiasm, happiness, optimism, courage and deep faith in a risen Lord. One of the Nation's finest classroom teachers, he demanded much of his students. But love them he did. He called them "my boys." He visited with them when he met us on campus. When time permitted, he loved to join the students for a round of golf or a ball game. He and Mrs. Lake went far beyond the call of duty to make the students and other guests "feel at home" when they came calling on a visit.

If I had time to relate to you the stories that we remember and something of the good times we had, you could better appreciate why his students admired, respected, and yes, loved their teacher. Until the very end, he constantly dedicated his books, articles and lectures to "my students" to whom I owe so much.

When God sent angels to bring Dr. Lake home last Thursday, I suspect they said: "Come ye, Beverly, blessed of our father, enter thou into the joys of the Lord."

It is hard to imagine anyone more deserving of such a Divine invitation than Dr. I. Beverly Lake who spent his life in service to the people of North Carolina and the Nation!

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as if in morning business for up to 20 minutes.

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

Mr. GRAMS. Thank you very much.

REMOVE THE BARRICADES, RE-OPEN PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE TO THE PEOPLE

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I don't know how or why it developed, but one trait most humans share is a deep interest in chronicling the passage of time. And so we attach a special significance to the observance of anniversaries—those anniversaries marking celebration and achievement, and those marking solemn events of remembrance and passage.

On May 20, 3 weeks from today, we'll have an opportunity to observe both. We'll be celebrating the 88th birthday of actor Jimmy Stewart, the 64th anniversary of Amelia Earhart's solo flight across the Atlantic, the patenting of the fountain pen in 1830, and Levis' riveted-pocket blue jeans in 1873.

But on May 20, we'll also be observing a much more troubling event, because unless the Government takes action in the next 3 weeks to stop it, we'll be marking the 1-year anniversary of the closing of Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House.

Mr. President, we have an opportunity—an obligation—to prevent this anniversary from ever happening.

The city has certainly grown up around it, but Pennsylvania Avenue has changed surprisingly little since 1791, when George Washington gave his approval to Pierre L'Enfant's innovative city plan. They envisioned the avenue as a bold, ceremonial stretch of boulevard physically linking the U.S. Capitol Building and the White House, and symbolically linking the legislative and executive branches of government.

By the early 1800's, Pennsylvania Avenue had become a busy thoroughfare. The people of Washington went about their daily business in the shadow of the White House, which for much of the 19th century, wasn't set off from the street by as much as a fence. Believe it or not, folks used to pull their carriages up to the front door of the President's house to ask for directions.

By 1995, carriages had been replaced by station wagons and tour buses, and Pennsylvania Avenue—America's main street—had grown up. Over 80 feet wide, the modern, six-lane boulevard was being used by more than 26,000 vehicles every day. Families on vacation would travel down Pennsylvania Avenue past the White House on the same route their ancestors might have taken, and it gave a lot of people goosebumps. When ordinary citizens could drive by the President's home or walk by his front gate, well, that said something important to them about living in a country where freedom is valued above all else.

As the home to every President since John Adams, the White House had become one of Pennsylvania Avenue's crown jewels, a primary destination of visitors to the Nation's Capital. The People's House was hosting 1½ million tourists annually. Given its prominent location on Pennsylvania Avenue and

its proximity to the people, the White House was a powerful symbol of freedom, openness, and an individual's access to their Government.

That is, until May 20 of last year, when the Treasury Department shut down two blocks of Pennsylvania Avenue. For the first time in its 195-year history, all traffic in front of the White House came to a halt.

The President ordered the avenue closed to vehicles in the wake of the tragic Oklahoma City bombing a month earlier, citing possible security risks from trucks carrying terrorist bombs. At the time, the President said the decision wouldn't change very much except the traffic patterns in Washington—but it has. By barricading a symbol of democracy and access which dates back to nearly the birth of this Nation, we've surrendered to fear. Without striking a single match in the vicinity of Washington, the terrorists have won.

Have you been to the White House lately, Mr. President? You'll see what fear looks like. With all the guards, the guns, the cement barriers, the police cruisers, Pennsylvania Avenue now looks like what some are calling a war zone. Or a bunker. This is not the White House of leaders like John Adams and Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, who defined freedom's essence and took deep pride in being its stewards.

In fact, I don't know whose White House this is anymore. But I do know that it no longer seems to belong to the people.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues had an opportunity to read the editorials on the subject of Pennsylvania Avenue published in the Washington Post over the last several months. The newspaper has focused on fear, and what happens when that fear is allowed to take hold and fester until it dictates and clouds the decisions made every day here in Washington.

"This is a concession to terrorism that should not be made permanent," wrote the Post last December. "Two world wars did not close Pennsylvania Avenue. Neither did the Civil War or past attempts on Presidents' lives, as the White House itself has noted. The avenue stayed open despite a British invasion, and despite street riots in the 1960's. But now, because of the devastation in Oklahoma City, the history of Pennsylvania Avenue may be erased by bulldozers."

Mr. President, it would be a second tragedy if a capital city steeped in fear is among the lasting legacies of the Oklahoma City bombing. That is not how we should honor the explosion's innocent victims.

In their rush to close Pennsylvania Avenue down, officials apparently gave little thought to the long-term consequences of their action. After all, Pennsylvania Avenue is far more than just a decorative patch of roadway, reserved for parades and official functions. It's a living, vital spoke of the

city. For almost 200 years, Washington's workers and families have lived along Pennsylvania Avenue, shopped along it, dined along it, done their shopping at its corner markets, traveled on it to and from the office. The knee-jerk closing of such a major artery has had a devastating cost for the District of Columbia and its businesses, its commuters, its tourists, its residents.

With the avenue closed for two blocks, and several surrounding streets blocked off as well, the people who live, work, and visit here and give life to this city are feeling choked off from it.

Nearby businesses are no longer as accessible to employees and clients, now that daily traffic hassles tie up the downtown area. City officials are worried that commercial development will eventually suffer: with the city's east and west sides artificially separated, potential tenants may decide to skip the headaches of dealing with the closed avenue and opt to locate outside Washington.

A great deal of parking space has been eliminated, too. Add up the lost parking revenue, the cost of changing street signs and signals, higher Metrobus subsidies, and police overtime, and just 6 weeks into the closing, the District estimated the cost of closing Pennsylvania Avenue had already reached nearly \$750,000. I'm afraid the cost after an entire year will be staggering.

And that doesn't begin to take into account the other indirect costs of the closing. Tour bus operators can no longer drive their customers—many of whom are strapped for time, or unable to walk the extra three or four blocks—past the White House.

What about the public transportation system? In order to provide the same services it offered before the Pennsylvania Avenue shutdown, transit officials have estimated they'll need to spend up to \$200,000 more every year by adding new buses and drivers.

And the increased bus traffic on streets not meant to bear such a heavy load is threatening historic buildings like Decatur House on H Street and St. John's Episcopal Church on Lafayette Square. Both have survived more than 175 years of political turbulence, but neither was built to endure the rumbling they've been subjected to over the last 12 months. Buses now pass by at a rate of more than 1,000 trips a day—experts are afraid the traffic will reduce the structures to rubble.

What's most troubling about all of this is the fact that the Federal Government carried out the closing of Pennsylvania Avenue without any consultation with the District, without any direct public input from the people their decision would most disrupt.

Mr. President, the people of this city who depend on open access to Pennsylvania Avenue say they've accepted the present closure, but they're not going along with the idea that the avenue must be blockaded forever. That

case has simply not been made, they say. And I agree.

I was pleased to learn that the National Park Service recently scrapped what they called their interim beautification plan for the 1,600-foot strip of the avenue between Lafayette Park and the White House. The plan involved replacing large sections of the asphalt with grass, but architects called it off when they realized that something as drastic as digging up the asphalt would be too hard to change in the future, once a final plan of action is decided upon.

The Park Service is still going ahead with plans to bring in 115 concrete barriers disguised as planters to ring the closed-off avenue. Most of these new roadblocks are almost 3 feet high; the largest is 7 by 13 feet and weighs 36 tons. "It will really dress the area up," said a Park Service official. Mr. President, I don't believe Martha Stewart herself could dress up a 36-ton, concrete traffic barricade.

And the cost of these new measures? About half a million dollars—a great deal of taxpayers' money, especially considering it's only supposed to be temporary.

Last December, 14 top architects, planners, and sculptors met to brainstorm about the future of Pennsylvania Avenue. They didn't publicly announce any final decisions—that won't happen until later this year. But they are expected to release five proposals later this month on how to proceed. Most of the plans are said to center around the idea of keeping the avenue closed and turning the area surrounding the White House into some sort of President's park, something they say could become a shrine of democracy. But a pretty name can't disguise a terrible idea.

Mr. President, Washington doesn't need another ceremonial park, especially around the White House. Kings live in park enclaves, as they say, while Presidents live along streets. Washington doesn't need another shrine to democracy, either. This city itself is a shrine to democracy. I would suggest that returning Pennsylvania Avenue to the way it was before May 20, 1995, would be the greatest tribute to democracy we could offer.

We all need to stop, catch our breath, and put aside the fear. If we don't, where will it stop? One year after Oklahoma City, the Government has already increased its national security force by more than 800 guards, at a cost to the taxpayers of \$32 million.

New security equipment is being installed in Federal buildings to the tune of \$77 million, and another \$174 million is slated to be spent on additional security measures over the next 20 months.

Then what? There are 8,100 Federal buildings in the United States—do we turn each and every one of them into a fortress? Already, the drastic security measures undertaken on Pennsylvania Avenue have set a precedent and have been mirrored on Capitol Hill. Access to streets on the Senate side of the

Capitol have been shut off and parking has been eliminated or restricted in many places. Security at the Capitol itself has been tightened dramatically.

How much of Washington, DC, are we going to have to rope off before the public begins thinking we simply don't want them here? As tragic as it sounds, that's the message we're sending.

Mr. President, all Americans are deeply concerned about the safety of their President. The security measures used to protect him must be well reasoned, appropriate, and thorough. I don't question the desire to afford him every ounce of security available, but I do question whether we can satisfy that desire without sacrificing the people's freedom.

The sad truth is that we can't protect the President—or any Federal worker, for that matter—by sealing them off from the world. A determined terrorist will not be stopped. But there will always be risks in a free and open society.

I received a letter from a California man who wanted to share his thoughts as an occasional visitor to this city. "I am in Washington about 10 times a year," he wrote, "and I feel an oppression there that I feel in no other city, either in the United States or abroad. I really feel the oppression around the White House." He wrote that any black or white minivan parked in the vicinity will have a policeman in it. That's in addition to the policemen with dogs, and the vast number on foot and in Secret Service cars in the area, all behind those ugly, concrete barriers. "Closing off Pennsylvania Avenue seems to be going a bit overboard," he concluded.

In the year since the closure of Pennsylvania Avenue, the calls for its reopening have grown louder. There's a deep perception among many Americans that the closing was an emotional reaction—a judgment rendered too quickly, and initiated out of fear. It's time for President Clinton to reconsider a decision made amidst such emotion, and replace it with one of reasoned courage.

And so I am sending today a letter to the President requesting the reopening of Pennsylvania Avenue no later than May 17, 1996. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of the American people who aren't here to stand up for themselves, I ask my colleagues to stand with me in taking back Pennsylvania Avenue from the fear to which it has been surrendered. It's time to halt these efforts to close off the people's house, on America's main street, from the people themselves. We don't need to wait for the reports and recommendations of another government commission to know that this is wrong.

By ordering the immediate reopening of Pennsylvania Avenue, President

Clinton has the power to return the avenue to the people. He has the power to undo a costly mistake. He has the power to ensure that the closure of Pennsylvania Avenue does not mark its first anniversary.

We must not allow fear to claim the victory. Dismantle the barricades, Mr. President, and may the souls of the patriots who founded this Nation in freedom's name take pity on us if we don't.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, April 29, 1996.

Hon. BILL CLINTON,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you are no doubt aware, May 20, 1996 will mark the passage of one year since the closing of Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House. To eliminate the need for observing this somber anniversary, I am writing to respectfully request the reopening of Pennsylvania Avenue by a date no later than May 17, 1996.

Within the history of Pennsylvania Avenue can be traced the history of this great nation. In 1791, President George Washington commissioned Pierre Charles L'Enfant to draft a blueprint for America's new capital city. They envisioned Pennsylvania Avenue as a ceremonial boulevard physically linking the U.S. Capitol and the White House, and symbolically linking the Legislative and Executive branches of government. As an integral element of the District of Columbia, Pennsylvania Avenue stood for 195 years as a vital, working, unbroken roadway, elevating it into a place of national importance as "America's Main Street."

As the home to every president since John Adams, the White House has become one of Pennsylvania Avenue's "crown jewels" and a primary destination of visitors to the Nation's Capital; today, "the People's House" is host to 1.5 million tourists annually. Given its prominent location on Pennsylvania Avenue and its proximity to the People, the White House has become a powerful symbol of freedom, openness, and an individual's access to their government.

And so you can imagine the disappointment of many when your order of May 20, 1995 closed Pennsylvania Avenue to vehicular traffic for two blocks in front of the White House. By impeding access and imposing hardships upon tourists, residents of the District, commuters, and local business owners and their customers, the closure of Pennsylvania Avenue has drastically altered L'Enfant's historic city plan, replacing the openness of the area surrounding the White House with barricades, additional security checkpoints, and an atmosphere of fear and distrust.

The closure has come with not only an emotional cost, but a financial cost as well—both to the taxpayers, who have been asked to bear the burden of funding new security measures along Pennsylvania Avenue near the White House, and for those who are dependent upon access to the avenue for their livelihood.

I acknowledge that the security of the President of the United States is paramount and a matter not to be taken lightly, but I ask you to recognize that the need to ensure the president's safety must be balanced with the expectation of freedom inherent in a democracy. I believe the present situation is tilted far too heavily toward security at freedom's expense.

In the year since the closure of Pennsylvania Avenue, the calls for its reopening have grown louder. There is a deep perception among many Americans that the closing was

an emotional reaction—a decision rendered too quickly, initiated out of fear fueled by the terrible disaster in Oklahoma City. I ask you to reconsider a decision made amidst such emotion, and replace it with one of reasoned courage.

By ordering the reopening of Pennsylvania Avenue by May 17, 1996, you have the power to undo a costly mistake, return the avenue to the people, and guarantee that its closure will not mark its first anniversary.

Sincerely,

ROD GRAMS,
U.S. Senate.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I ask to speak in morning business for such time as I may consume.

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Michael Schiffer, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges during my remarks.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON CHINA

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, 100 years from now, I have no doubt that when historians look back, the remarkable rise of China as a world power will be considered one of the most important international events in the latter half of the 20th century. Even more than the tragic war in Bosnia, more than the fragile attempts at peace in the Middle East, more than the collapse of the Soviet Union, I believe that China's ascendance as a great power and its impact as such—and the content and quality of the United States relationship with China—will shape the direction of global history in the Pacific century.

In recent months, Sino-American relations have reached perhaps their lowest level since President Nixon's historic trip to China in 1972. Our relationship has been plagued by tensions in nearly every area in which we interact—trade, nuclear nonproliferation, concerns about Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Tibet to name just a few. But most often the Sino-American relationship has been buffeted by clashing visions of human rights. And it is that which I wish to speak about today.

Last month, the State Department issued its annual report on human rights which contained a highly critical section on China. Having read the report and the attendant media coverage that interpreted its contents, I wish to address what I perceive to be a number of grave misjudgments and, frankly, a double standard in American foreign policy when it comes to China.

Let me begin with some examples of that double standard. The liberation of Kuwait following the Persian Gulf war is viewed as a triumph of freedom and a high point in recent American foreign policy. Yet, how many Americans are aware of the fact that upon their return the Kuwaitis expelled thousands of Palestinians and denied repatriation of thousands more who had fled during the war for their suspected—and I say suspected—support of Iraq. Before the war, there were over 400,000 Palestinians in Kuwait. Now there are 33,000, according to the Human Rights Watch/Middle East.

What happened to them, and who cares? At times, it seemed that there was more attention in the American press given to the number of wives of certain members of the Kuwaiti royal family than of how many Palestinians were expelled in political reprisal.

There has been, however, some media coverage and American criticism of Russia's brutal suppression of Chechnya's move toward independence. The Russian military decimated the city of Grozny with tremendous loss of life among civilians and the Chechnyan rebels alike. And the battle goes on today. Conservative estimates are that 30,000 people have been killed. Yet, our President just visited Russia, and our relations with Russia have never been better.

The cover story in the April 22 Washington Post puts America's blind eye in perspective: "Clinton, Yeltsin Gloss Over Chechen War."

... [the two leaders] declared their admiration for each other and brushed off criticism of Russia's war against Chechen separatists.

Our relationship with the former Soviet Union is of such unquestionable importance that, muted criticism aside, American support of the Russian President has never really been in question. So how can China's importance be any the less?

Recent tragic events in Liberia, where an unknown number of people have been killed, is only the latest slaughter to emerge from that continent. Not long ago, the news media recounted the massacre of hundreds of thousands of Tutsi and Hutus in Rwanda, and the regime of Gen. Sani Abacha in Nigeria continues to suppress political dissent with lethal force. And yet, each of these countries enjoys the most-favored-nation trading status with the United States.

Even some of our closest allies have deeply flawed human rights records.

In Egypt, a legitimate effort to crack down on Islamic extremists has at times crossed the line into abuse, such as extended detention without charge, torture, and even summary executions.

In Brazil police just 2 weeks ago killed 19 people who were protesting the slow pace of land reform.

Turkey, a close NATO ally, has made considerable progress on human rights in recent years, but freedom of expression is still suppressed, torture is still

widespread, and there have been numerous documented cases of the excessive use of force against the Kurds in recent years, about which we are all familiar.

I do not mean to suggest that human rights should not occupy an important place in our Nation's foreign policy. In each of the cases cited above we have, rightly, protested to the governments involved and worked with them to improve their human rights records.

The status of human rights in the countries I have just mentioned is or has been questionable, yet our relations with them do not fluctuate wildly based on human rights violations. We are able to recognize that the United States also has other important interests that must be taken into account, and we must constantly weigh these interests and values as we try to construct an effective foreign policy.

No one, for example, would suggest that we cut off relations with Kuwait, Russia, Egypt, Brazil, or Turkey based solely upon their record of human rights abuses. The United States simply has too many security, diplomatic, economic and other interest at stake to contemplate such a course of action.

And yet, that is exactly the case with what is probably our most important bilateral relationship in the world today.

Fundamental to the instability in the relationship between the United States and China is the lack of any conceptual framework or long-term strategy on the part of the United States for dealing with China. Instead, U.S. policy has been reactive and event-driven, responding to whatever happens to be the current revelation—generally about human rights. Each time we lurch from crisis to crisis, we call into question our entire relationship with China.

A whole host of events has contributed to the current deterioration in Sino-American relations, but it is important to recognize the role played by the media in this process.

I recognize that the Chinese government does not treat the international press well. But virtually everything we read, hear or see in the American press about China is negative. Yes, there is much that happens in China that is worthy of scrutiny and criticism, but there is also much that is positive as well, and it is largely ignored. The real danger in this is Americans know so little about China. They know only what they read and, particularly since Tiananmen, most of it is negative.

The most blatant example of this unbalanced reportage of China was evident when the State Department released its human rights report last month. I read the newspapers. The coverage of the section on China was 100 percent negative.

Then I read the report itself, and I am deeply troubled by what can only be described as America's blind eye when it comes to China.

Let me read you some of the press coverage following the release of the