

than simply its physical impact on the community.

Whenever we make such bold moves to further separate ourselves from the very people who sent us here and pay our weekly salaries, it has a tremendous impact on the national psyche as well.

What it comes down to, Mr. President, is the question of freedom versus security. Is ours a government that can operate openly, in the name of freedom, and still shut itself off from the people, in the name of security?

Are we willing to swap one for the other?

If we are, then perhaps we should not stop with a few tire shredders and a couple of closed streets.

Why do not we just build a fence around the Capitol? That is what the Capitol Hill Police proposed in 1985 in an internal report, at a cost then of \$2.8 million.

Or better yet, if we really want to make a loud, public statement that "you cannot mess with the Federal Government," we will dig a massive trench around the Capitol.

We will fill the moat with water and maybe a pack of alligators, and build a single, drawbridge entrance, where we will station guards armed with spears.

And then we will dare the public to visit.

We will be secure in our bunker, Mr. President, but for that security, we will be trading away freedom, and we cannot make horse trades with the very principles upon which this Nation was founded.

Mr. President, we should also consider the impact of our actions on the taxpayers.

The recent security precautions taken at the White House will cost the taxpayers \$200,000 for new traffic signals, signs, and pavement markings.

The new security arrangements here at the Capitol will come with a price tag to the taxpayers as well, although the costs will not be measured solely by dollars.

Where do we stop?

There are 8,100 Federal buildings in the United States—do we turn each and every one of them into a fortress?

The sad truth is that we can not protect Federal workers by sealing them off from the world.

If we tell terrorists that we are not going to let them park car bombs made of fertilizer and fuel oil next to our Federal buildings anymore, they will find another way.

And we may just be goading on a desperate kook who wants to prove they can not be stopped by another layer of security.

The public does not understand what we are doing.

They have vital business in Federal buildings, or they come here as tourists, expecting to be welcomed.

But when they see the police, and all they yellow tape, and the signs that say "Do Not Enter," they wonder what kind of message we are trying to get across.

I have heard their comments when they look down an empty stretch of Pennsylvania Avenue that used to be open to cars. I know what they whisper when they visit and walk through the metal detectors.

"It is a shame," they are saying.

And they do not like it. We have gone too far.

Washington should be a place where visitors feel secure, but by turning it into a fortress, we are sacrificing freedom for security, and making a city of such beauty and such history something dirty.

We can put in more concrete barriers and try to camouflage them with flowers, but in the words of one newspaper columnist, it is like putting lipstick on a goat. It is ugly, and fear is ugly.

Democracy should be about building bridges, not building walls. In Washington, we have become too adept at building walls. And every time a wall goes up, we knock freedom down another notch.

Let us seriously consider what we're doing, and what security we're willing to give up in order to live in a democracy.

If in the end it comes down to a question of security or freedom, this Senator will always choose freedom, Mr. President. And I believe the American people will, too.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 10:30 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each. Under the previous order, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes; under the previous order, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes; under the previous order, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] is recognized to speak for up to 10 minutes. The Senator from Washington may proceed.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am informed that Senator CRAIG is not going to utilize his time. My name was not mentioned.

I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 5 minutes in morning business.

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

THE SECOND RESCISSIONS BILL

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, at 10 o'clock, I understand, the Senate will take up a second rescissions bill, that bill having passed the House of Representatives last night. This is good news for the people of the United States, following on the even better news of the passage of the budget resolution yesterday, a budget resolution which will lead to a balanced budget in the year 2002. That path will be made markedly easier by the passage and hoped-for signing of a rescissions bill designed to save somewhere between \$12 and \$15 billion of spending already authorized and appropriated. In fact, next year's appropriations would be extremely difficult without the passage of this rescissions bill.

Regrettably, it will allow somewhat more spending, at the insistence of the President, than was the case with the earlier proposal. But even so, it will represent a major step forward, a significant commitment on the part of this Congress to a leaner, tougher, more efficient and more effective Federal Government with a reduction in spending which, in some cases, would simply be wasteful—in other cases, which might have been significant, but not of a high enough priority to borrow in order to do it and then to send the bill to our children and to our grandchildren.

One of the last matters, perhaps the last matter settled in connection with this rescissions bill, was a proposal of mine and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] with respect to salvage timber and to certain other rules related to timber harvesting in the Pacific Northwest—the salvage provisions applying all across the United States.

Negotiations with the administration on this subject were intensive and were lengthy. The net result, from the perspective of this Senator, is that the changes in the earlier bill are only slightly more than superficial. Both the provisions in the earlier bill and those in this bill, I wish to emphasize, were aimed solely at permitting the President and the administration to do what they claim they want to do anyway, to keep their own commitments. Neither in the field of salvage timber nor in connection with so-called option 9 in the Pacific Northwest, do I believe this administration proposes a balance between its environmental concerns and the very real, human needs of the people who live in timber communities and supply a vitally important commodity for the people of the United States.

I wish to emphasize this. I do not believe the administration's plans are appropriately balanced or that they give due weight to human concerns. But they are something. They are more than people in timber country across the United States have today. This amendment is simply designed to remove the frivolous and endless litigation which seeks to obstruct even the

modest relief which the administration proposes.

So the President is not required to do anything that he does not want to do. He is enabled to do what he does wish to do, or says that he wishes to do. He is enabled to keep his own commitments, and the people of the United States, and especially those in timber country, can then determine whether or not those commitments are indeed adequate; are, indeed, balanced.

I trust that later on this year we will be dealing with legislation that will create that balance. But in the meantime, this significant though modest relief will be available. For that I am most grateful.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

A TRIBUTE TO NILS M. SANDER

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a long time friend, Nils M. Sander, of Kingston, NH.

Nils was a deeply religious man, a devoted husband and father and a true American patriot. Although he would not immediately be recognized by millions of Americans, he embodied the essence of the American people and their spirit.

Nils Sander died on March 17, 1995, but it is his life that I want to share with my colleagues today.

Nils was born in 1917 in Stockholm, Sweden, the second son of John and Maria Sander. It was soon after Nils' birth that the Sander family began immigrating to America. Initially it was several aunts and uncles and then as word spread among the family that in America the jobs were plentiful and opportunity was boundless, Nils' parents, John and Maria, brought their whole family.

Nils, his brother, Arnie, a pregnant mother and a hopeful father disembarked from the boat at Ellis Island. Nils' sister, Nana, was later born in America and it was her birth as a U.S. citizen that enabled her to sponsor the rest of the family into citizenship. Nils' father, John, the industrious and hard-working Swede, found work as a machinist and was soon able to buy his family a home.

Nils grew up in a generation that knew the value of a strong work ethic. He saw the Depression. He saw it devastate the lives of his neighbors, family and friends. Nils' brother left home so there would be one less mouth to feed. His mother pawned her wedding ring to feed her family. Nils learned the value of saving and he learned the machinist trade from his father. He learned to love America.

In 1942, Nils married his high school sweetheart, Ruth Seaburg. While his wife was expecting their first child, World War II was raging. Nils joined the Navy because he knew that freedom was not free. Nils put his life on the line to preserve that freedom not only for his generation but for his children and grandchildren for generations to come.

He served as a machinist mate on board the U.S.S. *Doyle C. Barnes* in the Philippines and New Guinea. It was in 1944 that Nils returned from the war. He came home to a son who was ready a year old. Nils found work at the Wattertown Arsenal and then later at MIT as a tool and die maker.

In 1947, Nils moved his family to Kingston, NH, and a second son was born. He rode his bike 2 miles to the train station in the next town in order to make his way to and from Haverhill, MA, where he taught at a trade school. The family was soon able to buy a car and life became easier.

The agreement at Yalta removed forever any lingering Socialist ideas that had been brought from Sweden with his parents. No man or nation had the right to determine the sovereignty of another nation. Individual freedom with responsibility began to root itself deep into Nils' beliefs. Those beliefs formed the basis for his conservative philosophy.

Nils' family remembers very clearly the lengthy conversations around the dinner table had about communism, his compassion for people imprisoned within the Communist state, and his determination that freedom must prevail against those tyrannies.

For Nils, there was never a problem with defining right or wrong. His faith in God and knowledge of biblical lessons were all he needed to direct his life and to teach his family, his students, and all who came to know him.

Nils was a founder of the Kingston Community House, a volunteer organization formed to help those in need in the community. They provided food and clothes to those who were without. They provided Christmas gifts for needy children, and they ran a weekly meal program. The success of the Kingston Community House brought Nancy Reagan to Kingston because of her interest in voluntarism.

Nils became active in the New Hampshire Republican Party and campaigned tirelessly for those conservative candidates who shared his ideals. Those he worked for included Barry Goldwater, Richard Nixon, Ronald Reagan, Gordon Humphrey, Mel Thomason, and BOB SMITH. Nils was not only our supporter—he was our friend.

Nils was there for me in the beginning when it was tough going. He did not have to help me but he did, and he never asked for anything in return. Not one thing did he ever ask in return.

Nils helped to craft the conservative platform which now guides the party. He was one of the quiet people who never asked for anything but good gov-

ernment—and the less the better. He believed with all his heart that government should do only what people cannot do for themselves.

Nils never ran for public office. So you would not know him. Instead he preferred to serve from the sidelines. He was always there when a void needed to be filled which could further his conservative beliefs in the preciousness of freedom, the sanctity of human life, and the importance of family.

Nils and his wife, Ruth and his daughter, Asta, and the rest of the family, were quiet but active Americans who deserve a great deal of credit for the revolution which took place in last November's election. They never sat back and let the liberal agenda destroy the fragile freedom we enjoy. They went to work every day. They taught their families right from wrong and they taught them to love God and to love America and to take their responsibilities seriously, to save for the future, and not to be a burden to society.

As I indicated, Nils passed away a short time ago. He suffered from Alzheimers, a cruel disease that has also stricken one of his beloved political leaders, Ronald Reagan. Because he was in the final stages of Alzheimers, Nils was unable to witness the November elections and enjoy the fruits of his labors.

Nils—I know that you are watching now and smiling as you see your old friend in the majority in the U.S. Senate.

I am a U.S. Senator today because of Nils Sander. Nils believed in me at a time when it was tough. And I believed in him. I will miss my friend, and I intend to honor his memory by continuing to fight for the conservative principles he espoused.

Yes, Nils Sander, one man can make a difference * * * and you did.

Thank you, Mr. President.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Mr. PRYOR and Mr. HATCH pertaining to the introduction of S. 1006 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

REGULATORY PROCEDURES REFORM ACT

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, yesterday, I, along with a bipartisan group of Senators, introduced S. 1001, the Regulatory Procedures Reform Act of 1995.

Upon its introduction, it was my intention to have the bill printed in the RECORD so that all Members with an interest in this important issue—the