

SENATE—Monday, June 25, 1984

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Trust in the Lord with all your heart, and do not rely on your own insight. In all your ways acknowledge Him, and He will make straight your paths.—Proverbs 3:5,6 (RSV).

God of truth, grant that this promise from the wisdom book of the Old Testament will be meaningful to the Senators this week. After one of the most stressful weeks this year, they have 5 days to accomplish a great deal before recess. Make the truth of this proverb real to each Senator. Help these powerful people to realize there is a resource which transcends the finest of which the human mind is capable. Gracious God, help the Senators to believe that after they have done their best thinking, to trust and acknowledge Thee is the way of wisest leadership. In the name of Him who trusted His Heavenly Father implicitly. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The distinguished majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

A STRESSFUL WEEK

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the Chaplain pointed out that we had a stressful week last week. Indeed, we did. We were in session, as I recall, past midnight or close to midnight every night last week and all night it seemed like when we finished, although we got home, I guess, about 4 o'clock in the morning on Thursday. But we did do a lot of work.

I wish to commend those who were responsible for it, principally Senators TOWER and NUNN, for their good work in managing the defense authorization bill. But there is one thing for which I hold them accountable. With all that hard work, I got a bad cold and they are responsible for it or are herewith charged with official responsibility. If I am in a mean, grouchy mood today, it is their fault. I thought I would get that on the record early today so that everybody would fully understand.

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, today we are going to take up, if the Senate will agree, the so-called Public Law 480 conference report. There are a number of items in disagreement, most notably the Nicaragua/Boland amendment, which is item No. 14, I believe. And there are seven others in addition to that. But it is my hope and expectation that we can complete action on the conference report and all eight items in disagreement during the day today.

I would not think we would have a late session today. I hope that we can be out by about 6 o'clock. But it is essential that we finish that conference report today because the week is going to pile up on us.

In addition to the conference report, Mr. President, this week we need to do the drunk driving bill, which the leadership on this side would like to take up tomorrow. We need to do the math-science bill, which is the unfinished business and on which negotiations are still underway. I am hopeful that they will succeed and we might even do that bill today if those negotiations do succeed.

There is one appropriation bill here, the State-Justice appropriations bill, which is available to us. And, as Members know, at this point in the session appropriation bills must take priority. So I hope we can get that done this week.

But the big items, Mr. President, are the deficit reduction conference report and the debt limit. This does not mean that what I have just described is the entire schedule, but I hope that the House will send us the deficit reduction conference report on Wednesday and early enough in the day on Wednesday so that we could still take it up on Wednesday and finish it Wednesday night.

I wish to announce now that the Senate may be in session Wednesday night late in order to accomplish that purpose, and may be in late tonight or tomorrow night, but I do not anticipate that. But there is a good chance that we would have to be in late on Wednesday night in order to finish the conference report.

That would leave us, then, with the debt limit on Thursday. The adjournment resolution for the Fourth of July break will, I believe, recite Thursday, Friday, or Saturday adjournment. It would be my hope that we would finish all our work by Thursday evening. But if we cannot, Senators should clearly understand that we will stay Friday and/or Saturday, as neces-

sary, in order to complete the debt limit, the deficit reduction package, the Public Law 480 conference report, drunk driving, and the math-science bill, together with such appropriation bills as may be available and appropriate to deal with.

I attempted to contact the Speaker this morning about the deficit reduction package, and he was unavailable at the time of my call. However, I have sent word that I hope that the House could deal with that matter soon enough for us to have it by afternoon on Wednesday.

Mr. President, that is a lot to say for this week especially when I have just said that I hope we can finish all of that in 4 days instead of 5 or 6. But I find it is better to put Senators on notice than it is to delay these announcements.

ORDER EXTENDING TIME FOR ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the order today provides that the time for the transaction of routine morning business will be of 30 minutes duration. I would like to change that, if the minority leader does not object. I think for a variety of reasons it is not likely that we can get to the Public Law 480 conference report until about 1:15 or 1:30 p.m. So I would like to ask unanimous consent now that the time for transaction of routine morning business be extended until the hour of 1:15 under the same terms and conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HECHT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair and I thank the minority leader. Mr. President, I believe that is all I can announce at this time. I would like to reserve 1 minute of my time so that after the minority leader has spoken I may admit a messenger.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

THE DIVISION BETWEEN CIVILIAN AND MILITARY AUTHORITY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it was reported in the June 23, 1984, edition of the Washington Post that the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Vice Adm. James Lyons, delivered a broadside attack on the War Powers Resolution

and its impact on this Nation's foreign policy and military prowess.

Admiral Lyons stated, according to the report, that the War Powers Resolution, which provides Congress explicit authority to halt combat operations in the absence of a declaration of war, is insidious and an impediment which needs to be removed.

The theme struck by Admiral Lyons parallels closely the remarks delivered March 30, 1984, by the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. James Watkins. Admiral Watkins stated publicly at that time that the Nation—

Must shirk off the Vietnam syndrome of humiliation and defeat, which hounds our capability to implement positive change. I believe a good way to start is for Congress to carefully review the War Powers Resolution of 1973.

The public repetition of attacks by our uniformed leaders on the law of the land is inappropriate to their role as military leaders. Their job is to implement the policies of the civilian leadership of the Nation, not to challenge the wisdom of those policies. My question to our military leaders is this—have you made your forces ready to fight the adversary when the situation arises, and when you are directed to by civilian authority? My question is not—what do you think of the law of the land, and would you like to debate it?

If our admirals wish to debate national law and policy, they should divest themselves of their military duties and authority and run for office as politicians. Perhaps one of them would like to come to West Virginia and establish a residence or an inhabitancy there so that they could run against me. I will be up for reelection 4 years from now. That is what they ought to do. If they do not like the Constitution and if they do not like the laws of the land, then they should divest themselves of their military duties, get out on the political hustings, and then we would welcome their debate.

Many Senators have voiced their deep concern over the attitude of this administration toward the War Powers Resolution and toward what is clearly the constitutional role of the Congress in declaring war—including the authorization to commit American Armed Forces into situations of hostilities or imminent involvement in hostilities. It is disturbing that the administration has constantly attacked the Congress with the spurious contention that congressional debate over exercises in military power is not the proper domain of the people's representatives. It is outrageous that the uniformed leaders of one of our armed services should take the podium to voice such constitutional and political arguments. They are walking on very, very thin ice. It is singularly inappropriate for our active duty military

leaders to publicly espouse these sentiments. Our military leaders should spend their time making our forces ready to fight when they are needed, rather than taking the podium to challenge the constitutional role of the Congress.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER TO PROCEED TO URGENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, AGRICULTURE, 1984

Mr. BAKER. I inquire of the minority leader if he is in a position to agree to me obtaining an order of unanimous consent to lay down the conference report at 1:15 p.m. at the close of morning business.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if there were an objection on this side to the unanimous-consent request which the majority leader will make, the majority leader could move, as he well knows. I say this for the record so that my colleagues on this side of the aisle will realize that I am giving nothing away by giving consent to go the conference report. And I have no objection.

Mr. President, those on our side of the aisle have been very desirous of moving to this matter of summer jobs for youth, child nutrition, WIC, as soon as possible.

I feel that those on this side of the aisle not only do not have an objection, but we welcome the majority leader's effort to move quickly into consideration of this matter.

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the minority leader. In view of that, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 1:15 p.m. today the Senate temporarily lay aside the unfinished business, which is the math-science bill, and proceed to the consideration of the House Joint Resolution 492, the so-called Public Law 480 conference report.

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

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, at 1:15 p.m., the transaction of routine morning business will expire, and the Senate under the order just entered will turn to the consideration of the Public Law 480 conference report, House Joint Resolution 492.

At the conclusion of that, Mr. President, the Senate will resume consideration of the unfinished business, which is the math-science bill.

There is a possibility, however, that the leadership on this side may ask unanimous consent to once more set aside that measure temporarily, if it is thought desirable, in order to reach other matters that have been cleared on both sides.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, would the distinguished majority leader consider changing the time from 1:15 to 1:30?

Mr. BAKER. Yes, Mr. President. I make that request.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the majority leader.

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

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, under the amendment just offered, I assume morning business will now automatically extend until 1:30 p.m. Would the Chair concur in that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the minority leader.

Mr. President, I thank the minority leader for his cooperation today on these matters. I urge Senators to review the agenda that I have set out today for this week, and consider that, if we can finish this business by Saturday, we will be lucky; by Friday, we will be fortunate; and, by Thursday night, we will be exhilarating in the extreme.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF MR. DECONCINI

Mr. DECONCINI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Arizona is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

ISRAEL

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, many words have been spoken in the wake of the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Lebanon. In my judgment, most commentaries have missed the mark. They do serve to emphasize, however, that we are far from finding the Rosetta stone which can decode the swirl of events in Lebanon and in the Middle East.

It is also true that we are changed by our experience in Lebanon. We have begun to see the Middle East differently. I am concerned as I consider how our relationships with Israel and the Arab nations will develop in the wake of our bitter experience in Lebanon.

In the present confusion of our own national emotions toward Lebanon, there is an inclination to tar Israel with the same brush that is being used on those U.S. policymakers who have become identified with our failed Lebanon policies. Somehow Israel is responsible for our failure. There were those who have traversed from a period of almost romantic embrace of everything about Israel and its people to a state of disdain or, in extreme cases, outright hostility.

Obviously, neither extreme is close to the truth. I have, over the years, been provoked by policymakers, editorial writers and columnists with strong anti-Israel sentiments. Such instances in recent days have caused me to carefully examine my own attitudes and positions regarding the American-Israeli relationship. My question to myself, to my colleagues and to my friends has been: What is the fundamental basis of the U.S. relationship with Israel—what is the bottom line?

To a significant degree I have come to some resolution. It is clear to me, for instance, that we have gone greatly astray in recent years in our policies in the Middle East and in our relationship with Israel. I can best explain by historically tracing those events which have brought together the American people and the people of Israel. In doing so, I will try to point out where we have so badly shortchanged our interest in the Middle East.

To understand the full breadth of our attachment to Israel, one has to begin with that horrible period which has come to be known as the Holocaust. The memory of my generation lives with the full horror of discovery that Hitler had set out to do not less than exterminate an entire people—the Jewish people. Those first revelations of the death camps and the grotesque photographs that filtered into various publications after World War II still have the quality of a nightmare which will not end.

It has taken decades to attempt to understand and to cope with the magnitude of the horror of the Holocaust. I do not understand it. Is there a Member of this body who can rise to offer an explanation? While we Americans were still discovering the events of the Holocaust, another story of the Jewish people were being told in the press as warfare began to spread throughout Palestine. Those events seemed at the time to have a quality much like the maddening anarchy of recent events in Lebanon. It was impossible to keep all the different groups and locations straight. Then, suddenly, the situation in Palestine took on clear features.

What remained of the Jewish nation had engaged in a final act of defiance. The odds seemed impossible. Fifty million Arabs and their combined armies had surrounded mere thousands of Jews. These events were further complicated by the fact that the newly formed State of Israel faced an arms embargo by our country. Nonetheless, as the American people saw what was happening, they were stirred by the struggle of the Jewish people for their homeland. To this day, 35 years later, the drama of that time is a source of inspiration to me and many Americans.

Those early struggles of the people of Israel and their Government sug-

gested they were strikingly like us. They quickly brought to mind our own national heritage of 18th century American freedom fighters, arrayed against what was then the mightiest power in the world. During the years following her independence, the State of Israel mirrored the same growing pains as our own young democracy. It had to cope with expanding internal political factions and the economic burdens of thousands of new immigrants, not to mention the constant harassment of surrounding states who would not accept her right to exist.

Recently, the lively politics of Israel resembled America in another way. Popular demonstrations by Israelis against their Government's policy in Lebanon were reminiscent of the difficult and passionate days of street demonstrations by Americans against our Government's policies in Vietnam and the upheaval over Watergate.

We were able to understand the force of the political shock that rocked Israel when its highest leaders were called to public account for their behavior in the wake of the Lebanese Christian massacres at Chatilla and Sabra. The Israeli people demanded and received from their Government the Kahan report, a full disclosure of the facts surrounding the refugee camp massacres.

These comparisons are not enough. It is not just that the people of Israel share democratic values with us, but that no obstacle has been so great that they have failed to meet the challenge. They have demonstrated tenacity, innovation and bravery. The surprise attack of the Yom Kippur war was turned into a startling rout of Egypt and Syria. When the PLO kidnapped Israelis and took them to Idi Amin's Entebbe, the Israelis proved their courage and set an example for people everywhere that terrorism must be opposed. On the day of that rescue every free person and every free nation experienced a sense of special belonging—one to the other.

We have watched 4 million people constantly contend with a phalanx of 20 Arab States whose policies toward Israel can only be measured in their degree of hostility. Despite the terrorists repeated attacks on Israel, on her diplomats throughout the world, on her children, the Israelis have refused to capitulate. How many times in recent years, as America suffered one military and diplomatic setback after another, has each of us yearned for the opportunity to stand so resolutely and so effectively for what we believe?

For many of us, these ties to Israel are deep and cherished; to others, they may be less important than other realities which are closer to our national interests. First, however, we must fully comprehend that Israel is a living, breathing democracy in a world which has seen the disappearance of

so many of the democratic governments which existed following World War II. The Israelis strenuously practice their democratic responsibilities, so much so that during periods of intense political activity, the U.S. press has taken an almost patronizing tone when reporting the lively debate between Israeli political parties and also among its citizens and its Government.

It also concerns me that some reporting in our editorial pages, from our syndicated columnists, news reporters, and the TV media fails to adequately weigh the danger which faces the Israeli democracy. How frequently is it noted in such reportage that the Israeli democracy sits in the middle of a dense pack of authoritarian governments? How graphically is it ever explained that Israel is surrounded by states which have neither the crassest understanding nor the merest sympathy for the process of popular sovereignty. There is nothing that could be farther from the imagination of most Arab leaders than the notion that people should have a say in their government.

In so many instances, opinion-makers have failed to delineate between the Israeli democracy and the murky tribal politics that govern the rest of the Middle East. Somehow, terrorist groups, Arab brotherhoods, and feuding royal factions are more interesting to Sunday feature writers than the reality of a government of the people. We in effect are fed through some of the media with a set of values that place antidemocratic governments in the Middle East at the same plateau of respect and consideration given our democratic ally, Israel.

In more recent years, it has become a habit of U.S. policymakers to demand that Israel make concessions to authoritarian Arab countries who are dedicated to her destruction. The years of the Reagan administration have amounted to a continuous "good cop, bad cop" strategy in dealing with Israel. It is as if any friendly gesture we make toward that country is only for the purpose of making an equally unfriendly move later. The result surely has been to maximize suspicion of U.S. motives by the Israeli Government and to encourage Arab rejectionists to believe that in time our Government will not support Israel.

President Reagan recently began another of these cycles by announcing a new era of strategic cooperation with Israel. How can anyone assume that the Reagan gesture will be other than a replay of his administration's September 1981 memorandum of understanding with Israel detailing agreement on strategic matters. No sooner had that agreement been signed than it was canceled by our Government in reaction to Israel's announcement of its intention to retain control of the

Golan Heights. Our only consistency in policy in the Middle East has been our inconsistency.

Over a period of almost 2 years, from June 1981 to May 1983, this erratic behavior on the part of our Government was repeated with respect to the sale of F-16's to Israel. Agreements were negotiated and then withdrawn on two occasions; first, in response to the Israeli bombing of the Iraqi nuclear reactor and then when the Israeli military moved into Lebanon in June 1982.

Clearly, such fair weather friendship has given the appearance to the Arab world that the United States is able to modify, if not dictate, Israel's behavior. This big brother approach on a world scale is the same category of dereliction that has served as a scapegoat for Ronald Reagan's rhetoric for years when his subject was our own Federal Government. U.S. Federal Government assertiveness in the cause of improving civil rights or addressing poverty is a clear violation of the Reagan code. Pushing around a close ally that has never wavered in its support of us in the U.N. or in any other forum carries no such onus.

Lebanon provides an excellent example of two points I have been making. Somewhere in the Reagan administration, the idea was initiated and accepted that the United States would be a far more acceptable force in Beirut than the advancing Israeli Army. Obviously, the PLO and every other Arab faction or government was willing to do anything it could to keep Israel out of Beirut. It did not occur to our policymakers that in the absence of the stabilizing presence of the Israeli Army, an uncontrollable urban war would take place. By failing to allow Israel to follow through and fully eliminate the PLO and Syrian presence in Lebanon, our Government turned what would have been an American victory over Russian-backed forces into an American defeat. Had the United States permitted, Israel would have been able to remove the Syrians from a controlling position in Lebanon, thus giving the Gemayel government a genuine opportunity to reestablish Lebanese sovereignty.

Before and during these events, Ambassador Philip Habib was shuttling back and forth in the Middle East seeking some form of effective participation of the Arab moderates. As we know now and as we should have known, these states were both unable and unwilling to force Syria to live up to withdrawal negotiations. Ambassador Habib stated clearly to me during my February 1983 visits in the Middle East that he had assurances from Syria that it would withdraw if we prevailed on Israel to do the same. Egyptian President Mubarek and Jordan's King Hussein gave me the same answers. In my opinion, this single mis-

reading by our State Department is responsible for the reemergence of Syria as the dominant force in the area.

What initially was a U.S. policy to force Israeli troop withdrawal by introducing our own forces ended on a pathetic note. After the loss of our Marines and of U.S. public resolve, we asked the Israelis to stand close by Beirut, which meant that they would continue taking casualties. The message was then clear that only the Israelis could influence a Syrian withdrawal. The obvious question is why our policymakers in the State Department, the Pentagon, and the President insisted on refuting this fact during the summer of 1982. The reality that finally prevailed was that the moderate Arabs will yield to strength. This is the very quality in U.S. policy we so constantly betrayed.

Whenever we have demonstrated consistency and strength in our support of Israel, the Arab response has not been catastrophic. Clear evidence of this contention can be seen when the United States supported Israel in 1973.

In response to the surprise Yom Kippur attack by Egypt and Syria on October 6, 1973, the Nixon administration finally chose to act with resolve. U.S. military units in Europe and the United States were stripped of their equipment to provide a massive infusion of military hardware and material.

For the first time in its relationship with Israel, the United States took on the role as the primary supplier of arms to Israel. Prior to that point, Israel had to seek and receive help from a variety of Western countries.

The reinforced Israelis undertook a surprise counterattack across the Suez Canal, trapping much of the Egyptian Army. In the north, all the Golan Heights were captured from Syria.

The extraordinary support provided by the United States not only helped Israel dramatically reverse the tide of the Yom Kippur war, it changed the tide of events in the Middle East.

Even in that circumstance, when Israel's survival was uncertain, there was a brief period of indecision and hesitation. Should we help them or should we not? Thankfully for our own security interests, we finally assisted Israel. Had we not, the result would have been a Soviet victory. A peace between Israel and Egypt would not have occurred and we would not have had Camp David as a basis to begin the discussions between the Arabs and Israel.

In the case of Lebanon, similar moments of delay were far more damaging. It will take many years to know the full impact of our tragic stutter-step performance. It is now evident that the United States has single-handedly resurrected Syria from the status of a defeated nation that was

outmanned and outweaponed to the role of bullyboy it has always sought. The Reagan administration policy turned a Middle East victory for the United States in Lebanon into a debacle from which we will suffer for years to come.

If, Mr. President, there is anything positive that can be salvaged from our relationship with Israel in connection with the Lebanon crisis, it must be a fundamental lesson in the facts of Middle Eastern power politics. They are:

One, we need no longer play the dilettante in making needless distinctions between moderate and less moderate Arab States. Not long ago, our good and moderate friend, King Hussein, said in unambiguous terms that we must give him the armaments he wants while permitting any license he chooses in his behavior toward Israel. The alternative he specifies is not that he will in any way be tempted to modify his nation's policy toward Israel. He came into our living rooms on Sunday morning TV to say that Jordan will simply seek help from the Soviet Union if the United States does not see fit to deliver arms and economic aid under his terms.

The Saudis, who frequently insist that we should control Israeli behavior, have completely avoided our requests that they use their financial support of other Arab States and the PLO as a means to seek peaceful resolution of the Israeli question.

Two, even our sagest diplomats do not understand the realities of Middle East politics as keenly as do the Israelis. The proof of this contention is simple. The life of their nation depends on the quality of that understanding and, remarkably, Israel has survived under enormously adverse circumstances. Consequently, Israel's advice should be sought in every instance of United States-Middle East policy consideration. We have never profited from those instances when U.S. policymakers felt that an "arms length" stance with Israel would balance our Middle East interests.

Three, we have usually erred in providing less than a full measure of moral, political, economic and military support for Israel. Now that our failed Lebanese policy has set the scene for yet another Arab attempt at military intimidation of Israel, with the assistance of the Russians, we have obligated ourselves to offer full support to our ally.

Four, U.S. military security in the Middle East, the eastern Mediterranean, and the southern flank of NATO is dependent on a strong Israel. We must face that fact and make it a tenet of our defense policy.

The policy statements I have outlined will finally set the record straight and will create an atmosphere

for peace. The Arab world will understand our commitments to Israel, our ally, to democracy, and to those Arab leaders, like Anwar Sadat, who have the courage to become leaders for peace. We welcome any of those Arab leaders to come forth as Mr. Sadat did.

Mr. President, there is little that is novel in what I have said. I do hope, however, that there is the solidity of logic—and old logic which we once embraced and more recently set aside. It is a prerogative of our freedoms in the United States that we constantly seek to revise old truths. At times, the need to disprove the past seems almost a responsibility of political sophistication. In the case of Israel, that process has proved very destructive. Acting on the basis of our most recent enlightenment and sophistication on the nature of Middle East politics, we have done great harm to ourselves and to Israel.

If there is honesty in the assessment of these events, the result must lead to a restoration of the former spirit of our country's relationship with Israel. Not only will such an outcome properly bolster the future of a democratic Israel, it will inevitably lead to a fuller, more effective relationship with the Arab states.

It is in our national interests that we have a consistent Middle East policy as outlined heretofore.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am glad I was on the floor during the speech by my good friend from Arizona. It had quality; it also had quantity. While I was not able to hear all of his speech—and I am not sure I agree with all of it—I certainly agree wholeheartedly in the tribute he has paid to a democratic Israel, and particularly to the emphasis the Senator from Arizona has put on the fact that it is not easy for Israel to be a democracy. It is surrounded by authoritarian countries, threatened by countries far bigger than she is with far more resources that have sworn death to Israel. Israel is in a very, very vulnerable position and has been able to stand by that democracy under the most cruel kind of burden.

I understand that 50 percent of its gross national product goes to defense. We are concerned about 6½ percent in this country. We know it is a burden. But Israel, I think, has shown the way for democracy under the toughest kinds of circumstances, and I think particularly we should be aware that this country, small as it is, represents the most important military force in the Middle East. Thank heaven Israel is on our side. It has proven that again and again and again in many ways.

Mr. DECONCINI. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. DECONCINI. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for allowing me to infringe on his time. I did not understand he had the next standing order. And I also thank him for his kind remarks.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank my good friend.

TOP SCIENTISTS CALL FOR DEEP CUTS IN NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on May 1, Dr. Frank Press, the president of the National Academy of Science, the Nation's top honorary society of scientists and engineers, said that the time is ripe for a U.S. President to push for "deep cuts in nuclear weapons." The academy represents the most widely recognized and respected scientists in this country. These men and women have a special knowledge of the terrible consequences of the present arms race. They fully understand what absolute devastation nuclear weapons can wreak. They not only foresee the human tragedy of a nuclear war, they also understand the long run effect on the lives of all mankind flowing from the environmental devastation that would ensue.

Mr. President, does the academy speak as a group of pacifists or unilateral disarmers? No way. They understand the threat represented by the Soviet Union. As scientists they value their freedom to pursue truth wherever it leads as dearly as any Americans. They fully understand that a world dominated by the Soviet Union would mean the end of that freedom. Do they understand the importance of negotiating with the Soviet Union from strength, specifically military strength? Yes, indeed. The president of the National Academy of Science, Frank Press, served as the Presidential science adviser in the Carter administration. He has a realistic appreciation of the limitations and the dangers involved in arms control. He understands that military strength is an absolutely critical component of an effective foreign policy.

These, the Nation's top scientists, speak from a position of special responsibility. Who first unlocked the secret of nuclear energy? American scientists. Who first developed nuclear weapons and presented the Nation with the final instrument the atomic bomb—that both won and finished World War II? American scientists. Now as scientists they understand better than most Americans that the nuclear capability of the two superpowers is no longer simply another weapon—bigger and more devastating—not just another weapon with which great power can win a worldwide war.

They know that today's nuclear arsenals, once they begin to fire, will lit-

erally end civilization on this Earth, and very possibly end the life of mankind. They understand that a nuclear war would constitute the most serious environmental disaster the world has suffered in more than 50 million years, with a nuclear winter that could make the world unlivable and certainly would destroy many of the remnants of those who survived the devastation from the nuclear weapons themselves.

What Dr. Press emphasizes in his statement is that the constant additions, refinements, and modernizations to the world's nuclear arsenals, the billions and billions of dollars of expenditure by the superpowers and increasingly more nations on more efficient nuclear destruction, can only increase both the likelihood of a nuclear war and the certainty that this country which we love could not survive it.

Mr. President, who favors deep cuts in nuclear arms? Consider, we have had pleas to end the nuclear arms race from the great religious leaders of our country. How about military experts? Some of the most valiant and widely respected military leaders of this Nation have called on the Congress and the President to end the arms race and work for a negotiated mutual, verifiable, and comprehensive agreement to stop the testing, manufacture, or deployment of nuclear weapons. Have the seasoned and tested foreign affairs experts supported nuclear weapons reductions?

Mr. President, some of this Nation's top experts in foreign policy have called for prompt negotiations to stop the arms race. How about the people of this country? Where do they stand? The citizens of this country have voted in a series of statewide referendums by smashing margins to stop the arms race. Virtually every professional and respected public opinion poll indicates that Americans by an overwhelming 3-to-1 margin favor a nuclear freeze. These polls report there has been no diminution in public support for such negotiations. And now we have the Nation's most prestigious scientific body, the National Academy of Sciences, calling for deep cuts in nuclear weapons.

Mr. President, this Nation faces the most serious Federal deficits in our history. For the first time in this Senator's 27 years in the Senate, I see a Congress which recognizes that it must slow down these appalling Federal Government spending increases. We are beginning in a halting way to do that. Where should we make these reductions? Mr. President, the one most insistent demand I hear from my constituents, and I am sure the same sentiment dominates every section of our country—and I know the Presiding Officer hears from his constituents in Nevada, and the distinguished Senator from Florida his constituents in Flori-

da—is to cut our immense spending on nuclear weapons. Unless we make these cuts, in the next 6 years we will spend some \$450 billion on nuclear weapons. And what will that colossal \$450 billion of spending buy us? Will it buy us national security? Mr. President, who are we trying to kid? It will buy us not just a deeper deficit and a more cruelly burdensome national debt, it will buy us a more dangerous, a far more dangerous world.

Dr. Press and the National Academy of Science are exactly right. The time is, indeed, ripe for deep cuts in nuclear weapons, and it is time we get on with it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article in the May 2, Washington Post, by Cristine Russell, headlined: "Science Academy President Urges Deep Cuts in Nuclear Weapons," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 2, 1984]

SCIENCE ACADEMY PRESIDENT URGES DEEP CUTS IN NUCLEAR WEAPONS

(By Cristine Russell)

The time is ripe for a U.S. president to push for "deep cuts in nuclear weapons" to reduce the dangers of nuclear war, the president of the National Academy of Sciences, the nation's top honorary society of scientists and engineers, said yesterday.

Dr. Frank Press, presidential science adviser in the Carter administration, said that he believes there is an unprecedented readiness among members of the public as well as scientists for "some concrete steps" in weapons reductions.

"As scientists with special knowledge of the nature and effects of nuclear weapons, we are distraught at the current state of world affairs and its dreadful implications," Press said in a speech yesterday at the annual meeting of the 121-year-old academy, which has 1,400 members. The academy also holds a special congressional charter to advise the federal government.

The geophysicist said that he and a delegation of top academy members would go to Moscow in early June in an attempt to improve relations between Soviet and U.S. scientists.

In February, 1980, following the Soviet exile of Andrei Sakharov, the academy put a moratorium on many longstanding joint symposiums with the Soviet Academy of Sciences and two years ago the formal agreement ran out. Exchanges between individual scientists have continued at a reduced level.

Now, even though human rights concerns continue, the American academy is ready to "begin discussions to see what are the possibilities of a new agreement," Press said. "In these troubled times it is better that scientists keep talking, raising issues of concern, as well as exploring areas of fruitful cooperation."

In an afternoon session with reporters, he refused to spell out the details of what he will propose to his Soviet counterparts, but did say that he would not attempt to exact a "political price" in exchange for resuming joint projects. At this point, he said, "there

is a great deal of ignorance about what's going on."

While Soviet exchanges had stalled in recent years, those with Chinese scientists have expanded greatly. The academy has a new program with China "emphasizing applied science and technology," said Press.

He also sounded a continuing complaint that "a concern for national security" in the Reagan administration and among some in Congress "has led to proposals to restrict open communications between scientists in a few forefront fields of university research—proposals that could result in a decrease in both our scientific productivity and, ironically, in our national security."

Press and other members attending the national meeting said that the strongest concern seems to be arms control issues. About 200 scientists—nearly half of those attending the meeting—spent last weekend at a "tutorial" on arms control, and "deep and continuing concern," Press said, has also emerged at regional meetings of the academy.

The issue will be discussed with a Soviet delegation coming here next week. The academy is preparing its own report, to be released next August, analyzing the potential environmental effects of a nuclear war, and its Institute of Medicine is planning an international symposium on the medical aspects of nuclear war for early next year.

"It is the subject of greatest concern," said Herbert Friedman, a physicist attending the meeting. "We must try to find ways to step back from the brink."

The academy elected 60 new members yesterday, including Mortimer Mishkin of the laboratory of neuropsychology at the National Institute of Mental Health.

KHOMEINI'S CRUELTY IN IRAN

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, 3 years ago this week, Iran underwent an historic turning point. The Ayatollah Khomeini answered with bullets the peaceful protests of half a million people demonstrating in Tehran against the Ayatollah's policy of suppression. They demanded restitution of their democratic rights, upon which the regime in Iran had encroached.

The demonstrators had assembled in less than 3 hours, only to be met, upon the Khomeini government's orders, by armed guards.

They opened fire on the crowd.

Many peaceful objectors were killed instantly.

An even greater number of Iranian citizens who were arrested were also executed within 24 hours.

Mr. President, 3 years later, we remember this tragic slaughter of innocent people. We remember these abuses of human rights.

June 20 was, therefore, declared "the Day of Martyrs and Political Prisoners in Iran."

But what has been done?

Since the bloodbath of June 20, 1981, the nightmare of Khomeini has continued.

During the last 3 years, over 40,000 have been murdered and another 120,000 incarcerated.

Mass executions have been stepped up. A few weeks ago, more than 300

prisoners faced the firing squads in Evin Prison in Tehran.

The barbaric tortures have been intensified, with new techniques and equipment being employed in the jails to break the prisoners' resistance.

New prisons have been built and existing jails have been expanded.

In the face of the grave violations of human rights by the Khomeini regime, the Iranian resistance under the leadership of the People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran has grown. Lying at the focus of the nationwide resistance, the Mojahedin founded the National Council of Resistance and invited all nationalist, popular, and progressive Iranian forces to join it. The council is now composed of more than 15 popular political parties, groups, and personalities of Iran.

The fight for human rights and independence in Iran is a fight of and for the Iranian people. Tyranny is eventually defeated by those who are on the side of justice. That is where the National Council of Resistance stands.

As you know, Mr. President, the line between massive violation of human rights and genocide is a perilously thin one. It is crucially important that the United States strengthen its hand in protesting such wanton inhumanity to man.

So on this occasion of the third anniversary of the Khomeini massacre, I remind the Senate that the Genocide Convention, the oldest treaty before the Senate, remains still unratified. This document is an international criminal treaty designed to punish those guilty of the destruction in whole or in part, of a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group.

In light of the recent crimes that have taken place under the Khomeini government, I urge the Senate to ratify the Genocide Treaty without further delay.

Mr. President, I yield to my good friend from Florida the remainder of my time if he wishes it.

Mr. CHILES. I thank my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

CONFERENCE ON FIRST CONCURRENT BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, we are about ready to resume the budget conference, and it should not take long to finish. All indications are that the decisions have been made, at least those decisions that could be made, and I am afraid we did not make enough of them.

The conferees on the Budget Reduction Act worked long and hard, sometimes nonstop, to hammer out agreements among the differing committees

of both Houses. But on the first concurrent budget resolution, the conferees have not achieved much. In fact, we have not met much. You will find we will end up raising some revenues but not enough to reverse the increase in the Federal deficits. We will restrain the growth of medicare, our fastest growing entitlement program, but we were not able to put it under control to the extent necessary to safeguard its future.

We have not cut back discretionary spending at all.

And, when it comes to military spending, we will have done nothing but raise the ante.

The Senate Republicans refused to conference on the budget resolution and strike a compromise. After weeks of refusing to confer on the budget resolution, the Republicans have agreed to meet tomorrow. But they have still given no indication that they are willing to compromise on the numbers.

I am certain we could have done better. We did not because the budget process was ignored, and the executive leadership that could have helped turn the corner on so many close votes, was absent. All in all, we have done little for the economy, and, I am afraid we have damaged the budget process.

What does this conference report on Deficit Reduction Act say about spending restraint?

First, the point of order caps are gone; that is good, because they were an unenforceable sham. Second, we have different sense of the House and sense of the Senate language—each says they will enforce their own spending limits. What does that add up to?

It adds up to letting the House spend almost \$6 billion a year more in domestic programs than the Senate wants; \$17 billion over 3 years.

It lets the Senate spend \$13 billion more on defense than the House wants, or \$74 billion over 3 years. Since the conference agreements on various appropriations bills could come to the higher of either House, we are allowing up to \$13 billion more spending than shown by either House in 1985, and \$74 billion over 3 years.

I find that scant comfort for deficit reduction.

I note a certain irony that just last week, when I was introduced to give a speech, my host noted that this was the 10th anniversary of the Budget Act, and wondered if it had done any good in light of the huge deficits we face.

I was hard pressed to defend the situation. The act has been a success in holding off massive new entitlement programs, and it has kept us from having each of three committees spend money to solve the same problem. Also, we have limited domestic appropriations, so that they are taking a smaller share of the budget and the

economy each year. But the act has not convinced us to put prudent limits on the growth of military spending, and it has not kept us from cutting taxes 25 percent below the amount we are spending. The result is that our national debt and the interest payment on it are growing faster than our economy.

We are in a state of voluntary insolvency.

We need to do more, and we need to do it now.

This year, the Members want to do more, more on the tax side, more on the spending side, than the leadership is willing to accept.

They have the President make calls to keep Members from voting for more ambitious deficit reduction plans.

They bring in the Vice President to break tie votes to keep military spending as high as they can get.

It is a disservice to the Nation and a disservice to the institution of the Senate to refuse to let the Budget Committees compromise and bring forth a budget resolution that will give us a firm restraint on spending. Failing to reach a compromise will only encourage the membership to be irresponsible and spend more.

I know that is true because I hear it from my colleagues on the occasions that Senator DOMENICI and I go to the floor to fight off new spending. My colleagues say, "Why should we be responsible when we have no budget resolution in place to give us a guideline? Why should we restrain ourselves on domestic spending, when the Senate Republicans insist on a 13 percent, \$35 billion increase over last year's appropriation for the military?"

Every other committee has met and compromised on major issues for deficit reduction. We have had compromises on hundreds of tax provisions; we have crossed a major hurdle in medicare and medicaid spending; we have compromised on Federal pay and retirement, on veterans' benefits, and small business loans. Why cannot the Budget Committees come together and compromise on defense?

Make no mistake, Mr. President, that military spending is the only issue hanging up the conference. The House Democrats say they are willing to compromise, but the Senate Republicans will not.

What is the number they are holding out for? A total \$299 billion, compared to last year's \$264 billion. Is that restraint?

What growth rate do they want for 1985? Real growth of 7 percent beyond the rate of inflation, according to CBO. Last year's budget resolution set a guideline of 5 percent a year for real growth. Actual appropriations came in at a growth rate of 3.5 percent. So how can we call 7 percent a cut in defense? It is not; it is an addition.

The only courage I see from the Republican leadership this year is the courage to call a massive military increase of \$35 billion a cut. That does take a lot of nerve.

Mr. President, I am speaking strong words out of frustration. Many of us on both sides of the aisle have worked hard for 10 years to build the budget process. We have taken difficult stands against popular spending programs. We have borne the wrath of colleagues with pet programs to push. What we have built is an effective process that has left the Congress achieve what it wants to do. If the Congress wants to restrain military spending and increase domestic, it can set those priorities in a budget resolution and carry them out. In the last few years, those priorities have been reversed, and the budget process has been used to cut domestic programs tremendously, while allowing the military to grow rapidly.

Now the Members want to set a reasonable balance of restraint on both military and domestic spending. They want to reduce the deficit.

The Budget Act is under attack for record deficits. People want to know what good is a Budget Act if the deficits remain so high. Well, Mr. President, it could very well be the same question asked some years down the road if, after enacting a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, we continue to run huge deficits.

The problem is not in the procedures we have, but rather in the leadership we lack. All the procedures in the world will not do us any good if we will not use them. The Budget Act this year was sidestepped, and the economy will pay the price while the budget process gets the blame.

Mr. President, during the last century, a member of the British Parliament wrote a book called "Tom Brown's School Days." There was a short passage in there that pretty well describes the problem we had in this year's budget.

It says:

He never wants anything but what's right and fair; only when you come to settle what's right and fair, it's everything he wants and nothing that you want. And that's his idea of a compromise.

The "he" in this instance is the President of the United States. Whatever compromises are involved in the conference report are essentially those made last March when the Republican leadership agreed among themselves just how far they were willing to go. They had obtained the votes to win in the Senate. I am not sure, however, that they have a policy to keep the economy from becoming a loser.

So now all of Washington is about ready to take a summer vacation. We are all ready to lock the doors and windows, pull down the shades, and

cancel the newspapers. It is too bad we are leaving for a trip when we should have been moving instead. Because no matter how hard we play Walter Mitty and convince ourselves we have done well, the question is not what we have done, but where we are. And we are still sitting on top of a volcano of debt, deficits, and rising interest rates.

And we will be back.

Mr. President, I am happy to yield the time I have remaining to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mr. COHEN. I thank the Senator for yielding.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend beyond 1:30 p.m.

The Senator from Maine is recognized.

CANADIANS LEAVE NO TERN UNSTONED

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, a soft-spoken 68-year-old Jonesport sea captain, a group of rare Arctic terns, and a granite speck 12 miles off the coast of Maine: These are unlikely participants in an international squall which attracted the attention of the national media and the U.S. Department of State. The story is an interesting example of the kinds of matters that cross my desk and, I assume, the desks of my colleagues.

The territorial tug-of-war concerns Machias Seal Island, a 15-acre island favored by Atlantic puffins and Arctic terns for nesting. For 44 years, Capt. Barna Norton of Jonesport has been ferrying birdwatchers and photographers to the tiny island, a practice which is his avocation as well as his vocation.

For all of those years, there has been a sort of uneasy truce between the United States and Canada, both of which claim ownership of this tiny island. Each country cites a variety of treaties and boundary agreements to bolster its case, but there has been no final resolution of the problem over the years.

By and large, this situation has not affected people like Captain Norton, who make their living at the island. He thinks that the Maine and New Brunswick lobstermen who fish around the island can work out their infrequent feuds, but that the real problems come from the Governments of each country. Captain Norton says of the Canadian citizens who operate the island's lighthouse, "The keepers have been my best friends—I get along just great with them, taking them milk and mail when I can."

But from time to time over the years, Canadian Government officials

have accused Captain Norton of disrupting the natural habitat of the birds on the island by his daily birdwatching excursions. I have met Captain Norton on my first walk through the State of Maine back in 1972, and making such a suggestion about a man who is a naturalist and is passionately devoted to the care of the island, in my judgment, is patently ridiculous.

This on-again-off-again tension between our two Governments was definitely on again last week. A Royal Canadian Mounted Police helicopter swooped onto the island, scaring the birds and killing a large number of them. Ironically, the purpose of the expedition was to protect the birds from outside intruders like Captain Norton. After the helicopter landed, destroying a number of these rare birds, which thrive on the island during the spring and summer months, the RCMP left several officers to patrol the island.

First, it struck me as a rather poor imitation of Margaret Thatcher's resolve to save the Falkland Islands, but more importantly this really is a bit of absurd gunboat diplomacy on the part of the Canadian Government.

Apparently the Canadian Government is determined to leave no tern unstoned.

The reaction among many, including Captain Norton and myself, was one of incredulity. For the Canadians to launch this effort in an attempt to protect this island from a gentleman who has made the island his life for more than 44 years seems more than absurd. Coming as it did less than 1 week after the newly selected Canadian Liberal Party Leader John Turner pledged a new era of good relations with the United States, the incident seemed inexplicable at best. A wonderful way to open up a new era of diplomacy and good will is to invade this tiny island with the mounted police and slaughtering the birds they were sent to save.

I contacted the Secretary of State and asked him for an immediate review of this matter, and his office has agreed to look into it. There are possible options for a U.S. response, including sending a formal diplomatic note of protest or initiating formal discussions with Canadian wildlife officials to attempt a relaxation of tensions. But ultimately the step that has to be achieved is to resolve the lingering problem once and for all as to who owns the island.

The State Department will no doubt unleash a platoon of bureaucrats to study the international ramifications of all of these steps, and the process of diplomacy will grind along. But this is more than an abstract problem between governments. It is a matter of considerable concern to a slightly stooped gentleman with a downeast drawl who, with his dog, Matey, sets

off each day to explain the natural beauty of nesting birds to a new group of visitors, hoping that the great powers of government and diplomacy will allow him 1 more day to love the sea.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

AMERICAN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, every profession has a spokesperson, an advocate organization of professionals. For Home Economics that organization is the American Home Economics Association. It has been a force for families—for their health and well-being—advocating quality of life for 75 years and more. Today I cite the American Home Economics Association for this service and dedication and to recognize the 75th anniversary that this organization will commemorate today at its annual meeting and exposition in Anaheim, CA.

The role for such nonprofit organizations in the future? An outstanding and visionary member of this association of home economists gives this challenging prognosis for the next two decades: a position "squarely in the leadership center," she says, and I am heartened to agree:

It is the Association's challenge to build coalitions, to contribute to national and state economic and social policy, to retrain members to function in an information society, to implement federalism by sharpening the roles of national, state and local organizations, to educate leaders to be politically savvy and financially intelligent, to strengthen the power of networks of volunteer leaders, and to make technology work for us without losing our humanity.

Since the turn of the century when the home economics profession was formalized and this association founded, home economists have had the knowledge and skill, the organization and will to address the needs of the family relation to its environment. As this environment changed bringing changes in family resources, family functions, and cultural climates, new knowledge through applied research has been channeled through home economists working in teaching, industry, extension education, dietetics, human services for adults and children, and communications in all facets of the corporate and public sector and with an expertise that we and scores of others have valued and to which today we pay special note.

With me, I ask you to note with pride the accomplishments of home economists in all these areas: Consumer education, nutrition, human development, gerontology, textile science, family economics, housing, management, art and design, from the day when children working in factories at the age of 8 needed the protection of a

powerful voice, to the present when a program banked on home economics expertise, such as the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program which reaches 2 million people, 58 percent of whom are in cities and 60 percent of whom are minorities.

Home economists have made a difference in our lives—from the very first crusaders, captained by that dynamic woman, Ellen Swallow Richards, a true pioneer. She was the prime mover in the establishment of the American Home Economics Association, who sought to thrust the study of the home in all its multiplicity of concerns into the mainstream of educational thought by applying the principles of science to the work of the household and family. She sought to expand women's education so as to bring about the full development of their talents—for their own, and society's benefit. Since that day, home economists the world over through their professional work and volunteer efforts, have contributed mightily to the world's social, economic, and technical advances. The results of their efforts help us all. Consider these contributions:

Our children: Home economists were researchers whose work led to early childhood, child development, child care programs and centers, including Project Head Start as well as the renowned Merrill-Palmer Institute and other schools for the training of professionals and for the observation of the growth and development of children.

Our daily bread: We all eat better because of such work as that of William Atwater who defined the basic unit of analysis of the energy needs of individuals in diet. And Louise Stanley, the first director of USDA's former Bureau of Home Economics, who first defined the necessary elements of diet. And later researchers who helped develop the Recommended Daily Allowances [RDA's], convenience foods (including those used in the first space flights!); who developed the theory for and taught efficient management of institutional food service; and who pioneered in food preservation techniques.

Our education: Home economists were influential in the growth and development of the Cooperative Extension Service, and the U.S. Land Grant University System; in the implementation of Federal and State legislation affecting the education of children and adults in elementary, secondary, vocational, and continuing education programs, and in the development of the school lunch and other feeding programs.

Our ease and comfort: Home economists not only made food preparation easier by pioneering in the development and implementation of standardized food measurements and cooking

and measuring utensils, their work contributed to the development of standardization in household equipment and home furnishings.

Our clothing: Home economists conducted the major research leading to the development of standard sizing in manufactured clothing.

Our time and money: Home economists pioneered in research of time use by American families, and in cost of living indicators later used in the Consumer Price Index.

Our social responsibility: Home economists were pioneers in helping Third World families by giving technical and educational assistance in areas of sanitation, income generation, and food preservation.

The challenges of a post-industrial society are many. Technology can be a tool to enrich family life, but we need home economists there providing the balance, teaching the management so essential in coping with the demands of work, society, and family. We need the focus home economics brings: the kind of philosophy and programs that emphasize development, prevention, education, and health wellness, as opposed to crisis intervention, therapy, and remediation.

"How can a 75-year-old profession that has helped families in so many ways fail to receive the public recognition and respect it so justly deserves?" My answer to this question posed by the association's national president is to keep on without giving up, and to let us know more—more about the home economics teachers cited for "excellence in teaching," the researchers honored for charting new courses in nutrition, experimental foods, consumer education, manmade textiles, child development and family relations, and the members cited for affecting public opinion about issues of concern to families.

American Home Economics Association, grown from 830 members in 1909 to 35,000 now, I salute your "proud past" and harken to "your promising future." Congratulations!

CRIMINAL PENALTY FOR ROBBERY OF A CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on May 31, 1984, President Reagan signed S. 422, the Controlled Substance Registrant Protection Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-305). As a cosponsor of this bill, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the President, my colleagues, and the National Association of Retail Druggists for their efforts toward passage of this very important piece of legislation.

Passage of this pharmacy crime bill is very timely. Since 1973, robberies of retail pharmacies to obtain controlled substances have increased 160 percent. One in five of these robberies results

in death or injury to the pharmacist. Nearly 3,000 people have died or were injured since 1973 as a result of pharmacy robberies.

In my own State of Utah, I know that pharmacy crime has been a problem. Many pharmacies in Utah are small and many are located in predominantly rural areas. These pharmacies maintain long hours and a large inventory of controlled drugs making them especially vulnerable to crime.

Prior to enactment of the pharmacy crime bill, this dramatic rise in violence could be attributed in part to an inconsistency in the law. It is a Federal offense to obtain a controlled drug by fraud. It is a Federal offense to obtain a controlled drug by misrepresentation, forgery, or subterfuge. Yet it was not a Federal offense to acquire these drugs by violent methods.

This legislation expands the availability of Federal prosecution in a variety of instances involving the theft of controlled substances. By increasing fines and the length of prison terms for individuals convicted of "pharmacy robberies," this legislation provides an important new deterrent to this particular crime.

I am pleased to report that with passage of this legislation, pharmacists will no longer have to practice their profession in constant fear of robbery, injury, and even death. It is my hope that the 30,000 retail pharmacists and their customers who have been victims of thousands of injuries and robberies because they dispense federally controlled drugs will be able to sleep better at night.

Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a copy of the National Association of Retail Druggists' letter to President Reagan expressing their appreciation for the attention the Congress and the President have given this very important issue.

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

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
RETAIL DRUGGISTS,
Alexandria, VA, June 1, 1984.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of the Officers, Executive Committee, and members of The National Association of Retail Druggists, we would like to thank you for signing S. 422, the Pharmacy Crime Bill. Our 30,000 retail pharmacists and their customers have been the victims of thousands of injuries and robberies because they dispense federally controlled drugs.

Your administration is the first and only administration to support this effort since we brought this issue to the attention of the Congress years ago. We worked closely with your officials in the Department of Justice and with the Senator Roger Jepsen, who led bipartisan coalition in the Senate to obtain passage of this priority pharmacy legislation. We are particularly pleased that Sena-

tor Jepsen was able to assure that the use of weapons in such crimes would be the basis for federal prosecution of pharmacy robberies and burglaries to obtain controlled substances.

The final passage of S. 422 ends a 15-year effort by NARD to correct inequities in the 1970 Controlled Substances Act, which left the nation's pharmacists—and particularly independent retail pharmacists—vulnerable to violent acts perpetrated by gunmen on store owners, their employees and customers.

NARD deeply appreciates the generous support of its friends in Congress and your administration who have addressed this vital grievance confronting our members and others who have, for too long, practiced the honorable profession of pharmacy providing vital health care services in the shadow of potential violence while experiencing an increasing epidemic of actual violence. The final legislation contains significant federal jurisdiction over violent pharmacy crime.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. WOODS,
Executive Vice President.

NATIONAL DEBATE OPINIONNAIRE NETWORK

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I want to call my colleagues' attention to an especially interesting project which has been started in my home State, but which I hope soon will be implemented nationwide. The project is the National Debate Opinionnaire Network, sponsored by the Overlake and Bellevue Rotary Clubs of Bellevue, WA. The project is an effort to promote the participation of high school students in national issues by building upon the annual National High School Debate effort, sponsored by the National Forensic League. The National Debate Opinionnaire Network is the result of efforts by the Forum Foundation, a nonprofit corporation in Washington State dedicated to strengthening the democratic process in the United States.

The goal of the effort is to help high school students " * * * become aware of the responsibilities of citizenship by encouraging them to understand others' opinions and voice their own agreement or disagreement in a rational, respectful way * * * " Toward this goal, the NDON compiles annually the responses of high school debaters to a set of questions relating to that year's National High School Debate topic. It then disseminates this information for use by the debaters, as well as by high school social studies classes generally.

This is the first mechanism for providing to high school debaters a sense of how the Nation's students ultimately think about the debate topic. In other words, it extends the valuable rhetorical debate exercise by making the debaters into voters on the substantive questions involved, and encouraging all students—debaters and nondebaters alike—to consider these results, and formulate their own conclusions in a considered fashion. The

effort has been endorsed by the National Forensic League.

This effort represents the best in citizenship involvement and initiative, and I am proud that it has originated in Washington State.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE ON NATO AMENDMENT

Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Mr. President, I wish to offer a brief explanation of my vote on the Nunn amendment. My initial inclination was to support the effort of the Senator from Georgia in his attempt to wring greater defense contributions from our NATO allies. I was, however, prevailed upon to be patient a bit longer, to allow our Government's private urgings and the improving European economy to have their hoped-for effect. I gave a reluctant ear to these earnest appeals and voted to refrain from laying a specific ultimatum before our European friends.

But I wish to make clear that my patience, never my greatest virtue, is being sorely tested by the pattern of neglect which our allies have exhibited toward their own defense. I was forced as a child to flee that continent because of similar neglect by the Western democracies during the 1930's, so I suppose that I find it particularly galling to see this same problem arising a brief 50 years later. But I think that Americans of many backgrounds agree with this Senator that the United States can no longer be asked to bear a disproportionate share of NATO's conventional defense.

With 43 percent of NATO's gross domestic product, the United States contributes over 62 percent of NATO's total defense spending. We count less than one-third of NATO's population among our citizenry, yet we provide the alliance with over 42 percent of its active defense manpower. This situation cannot continue unchanged.

In fairness to our allies, I should point out that they have made substantial improvements in both these areas. Between 1971 and 1982 their contribution to NATO defense spending rose by over 25 percent, while ours actually declined slightly. Similarly, the contribution to active defense manpower for most of our allies increased during that decade while ours declined by over 16 percent. I recognize then that our allies have been making some progress in this area. Nevertheless, the fact remains that our allies have been either unable or unwilling to meet the goals we have set in our joint councils. Their defense budgets have not kept pace with their professed commitments.

I will be watching European defense budgeting with critical interest in the near future, Mr. President. I expect to see the first fruits of our diplomatic overtures and the European economic recovery in short order. I recognize

that the Europeans, to an even greater degree than the United States, have suffered severe economic reverses in recent years and have also lagged behind us in economic recovery. I recognize also that many of our European allies face peculiar political problems with respect to defense and I have no desire to place undue pressure on those friendly governments. But we cannot be expected to wait much longer.

At what point will these allies be in a stronger political position? If the will to upgrade their own defense doesn't materialize soon in Europe, we will have to draw certain inevitable conclusions. Some Members of this body have already begun to draw those conclusions. Those conclusions lead, as the Senator from Georgia has described with his usual perspicacity, to the conclusions his amendment embodies.

I have, as I have said, been dissuaded from reaching that conclusion just yet. But I am not far from reaching it, Mr. President. And I hope that our friends in NATO will heed the distant thunder heard here today.

We hope for cordial relations with our allies, but they must surely be sympathetic to the necessity we feel in this country to have our contributions to European defense matched by an equal will among Europeans to defend themselves. I look expectantly to see a stronger evidence of that will in upcoming European defense budgets.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1984

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move that the Chair appoint conferees for the conference on H.R. 5174, the Bankruptcy Act Amendments of 1984.

The motion was agreed to, and the Chair appointed Senators HEFLIN, KENNEDY, DECONCINI, and METZENBAUM conferees on the part of the Senate.

PARKINSON'S DISEASE

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, Parkinson's disease affects the lives of millions of Americans, robbing them of the ability to carry out normal activities. Presently, we do not know what causes this debilitating disease, nor do we have a cure for it. We do know that Parkinson's disease results from a deficiency of the chemical dopamine in the area of the brain that controls movement. Treatment consists of restoring the normal level of dopamine in the cholinergic system through the use of drugs. Many patients respond well to this treatment; however, about 10 percent experience no improvement. Furthermore, prolonged treatment in some patients eventually leads to a diminished re-

sponse to the medication. Clearly, more effective treatments need to be developed.

Only through further research and public awareness can we overcome this crippling disease. Research is being conducted at such places as the Parkinson's Disease Foundation at Columbia University. Equally important, however, is the effort of support groups such as the one sponsored by the Township of Parsippany, Office on Aging. As one of three such organizations in New Jersey, the Parsippany group works to bring members of the medical profession, health care agencies, and interested individuals together in an effort to rally public support to help eliminate this disease.

Without the involvement of community organizations, such as the Parkinson's Disease Group in Parsippany, in combating destructive diseases, we will find ourselves at a serious disadvantage in the battle against this dreaded illness. The dedication and concern demonstrated by the members of these groups is worthy of our recognition.

NEW JERSEY'S SMALL BUSINESSMAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, the "Small Businessman of the Year" award from the Small Business Administration represents the culmination of years of hard work and dedication by an individual. This award also salutes those who have made the American Dream a reality. Mr. Joseph Starita, founder and chairman of the board of Star-Glo Industries Inc. and this year's "New Jersey Small Businessman of the Year," is a fine example of a businessman who has achieved success through our system of free enterprise.

After serving in World War II, Mr. Starita returned to his hometown of Jersey City and began a job at the Linde Division of Union Carbide. Involved in the design and production of plastic parts for factory machines, Mr. Starita worked feverishly to keep up with the demands of post-war industrialization. In order to help his employer meet those demands, he borrowed money from the company to purchase an old press which he set up in his kitchen. He worked nights with his wife to turn out additional parts.

After a year, Mr. Starita decided to go into business for himself. With a little imagination, daring, and insight, Joseph Starita formed Star-Glo, Inc., in a garage. Almost 30 years later, Star-Glo has grown into a multi-million-dollar corporation specializing in precision custom rubber and plastic molding, rubber to metal bonding, and the machining of metal parts for a variety of applications. The company has been responsible for developments in packaging, including an innovative

patented process for Teflon [TM] bonding. Over the years, Mr. Starita has helped his company grow and prosper.

In addition to his impressive business career, Mr. Starita has continually demonstrated a sense of community awareness and responsibility, participating in a variety of civic and philanthropic activities. His community has bestowed many honors upon him.

I commend Mr. Joseph Starita for his demonstration of ingenuity, ambition, and spirit during his last 30 years as a New Jersey businessman.

SUGAR QUOTAS

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, for the last several years, American policymakers have quite correctly been extremely concerned about the political stability of the nations in Central America and the Caribbean. We have believed that one of the keys to political stability in that region is economic stability, and we have enacted programs aimed at providing economic aid and incentives for investment in these nations in order to hasten the pace of their economic development.

Unfortunately, we have not yet achieved our objectives of providing economic and political stability in Latin America. As news stories inform us each day, unrest is prevalent throughout the region. Recently we have seen growing tension in the Dominican Republic. This tension provides still another alarm signal from this troubled region of the world.

Given this extremely sensitive political situation and all the effort that has gone into aiding our Latin neighbors, it is ironic, Mr. President, that we have insisted on maintaining programs which are adding to the burdens of these nations. I am speaking specifically of the Sugar Program.

In order to keep American sugar prices high, we have established very restrictive quotas on imported sugar. Because of the quotas, sugar imports have dropped from 5,025,000 tons in 1981 to 3,080,000 tons in 1983. Consequently, the earnings of exporting nations from sugar imports to the United States dropped from \$2.1 billion in 1981 to \$1 billion in 1983. For Latin American nations, earnings have dropped from \$1.4 billion to \$0.7 billion from 1981 to 1983.

This loss of earnings from sugar exports has created tremendous economic problems for Latin American countries and is undermining our attempts to provide assistance. Ironically, as the loss of sugar exports to the United States has limited Latin nations' ability to gain foreign exchange, it has also reduced their ability to buy U.S. goods, particularly agricultural products.

A recent article in *Farm Futures* analyzed this issue quite well, and I

recommend that article to my colleagues for their serious consideration. Specifically, *Farm Futures* notes that improvement in net U.S. farm income depends primarily on increasing farm exports. Increasing U.S. farm exports, in turn, depends on selling more to the world's developing nations. However, developing nations can't offer to buy U.S. farm products unless they can earn more from exporting more of their own goods.

As the article points out, our Sugar Program restricts the ability of developing countries to export their products. As a result our farmers suffer, as do our foreign policy interests.

Further, Mr. President, American consumers pay a tremendous price to support sugar producers under the Sugar Program. Today, the world market price for sugar is approximately 6 cents per pound. In the United States, sugar is selling for over 22 cents per pound. When one considers that Americans pay about \$300 million more per year for sweeteners and sweetened products, when the price of sugar increases only 1 cent, it is clear that the Sugar Program is one of the most costly farm programs on the books. I must also note that the program benefits only 14,000 sugar producers and many of them are large multinational corporations.

Mr. President the Sugar Program makes absolutely no sense at all. It injures Latin American nations, when we should be helping them. It represents hypocritical trade policy. It rips off consumers, and it is doing serious damage to our farmers.

I hope my colleagues will take this opportunity to consider once again the costs of U.S. sugar policy and join me in resolving to effect major reforms in the Sugar Program. I also hope that they will carefully consider the information contained in the *Farm Futures* article, which I ask to have printed in the *RECORD*.

The article follows:

[From *Farm Futures*, February 1984]

EXPORTS: THAT SINKING FEELING

Reagan administration and industry forecasters agree in ruling out any near-term recovery for U.S. farm exports. That's a far cry.

From the message USDA and past administrations had given farmers in the 1970s, when exports were tagged as the answer to all our farm income problems.

One indicator of how export prospects have deteriorated is that U.S. agricultural exports as a share of cash marketings climbed to 24% for the 1980 to 1982 period, up from 8% for the 1951 to 1955 period. For fiscal year 1983, that share dropped back to 22%, reversing a steady upward trend set over the past 30 years. The USDA projects that export volume for fiscal 1984 will be 15% below 1980, marking the fourth straight year of decline.

In this month's articles examining where exports are headed, *Farm Futures* taps a string of experts arguing that the only road

to recovery is for the U.S. to accept some short-term pain as the cost of achieving long-term recovery.

Even putting exports back on the fast track by the end of this century depends on making some major course corrections now, they say.

The formula for getting the U.S. farm economy back on its feet may be alarmingly simple.

The good news is that as the world's leading trader, the United States itself is in an ideal position to turn defeat into victory. The bad news is that the U.S. may squander its opportunity to lead a turnaround. Instead, it may surrender to domestic political pressures which threaten to raise America's protectionist walls even higher.

Drawing on thick stacks of statistic-packed computer printouts, key trade experts conclude that:

Improvement in net U.S. farm income depends primarily on increasing farm exports.

Increasing U.S. farm exports depends primarily on selling more to the world's developing nations, the only remaining markets with potential for substantial growth.

Developing countries can't afford to buy U.S. farm products unless they can earn more from exporting more of their own goods.

Increasing the developing world's export earnings depends primarily on economic recovery in the industrial world and a reversal of the industrial world's tendency to choke off international trade through new protectionist trade measures.

The U.S. must reduce its budget deficit in order to spur recovery in third-world economies.

The bottom line is that U.S. farmers, faced with a sharp decline in export earnings and prospects, are wasting their efforts in blaming bad times on European Community export subsidies, on Japanese beef, citrus and wood import restrictions, or on bumper harvests in Australia and Argentina. Instead, trade experts say, the farmer and his elected representatives should concentrate on helping the U.S. economy to recover and on dismantling this country's spreading web of protectionist trade measures.

Consider the case made by the International Monetary Fund's managing director Jacques de Larosiere and others. They argue that heavily indebted developing nations are not economic basket-cases headed inevitably toward a collapse which might topple their western creditors as well. Instead, de Larosiere insists, third-world debt is "manageable" if richer nations respond to the problem by rewarding nations, such as Mexico, which are instituting sensible austerity measures. He has argued strongly against the move by major banks to demand higher interest payments and steep up-front fees as their price for rescheduling Third World debts. Joined by other trade experts and economists, de Larosiere has called on richer nations to accept the short-term pain of allowing imports from the Third World to increase while exports to the Third World decrease. This bite-the-bullet approach will benefit all parties over the longer term, he argues.

The IMF's latest outlook cuts through the confusion which breeds misdirected blame. The report estimates that "an additional increase of 1% in aggregate real GNP of the industrial countries leads to an increase in the level of export earnings of non-oil developing countries . . . by proportions ranging . . . from 2½ to 4%." The IMF report con-

cludes: "For the whole group of non-oil developing countries, the increase in earnings would amount to \$11 billion."

Curbing the U.S. budget deficit—which drives up interest rates—would also have a substantial positive effect on Third World economies, according to the IMF. "A reduction of one percentage point in market interest rates would, after a year or so, reduce the flow of interest payments of non-oil developing countries by roughly \$4 billion," IMF's outlook report stated.

Clearly that extra \$11 billion from increased export earnings and \$4 billion saved in interest payments on Third World debts would not translate dollar-for-dollar into buying \$15 billion more in U.S. farm exports.

But history has shown that any economic improvement in the developing world does lead directly toward more U.S. foodgrain and feedgrain purchases used to upgrade diets. And whenever extra money becomes available in developing nations, it has a rapidly multiplying effect. The standard sequence is for new capital investment boosting both industrial and agricultural productivity. This in turn boosts per capita incomes and living standards and results in pent-up demand for more and better food being unleashed by the country's ability to pay for the goods it wants and needs.

In Brazil, an example of major market potential, exports must increase in order for that nation to recover from its acute balance of payments difficulties. Such news may be difficult for U.S. soybean producers and other competitors to swallow.

On a smaller scale is the example of the Dominican Republic, which must export sugar to earn dollars. This country could be importing more U.S. farm products. But the only way it can import more U.S. wheat is to sell more of its sugar to the U.S. So in this case, increasing agricultural exports depends directly on dismantling U.S. trade barriers erected to protect the domestic sugar industry, according to Clifford Lewis, World Bank economist.

Lewis finds it particularly ironic that in the case of U.S. restrictions on sugar, dairy and tobacco imports, the agricultural sector itself is taking actions which restrict agricultural export opportunities. This is in addition to U.S. import restrictions affecting such items as textiles, steel, automobiles and footwear. Such restrictions are more understandable, but also even more costly to U.S. export prospects, he said. In his view the U.S. currently operates some of the world's most protectionist policies. His message to congressmen considering new layers of protectionist legislation is: "If you are going to protect U.S. steel, sugar, textiles, autos, think of the impact this will have."

Lewis added that helping developing nations improve their ability to afford U.S. products is important because the industrialized nations basically represent a saturated market. Others may look on the Soviet Union and China as major markets of the future. Lewis, however, warned that even if Soviet and Chinese demand were to improve substantially, these would be poor markets to depend on. Soviet and Chinese demand "will be very much related to government decisions, not to economic factors," he said, such that these markets will remain completely unpredictable.

According to Arthur Mackie, economist with USDA's Economic Research Service, farm export sector recovery depends on recognizing that it is the middle and low income developing countries that offer the

only potential for increased U.S. export sales.

The challenge, Mackie said, is to convince American soybean farmers, for instance, of the logic that "improving Brazilian soybean production improves the Brazilian economy, with the result that Brazil will be able to import more wheat and corn from the U.S."

Burleigh Leonard is one man charged with finding ways to convince soybean farmers and other special interest groups that they need to consider America's national economic interests. As a deputy assistant director in the White House's office of policy development, Leonard deals directly with the full range of farm policy issues.

As a direct consequence of the Reagan administration's effort to shift farm policy in a free-market direction, Leonard said, the administration places major emphasis on exports. This emphasis he added, has naturally increased due to the prospect of 1983's \$70 billion trade deficit climbing to \$100 billion for 1984.

"Without the surplus generated by our agricultural exports," he said, "we would be in far worse shape."

Leonard rejected the charge that the administration has neglected agriculture by putting a \$4-billion ceiling on export credits this year.

"The commercial credit guarantee program has always been a commercial program, not one designed to use for a balance of payments problems," he said. Redirecting the program to pump in more buying power into debt-ridden countries could backfire, he insisted. He fears this could lead to a string of defaults and result in demands by Congress to cut back or even eliminate the program entirely.

Leonard acknowledged that the administration could find good economic and political reasons for boosting export credit spending substantially and sweetening the '84 commodity programs. But Leonard said that another year of expensive acreage reduction programs and export credits would be "very hard to sell to the public" at a time when "we are confronted with a need to address the larger budget question" by cutting rather than increasing the bulging federal deficit.

Leonard also acknowledged that the administration has found itself locked into administering policies it doesn't really support, such as restrictions on sugar imports. The sugar quota system, he said, "is administratively difficult to implement, and it is contrary to our free trade policy."

But the price support program is the law, he said, and so "we opt for implementing it in such a way that we don't add to the budget deficit."

Leonard and other administration officials hold little hope of any improvement in export prospects over the near term. Their hope instead lies in a major overhaul of farm policy following the elections, leading to an '85 Farm Bill designed to boost export volume and value. While Leonard stressed that no administration decisions have been made about the new four-year farm bill, he did speculate that the top priority for farm programs should be maintaining open trade so that we can exercise our comparative advantage as an agricultural producer.

For Leonard, as for World Bank, IMF and USDA officials, the United States must recognize that reducing its own trade barriers now rather than raising protectionist barriers higher is ultimately in its own economic interests.

WORLD BANK: FOR LONG-TERM LOANS

Just blocks from the White House is the world's largest public lender. World Bank headquarters houses an international team of economists and analysts tracking loans worth some \$45 billion.

The profit-making World Bank was created in the aftermath of World War II to help rebuild Europe. Today its loans go primarily to developing nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, with special low-interest loans available for the poorest of the poor.

Owned by the governments of 139 countries, the bank has always been headed by an American. Current president is former Bank America Corp. boss A.W. Clausen, who took over from Robert McNamara in July, 1981. Clausen came in with a promise to drum up more private investment to twin with World Bank loans and a commitment to lessen tensions between third-world borrowers and wealthy nations, whose contributions pay for the bank.

World Bank loans cover agriculture, transportation, water, health, energy, population and education projects.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND: FOR SHORT-TERM AID

The IMF, with 146 member governments, provides short-term financing to ease its balance-of-payment problems. The IMF makes headlines particularly because its experts are the ones who draft "economic adjustment" programs for debtor countries. The borrowers find it hard to swallow the programs politically, even while their creditors complain that even more austerity is needed.

In an operation described as "much like a global credit union," the IMF offers three- to five-year loans. These generally have been tied to requirements that the debtor country impose tight restrictions on imports while making all-out efforts to boost exports in order to generate the foreign exchange required for debt servicing.

NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION IN IRAN, IRAQ, AND LIBYA

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, earlier today I addressed the Jonathan Institute Conference on International Terrorism. My remarks focused on the danger that unchecked nuclear proliferation presents to Western interests. The use of nuclear weapons in a regional dispute poses the ultimate terrorist threat. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON TO THE JONATHAN INSTITUTE CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM, WASHINGTON, DC

The magnitude of the threat terrorism poses to the people and nations of the free world is immeasurable.

I want to speak with you about the responsibilities of the democratic nations to check terrorism and to prevent terrorists from gaining access to weapons of mass destruction.

Nowhere in the world is war raging with fewer restraints and more frequent resort to terrorist tactics than in the Middle East and South Asia.

We are witnessing a continuing death struggle in the Persian Gulf between Iran

and Iraq. Without regard to traditional rules of war, they are using every possible weapon against each other in what began as a minor territorial dispute.

We are seeing an interminable conflict in Lebanon, where the forces of terrorists and extremist factions have yet to be vanquished.

And we are witnessing vicious civil strife across religious divides in India, and elsewhere in the region.

In conflicts in this region, international treaties have been no bar to the use of chemical weapons, to the seizure of diplomatic personnel, to attacks on nuclear installations, to assaults on religious sites, to deployment of brigades of children as human "mine sweepers", and to repeated attacks on commercial shipping.

It takes little imagination to comprehend the dangers posed to U.S. national security interests—and to the interests of our friends and allies in the region—if nuclear weapons were to play a role in these unrestrained wars.

Does anyone doubt that if the Shah of Iran had succeeded in developing a sophisticated nuclear program in Iran that the Ayatollah Khomeini would have used a nuclear weapon against Iraq?

By the same token, does anyone now doubt that if Iraq had been permitted to make swift progress towards a nuclear weapons capability that Saddam Hussein would have used a nuclear bomb against Iran?

Or that either of them might have subsequently resorted to a nuclear strike in a "jihad"—a "holy war"—against Israel?

Those most concerned about the spread of terrorism and the use of weapons of mass destruction by terrorist states should be deadly serious about the need for a sound and successful nuclear non-proliferation policy.

But the fact is that western democracies and industrialized nations have done grave injury to our security interests by spreading weapons-usable nuclear technology about the world. Like Lenin's capitalists—who would sell the rope for their own lynching—we have permitted the export of nuclear materials, plants and technology that may someday be used in a lethal assault against us.

Nowhere is this clearer than in the Middle East and South Asia, where several fundamentalist Islamic states have made great efforts to get "the bomb".

Last week I revealed substantial new information demonstrating that Pakistan has acquired all the capability necessary to produce their own nuclear weapons.

I based this conclusion on four new facts:

(1) Pakistan has operated and expanded its clandestine uranium enrichment facility at Kahuta;

(2) Pakistan has operated its clandestine plutonium reprocessing facility at PIN-STECH;

(3) Pakistan has expanded its nuclear weapons design team at Wah and has stepped up imports of nuclear warhead components;

(4) Pakistan's KANUPP reactor has been subject to continuing chronic failures in its safeguard system, making plutonium diversion highly feasible.

Pakistan also has the ability, should it so choose, to export the nuclear-trained technicians, the highly advanced nuclear technology and designs—and perhaps even nuclear weapons—to fundamentalist colleagues in other Islamic nations. This export capability and the extent of Paki-

stan's nuclear weapons capability have far more profound implications than were presented by the Iraqi nuclear program before the Osirak reactor was bombed in 1981.

Pakistan is a nation ruled by a fundamentalist Islamic dictator, General Zia. Under Zia's leadership, the Islamic Conference in 1981—and again since then—has renewed its call for "holy war" against America's only stable, democratic ally in the Middle East, Israel.

This is obviously of grave concern to Israelis, to Americans and to all those who seek to prevent nuclear conflict.

But there is another story here, and there are more details I would like to discuss today.

This is the story of the continuing reckless transfer of nuclear know-how from western nations to countries which may not share our reservations about using weapons of mass destruction.

How did Pakistan get nuclear weapons capability?

They picked up key components in the offices of Saint Gobain Technique Nouvelles in Paris, at VAT and CORA in Switzerland, at the firm of Keybold Heraeus in West Germany, of Emerson Electric in the U.K., and in the offices of hundreds of firms in the west who were so eager to consummate a sale that they were indifferent to Pakistan's clear intentions.

In fact, the west has repeatedly sold sensitive nuclear technology to countries which routinely employ terrorism as an instrument of state policy.

Let's look at Iraq. How did they come so close to their own nuclear weapons capability in 1981? They bought plutonium producing reactors in Paris; they bought hot cells from Paris and Brussels; they brought in the best Italian technicians; and they bought weapons-grade enriched uranium from the French.

And how did Iraq put together the chemical weapons used with devastating effectiveness against the Ayatollah's young volunteers? My information is that Iraq bought several of the components from unwitting U.S. firms. And there are persistent reports that the key ingredients for manufacturing this gas came from a firm that should have—and did—know better, I.G. Farben of West Germany. To this day, Iraq has a chemical weapons stockpile and latent production capability. They also still have sensitive hot cells for reprocessing plutonium and a core load of some 14 kilograms of highly enriched uranium. They have a large stockpile of some 200 tons of raw uranium. They are still trying to get the case to replace the Osirak reactor. The shell of the destroyed reactor is today surrounded by an ominous array of anti-aircraft systems, balloons to frustrate low flying aircraft, and sixty foot high earth berms that look rather like a Great Wall of Baghdad. Clearly they hope to reinvigorate a sophisticated nuclear development effort.

And what about the nuclear program in Iran, which the Shah once hoped would bring more than two dozen enormous power reactors on line in his lifetime? Abandoned in 1979 by the Ayatollah as too reliant on the technology of the "Satanic" west, this program is now undergoing a revival. The Iranian Atomic Energy Commission is back in business and senior Iranian officials have reportedly pursued nuclear cooperation possibilities both in Europe and Pakistan. Recent press reports about the Ayatollah attaining nuclear weapons capability within the next two years, are in my judgment, ir-

responsibly exaggerated. It is true that 35 West German technicians are back in Iran studying the feasibility of completing two 1350 megawatt reactors at Bushehr. But it would take nearly five years to finish these reactors and generate some plutonium through their operation.

There are two ominous developments in the Ayatollah's nuclear program, however:

First, Tehran has sent agents throughout Europe to press exiled nuclear scientists and engineers to return to Iran. Lucrative offers and personal threats have reportedly been made in an effort to reassemble a cadre of nuclear specialists to work on a new, unmistakably Islamic, nuclear development effort.

Second, representatives of the Ayatollah's government have reportedly approached firms in Switzerland and Belgium to express an interest in plutonium reprocessing technology. Their technology could not be used by Iran for anything other than nuclear weapons inasmuch as they have no "peaceful" nuclear energy generating program whatsoever. It takes some fifty operating reactors before such reprocessing becomes even arguably cost-effective.

And then there is Colonel Quadaffi of Libya, who continues his ham-handed efforts to beg, borrow or steal a nuclear weapons capability. He has pressed the Soviets for an optimum plutonium producing reactor. He has offered Pakistan cash and uranium in the hope of benefitting from Islamabad's weapons efforts. He has tried to buy nuclear weapons from China. And he is building at least the intellectual resources in Libya to help make one of his own. Libya's Tajura Nuclear Research Center offers use of highly advanced fusion technology. Libya has an experimental research reactor which runs on highly enriched (weapons-grade) uranium. They have several extra core loads in-country, though not enough HEU sufficient for fabricating a nuclear warhead.

Much has been made of the extent to which the Pakistani nuclear program has been supported and advanced as promising an "Islamic bomb." It is fair to ask: Is it in the Pakistan's eye—or in the eyes of nervous Americans or Israelis or Hindus—that this nuclear program is so viewed?

We should be reluctant to brand forces poorly understood in the west. But concerns about the use of a Pakistani nuclear bomb in a "holy war" seem justified by the words of the program's architects. At some point, one has to take seriously the statement of Pakistan's leaders.

Let me quote from General Zia: "China, India, the USSR and Israel possess the atomic arms. No Muslim country has any. If Pakistan had such a weapon, it would reinforce the power of the Muslim world."

Or as Prime Minister Bhutto wrote in his memoirs: "We know that Israel and South Africa have full nuclear capability. The Christian, Jewish and Hindu civilization have this capability. The Communist powers also possess it. Only the Islamic civilization was without it, but that position was about to change" (with the event of Bhutto's nuclear program).

Most to the point are recent statements by Dr. A. Q. Khan, the "father" of the Pakistani bomb who recently declared:

"All the Western countries including Israel are not only Pakistan's enemies but also enemies of Islam. If some other Muslim country had accomplished the same thing (as Pakistan's breakthrough on uranium enrichment), the same venomous and false propaganda would have been conducted

against it as well. The examples of Iraq and Libya are before you. Even though these countries are not capable of manufacturing an atomic bomb for a long time yet, western media sources are conducting a violent propaganda campaign against them. All this is part of the crusade which the Christians and Jews initiated against the Muslims 1000 years ago. They are afraid that if Pakistan makes obvious progress in this field that the whole Islamic world will stand to benefit."

Khan went on to charge: "the 'Islamic bomb' is a figment of the Zionist mind and this has been used full force by the anti-Islamic Western countries." He insisted that the only reason he was convicted by a Dutch court of stealing sensitive nuclear design information for Pakistan's nuclear effort was that "all these charges and court cases were imposed at the insistence of Zionists and Western anti-Islam elements."

General Zia could use this program as a magnet for training scientists from several nations to whom he is in debt including Saudi Arabia and Libya, or with whom he needs to curry favor, like Iran. Despite Zia's radical program of Islamization in Pakistan—which includes judicial sentences of public flogging, stoning and amputation—General Zia has reason to fear the Ayatollah Khomeini's forces, as well as those forces in Pakistan who believe Zia has not gone far enough to advance fundamentalist causes.

Will men like Khan help other fundamentalist scientists in Iran, Libya or the P.L.O.?

Will they export plans, designs, hardware, technology, or weapons-usable materials with or without General Zia's approval?

Will they train scientists who will help still more extremist nations or terrorist groups?

Will they make nuclear threats in subsequent regional wars?

And how responsible will General Zia's successor be with nuclear weapons—a successor who is likely to come from among the more extreme fundamentalists?

The answers to these questions could have grave ramifications for American interests. They could affect the very survival of Israel. It would only take three nuclear weapons in the hands of terrorists or a terrorist state to decimate Israel.

The United States has a compelling interest in combatting nuclear proliferation and preventing nuclear terrorism. A nuclear war launched regionally could swiftly engulf the superpowers and destroy us all in the ultimate holocaust.

There is much the democratic nations of the world should be doing.

We should be clamping down once and for all on the sale of sensitive technology and dual use hardware to unstable nations.

We should be halting aid to countries like Pakistan who are bent on developing nuclear weapons. American taxpayer dollars should not be subsidizing Pakistani nuclear weapons. And we should not be selling them F-16's—the world's most capable penetrating fighter-bomber.

We should be checking the growth of arsenals of radical states so eager to acquire the most sophisticated military technology.

And we should set our own houses in order. Here, in the U.S., this means we should live up to our obligations under the Non-proliferation Treaty to negotiate a halt to the superpower nuclear arms race.

For years, nuclear proliferation has been a life-or-death threat that many of us have talked about and warned about but none of us are doing enough to stop.

Now it's happened again. Now still another nation, Pakistan, has joined the nuclear club.

This is an issue which warrants the highest attention of the leaders of the industrialized democracies.

It should have been on the agenda at the recent summit of NATO leaders.

To deal with this ultimate terrorist threat, I believe nuclear proliferation warrants a summit of its own.

Thus I call upon my government and those of our allies to join together on this issue and to think anew—and act—on the means to avert this most serious threat to our survival.

NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION AND U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY INTERESTS

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, last week I addressed the Senate on the development of a nuclear weapons capability by Pakistan and the role of the People's Republic of China in this program. Unfortunately, a number of sections from this speech were not printed in full. I am therefore submitting for the RECORD today the full text of my remarks as prepared for delivery last week.

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

NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION AND U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY INTERESTS

Nowhere in the world is war raging with fewer restraints and more serious threats to U.S. national security interests than in the Middle East and South Asia.

We are witnessing a continuing death struggle in the Persian Gulf between the two neighboring states of Iran and Iraq. Without regard to traditional rules of war, they are using every possible weapon against each other in what began as a minor territorial dispute.

We are seeing an interminable conflict in Lebanon, where the forces of terrorists and extremist factions have yet to be vanquished.

And we are witnessing vicious civil strife across religious divides in India, and elsewhere in the region.

In conflicts in this region, international treaties have been no bar to the use of chemical weapons, to the seizure of diplomatic personnel, to several attacks on nuclear installations, to assaults on religious sites, to the deployment of brigades of children as human "mine sweepers", and to numerous attacks on neutral commercial shipping.

It takes little imagination to consider the dangers posed to U.S. national security interests—and to the interests of our friends and allies in the region—if nuclear weapons were to play a role in these unrestrained wars. If nuclear weapons were in the hands of many of these combatants, there is every reason to believe that they would be used. Superpowers allied with one or another nation might be drawn directly into a regional conflict after the nuclear threshold was crossed. This is perhaps the most likely way that a general nuclear war could begin.

COURSE OF PAST U.S. POLICY

United States policymakers have long recognized the special danger of nuclear proliferation in this region.

Under the Ford Administration, concerted efforts were made to avert a nuclear arms race on the subcontinent. Under the Carter Administration, strong pressures were brought against India to reject a dedicated military nuclear program; strong sanctions were placed on any U.S. assistance to Pakistan so long as it had a vigorous program to develop nuclear weapons; and significant progress was made with nuclear supplier nations to agree on export restraints.

A few related efforts continued under the Reagan Administration. For example, the Reagan Administration has had some success in discouraging other nuclear supplier nations from giving any legitimacy to the Pakistani "peaceful" nuclear energy program that is so clearly dedicated to producing nuclear weapons. Under U.S. pressure, no western reactor vendors have responded to Pakistani solicitation of bids for their first large nuclear energy generating reactor.

Nevertheless, the Reagan Administration has not demonstrated a firm commitment to combatting nuclear proliferation. Asked about the danger of proliferation in Pakistan and elsewhere, Ronald Reagan stated on January 31, 1980 in Jacksonville, Florida that "I just don't think it's any of our business" if they build nuclear weapons. Subsequently, his Administration brought little pressure to bear against such efforts. In fact, the administration has in effect subsidized the Pakistani nuclear weapons effort. Pakistani leader General Zia has received more than half of a \$3.2 billion U.S. military and economic assistance program. Outside of our Camp David Treaty obligations, this is currently the largest direct U.S. assistance program anywhere in the world. The Reagan Administration stated that this money has been provided to give Pakistan a sense of security by enabling it to build-up its conventional military forces. The Administration hoped Pakistani leaders would then honor their pledges not to pursue a nuclear weapons program. But Pakistan has relentlessly pursued the nuclear path nonetheless.

On April 27, 1981, the eve of Congressional decision to give an unprecedented country-specific nonproliferation waiver for aid to Pakistan, I addressed the Senate. I warned that Congress was being kept in the dark about two facts generally known to experts and analysts: India and Pakistan were preparing nuclear tests sites and Pakistan was nearing completion of a pilot-scale reprocessing plant capable of extracting significant amounts of plutonium that would be usable for nuclear weapons. The Reagan Administration subsequently acknowledged these facts but went ahead with the Pakistan aid program.

Congress has since been given repeated assurances by Administration officials that this \$3.2 billion aid program—along with the sale of 40 F-16 aircraft—has been serving the U.S. interest in checking Pakistan's nuclear weapons drive. Undersecretary of State James Buckley told the Senate Government Affairs Committee on June 24, 1981, "I was assured by the (Pakistani) ministers and by the President (Zia) himself that it was not the intention of the Pakistan Government to develop nuclear weapons." Then on September 16, 1981, Undersecretary Buckley declared "I fully accept the statement of President Zia that Pakistan

has no intention of manufacturing nuclear warheads or acquiring nuclear weapons". And Reagan Administration officials publicly accepted General Zia's pledge of December 9, 1982 before the Foreign Policy Association in New York City when he said:

"I would like to state once again, and with all the emphasis at my command, that our ongoing nuclear program has an exclusively peaceful dimension and that Pakistan has neither the means nor indeed any desire to manufacture a nuclear device."

Such blanket assurances were in no way contradicted by subsequent Reagan Administration statements, including the statement of Secretary Shultz, made last July 4 in Islamabad, when he declared at a news conference:

"The United States Government is not opposing the development of nuclear power for peaceful uses in Pakistan. It was notable to me that President Zia went out of his way to assure me that that, and only that, was the objective of the government of Pakistan."

More recently, in seeking to convince the Senate Foreign Relations Committee not to adopt nuclear nonproliferation restrictions on continued aid to Pakistan Undersecretary of State for Security Assistance, William Schneider, assured the Committee on March 28, 1984:

"The President personally has been engaged in dealing with the follow-up with respect to our nuclear nonproliferation objectives with Pakistan and has had conversations directly with President Zia on this subject. I believe that the matter is being effectively attended to by those means, and hence the goals of (stopping countries from acquiring nuclear weapons) are focused on by that objective."

When pressed by Committee members on these statements, in an April 3, 1984 markup, Undersecretary Schneider reassured senators. "We have made substantial strides with respect to Pakistan's nuclear program", he asserted.

New information on Pakistani nuclear weapons effort

Great strides have not been made in the U.S. effort to stop the Pakistani nuclear weapons program.

I am today releasing substantial new evidence that Pakistan has acquired all the capability necessary to produce their own nuclear weapons.

I base this conclusion on four new facts; (1) Pakistan has operated and expanded its clandestine uranium enrichment facility at Kahuta; (2) Pakistan has operated its clandestine plutonium reprocessing facility at PINSTECH; (3) Pakistan has expanded its nuclear weapons design team at Wah and has stepped up imports of nuclear warhead components; and (4) Pakistan's KANUPP reactor has been subject to continuing chronic failures in its safeguard system, making plutonium diversion highly feasible.

This evidence has come to me on a non-classified basis from a variety of government sources. I have confirmed it to my satisfaction with U.S. officials. None of this information has been volunteered to me in classified briefings by the Administration. Inasmuch as this information does not pertain to any alleged U.S. covert operations, but is required for informed U.S. policymaking, I feel a responsibility to reveal it to Congress.

I have no evidence that Pakistan has actual nuclear bombs in hand, or that Pakistan has already produced a specific amount

of weapons grade material. The Pakistanis may have done so—and simply decided to wait until 1986, after delivery of all the \$3.2 billion in U.S. aid and the 40 F-16's, before they conduct a nuclear explosive test on their own soil. Many well-informed observers believe that Pakistan will not test until 1986. Others believe Pakistan may not need to test because of weapons design information and test data they can get from the People's Republic of China. As with India and Israel, we may never be able to say exactly when it was that Pakistan crossed the threshold to achieve a nuclear weapons capability, or exactly how many bombs they might have in hand at a given time. The point is that they now have what they need to produce their own nuclear weapons. Henceforth, United States security policies must be premised on the fact that Pakistan now has the designs, the hardware, the plants and the personnel capable of producing several nuclear weapons per year. According to my information, this capability will grow to where Pakistan could produce at least a dozen nuclear weapons during the next three or five years if their facilities function smoothly.

Pakistan also has the ability, should it so choose, to export the nuclear-trained technicians, the highly advanced nuclear technology and designs—and perhaps even nuclear weapons—to supportive colleagues in other nations. This export capability and the extent of Pakistan's nuclear weapons capability have far more profound implications than were presented by the Iraqi nuclear program before the Osirak reactor was bombed in 1981.

To assess the new information on the Pakistani program, it is useful to see how they now stand on the basis of five key criteria. These are as follows:

1. Intellectual Resources: Do they have the cadre of trained nuclear scientists, engineers and technicians and an industrial base?
2. Money: Do they have the financial resources necessary for the development of an extensive nuclear arsenal?
3. Production Capacity: Do they have the technology, hardware and operational plants for producing their own weapons-usable material using either (a) uranium enriched by elaborate technology or (b) unsafeguarded nuclear fuel, reactors and advanced spent fuel reprocessing technology for separating plutonium?
4. Design Team: Do they have a nuclear weapons design team capable of producing high confidence weapons and weapons tests for military use?
5. Delivery Capability: Do they have a high-confidence capability for delivering nuclear weapons?

There is substantial evidence that Pakistan has developed all of these capabilities including both uranium enrichment and plutonium recovery. Based on new information I have received, here is how the Pakistani nuclear program stands on the basis of these five key criteria:

1. Intellectual Resources: Pakistan has an extensive cadre of nuclear scientists, technicians, metallurgy experts and engineers. Pakistan has tenaciously accumulated all necessary components for their nuclear bomb building program. For a time, they bought parts on the open market from firms in the U.S., the U.K., France, Switzerland, Italy, Belgium, Sweden and West Germany. Subsequently, elaborate third-country drops have been devised for smuggling and transshipment of needed components from the

west. Highly classified designs and critical subcontractor lists were stolen from the URENCO enrichment plant in Holland. Parts recently intercepted by a belated U.S.-initiated export control effort were subsequently stolen from a customs warehouse in Europe. Exports of key inverter equipment for uranium enrichment were halted first by the British and more recently, by the Canadians.

But components needed for this part of the process are now being handtooled in a specially designed shop constructed at the site of the clandestine Kahuta enrichment facility. The majority of materials smuggled from the west continue to move through Turkey, principally from West German and French companies. But Pakistan already has a significant quantity of all components necessary for a small-scale nuclear weapons program; they are now just expanding their capabilities.

2. Money: Though a single "quick and dirty" nuclear bomb could be produced quite cheaply, Pakistan has spent hundreds of millions of dollars to develop an extensive nuclear capability since Pakistan's Zulfikar Ali Bhutto first promised that "we will eat grass or leaves . . . but we will get one of our own". The Libyans provided some early cash assistance. More recently the Saudis have taken over as significant financial contributors to Pakistan's nuclear effort. And since 1981, Pakistan has enjoyed the subsidy of the \$3.2 billion aid program from the U.S.

3. Production Capacity: (a) Uranium Enrichment—Pakistan imported substantial quantities of uranium from Libya before developing its own uranium mining capability. With the assistance of West German companies, it now has its own uranium fuel fabrication facilities. Following designs which were stolen in Holland, the Pakistanis built a large centrifuge uranium enrichment plant at Kahuta, near Islamabad. By 1983, they had completed nearly 1000 units—enough to produce at least 15 kgs. of weapons-grade highly enriched uranium (HEU) a year. The Kahuta plant is estimated to have a current capacity of 2,000 to 3,000 swu (separative work units). This is enough capacity to produce 45 kgs. of HEU, of which 16 kilograms is deemed more than sufficient for fabricating one nuclear warhead. Pakistan has had numerous difficulties fully mastering the intricate centrifuge technology. These difficulties will doubtless continue. But those who are all too ready to be reassured that after ten years of relentless effort, Pakistan is still not able to build and operate a centrifuge enrichment facility, are mistaken. Pakistan is now enriching uranium and expanding its enrichment capacity. Both General Zia and the director of the Pakistani enrichment effort, A.Q. Khan, have acknowledged reports of successful production at Kahuta. In a February 9, 1984 interview with the Pakistani journal *NAWA-I-WAQT*, Khan was asked: "Can Pakistan make an atomic bomb?" He answered:

"You have me cornered. I do not know whether to say yes or no. Either way, I get caught. First of all, I must say that our atomic program is peaceful . . . The question is now one of our abilities. We have made major strides in this difficult field and we have a team of patriotic scientists and extremely brilliant engineers and local experts in the fields of metallurgy, electronics, mechanical engineers, etc. which is not found elsewhere. In brief, Pakistan has a proficient and patriotic team capable of performing the most difficult tasks. Forty

years ago no one was familiar with the secrets of the atom bomb and education was not so widespread, but American scientists did the job. Today, 40 years later, we have ended their monopoly in this most difficult field of the enrichment of uranium in only 10 years. This job is undoubtedly not beyond our reach. India achieved this 10 years ago, although other countries definitely assisted it. We have the capacity to complete such a task. This is a political decision in which my colleagues and I have no concern except for the sake of the country's safety and security. Our honorable president has to make such a momentous decision and we were entrusted with this duty. We, my friends and I, will stake our lives but we will not disappoint the country and the nation, by the grace of God. In short, I wish to say that if India could accomplish such a feat 10 years ago, we are not so abnormal or mentally retarded that we cannot do this, and God willing, we will do it better as we have proved in the field of uranium enrichment."

Clandestine Pakistani purchases of the technology and hardware almost identical to that used in the Kahuta plant have been accelerated over the past twelve months and are being sent both to Kahuta and to a new underground site in Multan. The latter is nearby a large electric power source necessary for extensive uranium enrichment. The Pakistanis already have a significant stockpile of aluminum centrifuges—ideal for production of weapons-grade material, but of less utility for energy production. And they have stockpiles of baffle connectors to deal with centrifuge vibration, high vacuum valves, and gassification and solidification units. General Zia has permitted Khan to emerge as a national hero in recent Pakistani press interviews. And purchases for Kahuta expansion have accelerated. It is unlikely that either of these developments would have taken place if the Kahuta R&D project had not succeeded in producing weapons-usable uranium. Estimates are that these purchases are suitable for construction of a larger HEU plant with a 6,000 to 8,000 swu annual capacity or 90 to 120 kgs. of HEU (5 to 7 bombs' worth) a year. A recently declassified report, submitted this spring to the Director of the U.S. Defense Nuclear Agency, by the collaborative efforts of more than 90 government and academic experts, estimates Pakistan's maximum production potential as six bombs' worth of highly enriched uranium each year for the latter half of this decade. This estimate would give Pakistan an accrued total of thirty uranium bombs by 1990. (Pakistan's nuclear weapons production rate could be significantly higher if substantial amounts of spent fuel are diverted from Pakistan's KANUPP reactor for plutonium extraction in their PINSTECH facility. If the KANUPP reactor was operated smoothly year round, it could produce enough plutonium for as much as 10 weapons per year, though I believe substantial hurdles remain in the Pakistani reprocessing program which bar extraction of more than a fraction of this total for several years yet.)

(b) Pursuing both avenues to nuclear weapons, Pakistan has also pressed development of a reprocessing capability. 95% of the French plans for a reprocessing plant at Chasma were delivered before the French cancelled the contract on nonproliferation grounds. The Pakistanis are proceeding with work on a Chasma plant, completing civil engineering and building construction at the Chasma site and continuing pur-

chases of needed components in Europe. With a steady supply of plutonium-bearing spent nuclear fuel, Chasma could separate plutonium sufficient for its own substantial nuclear arsenal. Clandestine technology purchases for Chasma have gone forward for more than nine years. But the Pakistanis have lacked a steady source of unsafeguarded spent reactor fuel. Their only power reactor, the Canadian-supplied KANUPP reactor, produces plutonium. But this spent fuel is supposed to be accounted for under the only operative Pakistani agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). In 1981, IAEA officials expressed worries that possible diversions of plutonium bearing fuel from KANUPP may have taken place due to the combination of inadequate safeguards and the ominous development by Pakistan of a capability for fabricating their own uranium fuel not subject to IAEA accounting safeguards. In 1982, Pakistan ran cold tests on an indigenous pilot reprocessing facility, built along Chasma designs, called PINSTECH. Since these cold tests, well-informed observers believe that this facility has "gone hot" and has been in operation with radioactive material. This facility has a production capacity of about 15 kgs. of weapons-usable plutonium per year, or enough for at least one nuclear weapon. Some observers believe that the Pakistanis diverted spent fuel from the KANUPP reactor by mixing their own, unaccounted-for uranium fuel into the reactor and by-passing the faulty IAEA accounting system. These safeguards were, by the admission of the IAEA staff, easily defeatable between the fall of 1980 and the spring of 1983 because of faulty cameras and inadequate accounting procedures—as well as the development of the indigenous Pakistani fuel fabrication capability. Reassurances were subsequently given by IAEA and Reagan Administration officials that these serious deficiencies had been taken care of. But new information indicates that continued chronic failures of monitoring cameras and other suspicious "irregularities" at KANUPP have made routine diversions of Pakistani-produced fuel from KANUPP to a weapons program highly feasible to this day.

4. Design: The Pakistanis have been engaged in advanced nuclear warhead design work since at least 1980, having received design assistance from the People's Republic of China beginning in the late 1970's. Pakistan prepared a nuclear weapons test site in the Baluchistan mountains about 40 miles from the Afghan border in early 1981. These preparations were completed with the installation of extensive cable sensors and construction of a nearby test monitoring facility. This effort may have been a bluff, pressed by Zia in a cat-and-mouse game with the Indians, who were simultaneously digging large holes at their Pokhran test site amidst high security. Or it might have been a genuine preparation with an actual, in-country nuclear test deferred until after Pakistan got all of its 40 F-16's and the U.S. \$3.2 billion in 1986. But the mountain tunnel is still there and the prospective test site remains intact. A nuclear weapons design team ("the Wah group") was assembled and has operated alongside key components of the Pakistani armaments industry at Wah. It includes experts in high explosives, metallurgy and fast electronics. After the 1981 test site preparations, assertions were made by Administration advocates of the Pakistani aid program that this Pakistani weapons design team

had dispersed. That is not true. To the contrary, there is new evidence that this nuclear weapons design team has been expanded and has accelerated its efforts. Pakistan has stepped up clandestine imports of high speed electronics equipment and precision spherical cutting machinery for the nuclear weapons design group at Wah. These are essential components for fabricating nuclear warheads. They have no place whatsoever in a 'peaceful' nuclear energy program.

5. **Delivery Capability:** Pakistan has already received 12 F-16's from the United States. The F-16 is currently the world's most capable penetrating fighter-bomber. Pakistan is slated to receive another 28 in the next several years for a total of 40.

Each of the foregoing Pakistani efforts are essential building blocks for a nuclear arsenal production line. None are appropriate to any civil nuclear energy program that could possibly be developed by Pakistan in the next twenty years. The Pakistanis have only one small power reactor—which runs on natural uranium, not enriched fuel. They have no breeder reactor program, so have no 'legitimate' excuse for crash efforts to separate plutonium. Showy public efforts soliciting bids for Pakistan's first large power reactor to be built at Chasma received no takers.

The Pakistanis have been pursuing nuclear weapons relentlessly for ten years. They have now succeeded in attaining an indigenous capability to produce them.

Implications for U.S. security

This Pakistani nuclear weapons program has grave implications for U.S. national security interests. We stand on the brink of a full-fledged nuclear arms race amongst turbulent third world powers in the globe's most unstable regions.

1. The Pakistani nuclear weapons program increases the danger of the nuclear threshold being breached by a nuclear conflict in the third world—an initially 'regional' nuclear war between Pakistan and India that could bring in their respective patrons, the U.S.S.R. on one side, and the U.S. or the P.R.C. on the other.

2. It increases the likelihood of India's embarking on a dedicated nuclear military program. India is likely to respond to an overt Pakistani nuclear capability by building a large nuclear arsenal and possibly developing thermonuclear weapons.

3. It increases the danger that extremist forces may employ nuclear threats in a "holy war" against India, Israel, or some other nation.

4. It weakens America in the Third World; extensive U.S. financial support for a right-wing military dictator has undermined non-proliferation efforts and helped subsidize a Pakistani bomb.

5. It raises the prospect of a preemptive strike against Pakistan's nuclear facilities. Responsible sources have reported that serious consideration has been given to a strike against Pakistani nuclear facilities, which are heavily guarded (including deployments of French Crotale anti-aircraft missiles at Kahuta). Many Indians perceive this to be the only alternative to a major nuclear weapons program of their own.

6. Finally, it is extremely destabilizing. Along with other potential nuclear forces in the region, it could threaten the very survival of several countries. Quoting the study conducted for the Defense Nuclear Agency: "the small physical size or concentration of population in small areas and the importance of capital cities for national identity means that a minimal Small Nuclear Force

(SNF) could threaten national survival, a fact that would make SNF appearance immensely destabilizing. Oil and other physical assets could also be destroyed more thoroughly and quickly by SNFs than by conventional forces."

Much has been made of the extent to which the Pakistani nuclear program has been supported and advanced as promising an "Islamic bomb." It is fair to ask whether it is in the Pakistanis' eye—or in the eyes of nervous Americans or Israelis or Hindus—that this nuclear program is so viewed.

One should be reluctant to brand people and characterize forces poorly understood in the west. But concerns about the use of the military potential of Pakistan's nuclear bomb in a "holy war" seem justified by the words of the program's architects. At some point, one has to take seriously the statements of Pakistan's leaders. Let me quote from General Zia: "China, India, the USSR and Israel possess the atomic arms. No Muslim country has any. If Pakistan had such a weapon, it would reinforce the power of the Muslim world." Or as Prime Minister Bhutto wrote in his memoirs: "We know that Israel and South Africa have full nuclear capability. The Christian, Jewish and Hindu civilization have this capability. The Communist powers also possess it. Only the Islamic civilization was without it, but that position was about to change" (with the advent of Bhutto's nuclear program).

Most to the point are recent statements by Dr. A.Q. Khan, whom the Pakistani journal NAWA-I-WAQT on March 16 of this year called "the world renowned and legendary-in-his-lifetime Dr. Khan."

In his startlingly frank interview with NAWA-I-WAQT published on February 10 of this year, the "father" of the Pakistani bomb stated:

"All the Western countries including Israel are not only Pakistan's enemies but also enemies of Islam. If some other Muslim country had accomplished the same thing (as Pakistan's breakthrough on uranium enrichment), the same venomous and false propaganda would have been conducted against it as well. The examples of Iraq and Libya are before you. Even though these countries are not capable of manufacturing an atomic bomb for a long time yet, western media sources are conducting a violent propaganda campaign against them. All this is part of the crusades which the Christians and Jews initiated against the Muslims 1000 years ago. They are afraid that if Pakistan makes obvious progress in this field that the whole Islamic world will stand to benefit."

Khan went on to charge that "the 'Islamic bomb' is a figment of the Zionist mind and this has been used full force by the anti-Islamic Western countries." He insisted that the only reason he was convicted of stealing sensitive nuclear design information by a Dutch court was that "all these charges and court cases were imposed at the insistence of Zionists and Western anti-Islam elements."

It is of concern to the United States that General Zia could use this program in coming months to assert leadership in the Moslem world and use his facilities in Pakistan as a magnet for training scientists from the several nations to which he is in debt (such as Saudi Arabia and Libya), or with whom he otherwise needs to curry favor, like his neighbor Iran. Despite Zia's radical program of Islamization in Pakistan—which includes judicial sentences of public flogging, stoning and amputation—General Zia is still pressed in Pakistan by extreme fun-

damentalist forces. General Zia has reason to fear the Ayatollah Khomeini's forces, as well as those forces in Pakistan who believe Zia has not gone far enough to advance fundamentalist causes. Will men like Khan help other fundamentalist scientists in Iran, Libya or the P.L.O.? Will they export plans, designs, hardware, technology, or weapons-usable materials with or without General Zia's approval? Will they train scientists who will help still more extremist nations or terrorist groups? Will they make nuclear threats in subsequent regional wars? And how responsible will General Zia's successor be with nuclear weapons—a successor who is likely to come from among the more extreme fundamentalists? The answers could have grave ramifications for American interests in the Middle East and South Asia.

Intelligence withheld or ignored

Before I make several policy recommendations, I want to say a word about informed policy-making. There is a systematic Reagan Administration pattern of ignoring—or withholding—the bad news on nonproliferation.

The new evidence on Pakistan leads one to question whether there has been a serious intelligence failure or a deliberate misrepresentation of the facts by the Reagan Administration.

Similarly, the Administration has repeatedly dodged Congressional inquiries on the appropriateness of the pending nuclear agreement with China in light of China's assistance to Pakistan's nuclear weapons program. Did the President know of this assistance when he hastily concluded the U.S.-P.R.C. nuclear agreement? If he did, why has he withheld official confirmation of these facts to Congress? If he did not, why was he operating in ignorance when the April, 1984, agreement was concluded in Beijing? Whichever is the case, the result of this slobby diplomacy may seriously set back both U.S.-China relations and nonproliferation efforts. Already, the U.S.-China nuclear agreement, once hailed as the major diplomatic breakthrough of this Administration has been sidetracked and withheld from Congress.

Mr. President, Administration officials are now confirming to the press what they have refused to confirm to Congress—that is the fact that China has played an important role in Pakistan's development of a nuclear weapons capability. The Administration has refused repeated and specific requests from many of us in Congress for more information on this key issue. They have begrudgingly come up for a few one-on-one briefings of some Hill leaders—and then still insisted in these closed meetings that they can't talk about China because it is too sensitive.

It is now clear that this break-through is a disaster. This "China card" may turn out to be a joker. The Administration is backing away. They had an agreement with inadequate verification procedures which did not protect American security interests. And they initialed a document that may be in violation of provisions of U.S. law governing the re-export of U.S.-supplied sensitive nuclear materials. An Administration obsessed with verification has failed to provide for adequate verification of a major nuclear accord with a communist power.

I understand that, as usual, the White House is trying to blame this all on Congress, saying the China agreement is dead for now because of Congressional opposition. That is nonsense. I know of no one who has yet taken a position of opposition

to this agreement. But we do want to see an official copy of the still-secret text and be reassured that U.S. security and nonproliferation interests are protected. And we want more information about China's assistance to Pakistan for the record.

What type of help has China given for Pakistan's clandestine uranium enrichment facility at Kahuta? What type of nuclear weapons design information has China provided to Pakistan? What of the persistent unconfirmed reports that China tested a weapon for Pakistan in the spring of 1983 and has provided Pakistan with test data? Has Pakistan imported plutonium-bearing spent fuel from China to reprocess in their PINSTECH facility? There are many questions that this Administration needs to provide answers to before Congress can make a better-informed judgment on the wisdom of nuclear trade with the PRC. I will have more to say on this subject in the days ahead.

I have carefully monitored developments in the Pakistani nuclear program since well before the beginnings of the U.S. aid program in 1981. Close Congressional scrutiny of this program has been acutely needed under the Reagan Administration. It has become clear that certain Reagan Administration State Department officials have a vested interest in obscuring, withholding or downright misrepresenting the facts about Pakistan's program. I have repeatedly expressed my objection to this practice; it contravenes the statutory obligation of the Executive Branch to keep Congress "fully and currently informed" on nuclear proliferation developments relevant to national security policymaking.

Reagan Administration officials have not been forthcoming about repeated I.A.E.A. safeguards deficiencies in Pakistan. They belittled Iraq's growing nuclear capabilities. They kept silent on the P.R.C.'s assistance to Pakistan's nuclear weapons program. And Administration officials have withheld new information on Pakistan's continuing nuclear weapons production effort.

I have thus found it necessary to share with my colleagues information I have received independently, information which has been generally known among informed observers, but which has not been officially conveyed to Congress. This has been a consequence of the unwise and unacceptable politicization of intelligence on these issues undertaken by the Reagan administration—and of their failure to give us timely and complete classified briefings.

New policy initiatives

The United States has an overriding national security interest in checking the growth of Pakistan's nuclear weapons capability and averting a move by Pakistan, India and other regional powers to the announced deployment of nuclear weapons. We must take every practical initiative to discourage the continuing Pakistani nuclear weapons drive and to avert any possible use of nuclear weapons by Pakistan, or any other nation. It is essential for Congress and the Reagan Administration to put nuclear nonproliferation again at the very top of our list of priorities. We must do more with our allies; we must push harder on the I.A.E.A.; we must press harder on Pakistan. And we must get serious about curbing the bloated U.S. and Soviet arsenals—which make those of emerging nuclear weapons states pale in comparison.

The American people must no longer subsidize Pakistan's nuclear weapons development. Therefore, when the Senate takes up

the foreign aid bill in the days ahead, I will move to bar all further military assistance to Pakistan until all of that nation's nuclear facilities are placed under international inspection and until President Reagan can certify that the U.S. has absolutely reliable assurances that Pakistan has halted its nuclear weapons drive. American tax dollars should not be subsidizing nuclear weapons development by a right-wing military dictator. The alleged justification for this \$300 million a year military assistance program—to make General Zia feel militarily secure so he wouldn't pursue nuclear weapons—ceased to exist long ago. To continue this expenditure is like paying ransom money after the kidnap victim has been found dead.

Providing General Zia the best penetrating fighter-bomber for delivering nuclear weapons is simply not in our national security interest. Therefore, I will move at the appropriate time to bar any further transfer of U.S.-built F-16's to Pakistan until all of that nation's nuclear facilities are placed under international inspection and until President Reagan can certify that the U.S. has absolutely reliable assurances that Pakistan has halted its nuclear weapons drive.

I call upon the Reagan Administration to work with Congress to make these sanctions meaningful so that they might further U.S. policy interests.

I call upon the Reagan Administration also to reinvigorate its efforts to work with NATO allies and nuclear exporters to stop once and for all the flow of any more dual-use items that are being used in Pakistan's nuclear weapons program. Despite bipartisan efforts under the Ford and Carter Administrations, these sales continue. The Reagan Administration has an obligation to defend our security interests by pressing other nations to halt these exports.

I call upon the Reagan Administration to address more effectively our obligation under Article VI of the NPT "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date." The Administration's refusal to pursue a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban (CTB) has been a major setback to nonproliferation efforts and is inconsistent with our Article VI obligations. The failure to achieve any progress on a START, INF, or ASAT treaty has also weakened the entire nuclear nonproliferation effort.

And I call upon the Reagan Administration to address the grave threat nuclear proliferation poses to the security of our people. For nearly four years, Reagan Administration policymakers have failed to give this issue the seriousness it deserves. Reagan Administration officials have failed to press the issue with allies in Europe and to discuss it at annual summit meetings with them. Reagan Administration officials have failed to heed the warnings of allies most threatened by proliferation developments. Reagan Administration officials have failed to keep the Congress fully and currently informed on proliferation developments relevant to national policymaking. Reagan Administration officials have shunted aside evidence of serious threats to our interests. And Reagan Administration officials have refused to accept the failure of lavish U.S. assistance to stop Pakistan's acquisition of nuclear weapons capability.

Every step the Reagan Administration can now take to reduce the dangers of nuclear proliferation will warrant Congressional support. The time for getting on with this essential task has long passed.

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

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there are no more takers for morning business, I am told. We cannot get on the conference report until about 1:30 p.m.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess until the hour of 1:30 p.m. today.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:24 p.m., recessed until 1:30 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. RUDMAN].

URGENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1984—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, under the previous order, I submit a report of the committee of conference on House Joint Resolution 492 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill joint resolution (H.J. Res. 492) making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, for the Department of Agriculture, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of May 17, 1984.)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATFIELD. 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. HATFIELD. Mr. President, at long last, we have before us the conference agreement on House Joint Resolution 492. This measure was originated by the House in February and was to provide an urgently needed supplemental appropriation for emer-

gency food relief in Africa. We received the joint resolution on March 7. Despite my request that the measure be held at the desk and passed expeditiously, it was referred to committee and amended. It was further amended during the 9 days that the measure was debated on the Senate floor. Finally on May 17, the committee of conference reported an agreement on most of the amendments of the Senate. That report was passed by the House on May 24. Senate action has been awaited since.

The delays experienced in the consideration of this measure have made immediate action all the more critical. The original purpose of House Joint Resolution 492 was to appropriate \$150 million for food aid to African nations suffering from a devastating drought. Although \$90 million of this amount was provided in a measure enacted earlier this year, the balance of \$60 million in this joint resolution is still urgently needed to more adequately address the widespread hunger and starvation confronting these countries.

In addition to these funds, the Senate added several supplemental items which must be enacted now to prevent disruptions or terminations of important domestic programs. Among these items are \$300 million for the Women, Infants and Children [WIC] Food Program and \$545 million for the Child Nutrition Programs. The Government is already out of funds for several meal service activities, including the school lunch, school breakfast, and child care programs. Furthermore, unless we enact appropriations for the WIC program by July 1, States will be forced to curtail or terminate this program.

The conference agreement also includes an appropriation of \$100 million for the Summer Youth Employment Program. Because of a change in the allocation process and a reduction in overall funding, many urban areas are confronted with drastic cuts in the summer jobs program at a time when youth unemployment levels are the highest in history. The additional funding contained in this measure will restore most of these reductions, but these funds must be made available now if they are to be used this summer.

Among the other items included in the conference agreement are \$62 million for additional assistance to El Salvador, \$7 million for displaced persons of that nation, funding to maintain the Civil Aeronautics Board, and \$25 million to acquire aircraft for drug interdiction.

Mr. President, the measure before us contains a number of very important and urgently needed appropriations. It reflects a generally good compromise on the 36 separate amendments of the Senate, some of which were very diffi-

cult to resolve. I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. President, at this time, let me yield to the ranking member of the committee, Senator STENNIS, for any opening remarks the Senator may wish to offer. Then we will proceed with the amendments in disagreement, and particularly the ones which I think are noncontroversial.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber? I have not been able to hear the distinguished chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I will just announce that I am ready for us to proceed. Because of the noise in the Chamber, I was unable to hear all that the Senator covered in his remarks. In a general way, I know the substance of his remarks, and I believe I am in full accord with what he said. We can proceed now under his leadership.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATFIELD. 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. LEVIN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Oregon and the majority leader for the assurance they have given regarding amendment No. 14 relative to aid to the Contras in Nicaragua.

The fact that they indicated they intended to move to recede to the House position assumes quick passage with broad support of this urgent supplemental.

It makes sense in terms of foreign policy and in terms of the many needed items in this bill, such as summer youth employment, rural housing insurance, food relief for Africa, and child nutrition in this country.

Mr. GARN. Mr. President, the primary focus of interest in House Joint Resolution 492 has been the El Salvador aid amendments. The underlying bill however, is a supplemental agriculture appropriation for fiscal year 1984. It is the agricultural part of the bill I would like to address at this time.

House Joint Resolution 492 now contains language changing the very low income targetting provision for homeownership loans passed by Congress last November. The housing bill required that 40 percent of subsidized homeownership loans be made to very low-income families.

Farmers Home chose to administer that requirement in a way that severely restricted program use. Senator COCHRAN had a provision in the Senate passed version of House Joint Resolution 492 to free up the funds by converting 40 percent of loans to a set aside of 40 percent of funds for very low income home buyers. This action would have released the remainder of funds for immediate use.

Unfortunately the Conference report contains the House provision reducing the set aside for very low income families to 30 percent of funds for fiscal year 1984. I also hear that the fiscal year 1985 appropriations bill contains this reduction. While I am willing to accept this provision for this year as a transition, I strongly oppose any change to the targetting for fiscal year 1985.

The Banking Committee is preparing legislation along the lines of Senator COCHRAN's original amendment that will prevent Farmers Home from applying its restrictions in fiscal year 1985. This bill will reaffirm the commitment to targetting 40 percent of loan funds to very poor families. The House has already passed the Rural Housing Assistance Act of 1984 which has a different approach to the problem but it, too, reaffirms 40 percent targetting for very poor families.

A topic of confusion has been the definition of very low income families and what income limits to apply. After years of confusion, the November housing bill required Farmers Home to use definitions consistent with the other housing subsidy programs. The interesting result has been to raise the income limits for a family of four over the old Farmers Home limits in 2,696 counties, that is 87 percent of all counties.

The HUD income limits are adjusted on a regular basis using the latest census data. The latest limits were published on May 16, 1984. These county-by-county income ceilings are adjusted upward for very poor counties in order to prevent these areas from being cut out of all housing subsidy programs. Likewise, HUD lowers the effect on Farmers Home of tilting program use to the poorer, more rural areas.

I want to emphasize at this point that the set aside of 40 percent of funds for very low-income families is realistic and achievable. A GAO analysis of 1983 Farmers Home Loans shows that 28 percent of loans were to very poor families according to the new consistent definition. This was achieved without any special program focus.

An unfortunate fact is that the average home built under this program is more expensive than the modest basic home that is affordable even with a 1-percent interest loan. The Banking

Committee is working with Farmers Home to promote lower cost housing so that more poor families can be served. There were specific provisions in the November housing bill to encourage lower cost housing. Unfortunately, these provisions have not yet been implemented by Farmers Home.

Indeed, the most notable action taken by FMHA this year has been to request authority to transfer funds out of housing into another program. Senator HUMPHREY and I have written to Mr. Shuman asking him to reaffirm the commitment of Farmers Home to improving housing in rural areas by withdrawing the request.

I am confident that my colleagues support our efforts to make the Farmers Home Loan Program more effective for very poor families. I want to express my opposition to any reductions of the targeting requirement in fiscal year 1985.

HOUSING ISSUE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, as you may recall, during original Senate consideration of House Joint Resolution 492, I offered an amendment dealing with the Farmers Home Administration section 502 housing program. The purpose of my amendment was to provide a mechanism by which Farmers Home could obligate funds for low-income housing applicants without waiting until enough very low income applications had been approved to meet the 40-percent requirement as provided for in the rural housing amendments approved last November.

The effect of this 40-percent requirement, and the States' inability to meet this requirement, has been a reduced level of obligation of the housing funds appropriated for this fiscal year. This amendment would allow those funds to be obligated at the full level of the appropriation.

My amendment divided the housing money into two pots—60 percent for low income loans and 40 percent for very low income. This correlates to the authorizing legislation which called for 40 percent of the housing loans to go to very low income borrowers. As of March 31, only 28 percent of the housing funds had been obligated for very low income loans. For this reason, the conferees agreed to provide 30 percent of the funds for very low income and 70 percent for low income. Another reason for using 30 percent rather than 40 percent is that the authorization called for 40 percent nationally, but not less than 30 percent in each State to go to very low income borrowers. Farmers Home regulations do not allow any State to drop below 40 percent. For many States, the 40-percent rate is not feasible.

This provision applies only to the remainder of fiscal year 1984. I understand that the authorizing committee is in the process of drafting technical legislation to deal with this problem in

future years. I am hopeful that this legislation will be considered expeditiously.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, I am very pleased that with the \$21 million included in this bill we will now be able to proceed with implementation of critically needed non-structural components of the section 202 flood prevention program.

I further understand that these funds will provide for a balanced implementation of flood plain measures throughout the program area and, in particular, with regard to the portion of these funds to be used in Kentucky, they would be distributed between the Big Sandy and Upper Cumberland Basins. Is this your understanding?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, the conference report now before the Senate contains several items falling under the jurisdiction of the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee. The joint explanatory statement describes the conference agreement on these items; therefore, only a brief description is necessary at this point.

Mr. President, several programs for which funds are provided in this bill have reached a critical point. Funds for some accounts have been completely depleted, while another program is expected to run out of money next month.

The supplemental appropriation for child nutrition programs will provide necessary additional funding for the school lunch, school breakfast, summer food care, and child care food programs. As of June 15, 1984, there were no funds available to reimburse the States for the cost of any of these programs.

Funds for the Women, Infants, and Children [WIC] Program are due to expire in mid-July. Unless we act before the recess, many States will completely shut down the program rather than absorb the cost and wait reimbursement. This will cause the 3 million participants, who are already at nutritional risk, to go without the nutritional foods they need and can obtain through this program.

These are the most critical items in this bill, although the other items which the conferees agreed to are also urgent in nature: Expansion of Commodity Credit Corporation guaranteed export loans; release of Farmers Home Administration housing funds for low-income borrowers; and the original single item in this bill, the additional Public Law 480 Emergency Aid for Africa.

The critical situation which exists in these programs makes it essential that we take action before the recess. I urge expedient action on this conference agreement.

A more detailed account of those items dealing with the agriculture,

rural development, and related agencies appropriations bill follows:

The conferees agreed to include \$60 million for title II of Public Law 480 for Emergency Food Assistance to Africa. Earlier this year, \$90 million was appropriated in House Joint Resolution 493 (Public Law 98-248). The joint explanatory statement contains language which earmarks \$5 million of available Public Law 480 title II funds for the Philippines and which provides that section 416 surplus agricultural commodities should be made available to help feed the Guatemalan refugees in Mexico on an expedited basis.

The House conferees accepted the Senate amendments which provide an additional \$545,544,000 for the child nutrition programs and an additional \$300 million for the feeding program for women, infants, and children [WIC].

The conference agreement also provides that 70 percent of the rural housing funds made available in fiscal year 1984 shall be made available for low-income borrowers and 30 percent for very low-income borrowers. Last November, the Congress passed legislation which required the Farmers Home Administration [FmHA] to provide 40 percent to persons or families with very low income and 60 percent to those with low incomes. In implementing the law, however, Farmers Home refused to distribute the low income until the 40-percent ratio was met. This should allow all States ample opportunity to process loans and obligate funds at their normal levels.

A final item in the conference agreement provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC] shall guarantee not less than \$5 billion in short-term credit loans for the purposes of expanding sales of U.S. agricultural commodities.

Mr. President, two other items under the subcommittee's jurisdiction—authority for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to borrow \$50 million from the Secretary of the Treasury and \$175 million for titles I and III of Public Law 480—were deferred until the general supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. President, I support this conference agreement.

URGENT SUPPLEMENTAL FOR AGRICULTURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I rise in support of this conference report on the urgent supplemental for agriculture, because it contains much needed funding for various child nutrition programs, as well as Public Law 480, the Food for Peace Program.

CHILD NUTRITION FUNDS

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Nutrition, the Senator from Kansas is very concerned about the current funding situation for the Special Supplemental Food Program for

Women, Infants, and Children, usually referred to as WIC. As it now stands, this program is only funded through July 10, and the Congress is scheduled to go into the July recess at the end of next week. An additional \$300 million is needed to provide funding through the end of this fiscal year, in order to maintain the current caseload of 2.96 million women, infants, and children.

In addition, this supplemental contains \$545 million for other child nutrition programs, including the School Lunch and Breakfast Programs. This money is necessary to cover the annual shortfall.

PUBLIC LAW 480 FUNDS

At times, this urgent supplemental has been called the Public Law 480 supplemental, because it contains the balance of the total \$150 million in funds for the Food for Peace Program; \$90 million has already been provided to relieve the crisis hunger situation in Africa, which has occurred as a result of the severe drought conditions there. This urgent supplemental contains the remaining \$60 million in the President's request. World hunger remains a pressing concern for the wealthy food-producing nations who try to respond to the best of their ability in emergency situations, like what we have now in Africa. With the passage of this additional funding, the United States will be able to provide the entire \$150 million that we committed for relief of this hunger emergency.

URGENT NEED FOR WIC FUNDING

Mr. President, because we are getting closer to the wire for WIC Program funding, the situation is most urgent. This program deals with low-income pregnant women, infants, and children, who are certified to be at nutritional risk. If the funds are not put out there for the States, the States will be forced to cut back their caseloads, and nobody in Congress wants this to happen.

WIC'S GREAT TRACK RECORD

Perhaps more than any other Federal nutrition program, WIC has a strong performance record, as well as strong bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress. WIC has earned this high regard, because it is free from the fraud, waste, and abuse that continues to mar the image of the Food Stamp Program, for example.

WIC is a true nutrition program whose benefits are tailored to meet the special nutrition needs of the recipients it serves. Evaluation studies indicate the WIC Program has been cost effective in both health and dollar terms. A major study at the Harvard School of Public Health found that each \$1 spent in the prenatal component of WIC saves \$3 in hospitalization costs due to the reduced number of low birthweight infants requiring expensive neonatal care.

Members on both sides of the aisle are well aware of the tremendous track record this program has maintained. It speaks very highly of WIC, that, at a time when other Federal nutrition programs were undergoing significant budget reductions, the WIC Program was allowed to expand. The number of WIC Program participants has grown from 2.1 million in 1981 to about 3 million in 1983. Back in 1981, the Federal Government invested about \$890 million in WIC, and we are now spending about \$1.4 billion on this very worthwhile program.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Mr. President, I would like to thank the distinguished chairman and ranking minority members of the Appropriations Committee and Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee for being sensitive to the urgent funding situation facing the WIC Program, and doing everything possible to provide the necessary funding before the Congress adjourns for the July recess. I would also like to commend the majority leader for his expeditious handling of the situation.

For a while, the funding status for WIC was beginning to remind me of the process we used to go through with Food Stamp Program supplementals. It is the hope of the Senator from Kansas that this additional WIC funding will be in place by the time it is needed on July 10.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I have a conference report at the desk on House Joint Resolution 492. I urge adoption of the conference report. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BAKER. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. ABDNOR], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Florida [Mrs. HAWKINS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. HEINZ], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. JEPSEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. LAXALT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WEICKER] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. HEINZ] would vote "yea."

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. EAGLETON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. HART], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], the

Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. TSONGAS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] would vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KASTEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 2, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 155 Leg.)

YEAS—79

Andrews	Exon	Mitchell
Armstrong	Ford	Moynihan
Baker	Garn	Murkowski
Bentsen	Glenn	Nickles
Biden	Goldwater	Nunn
Bingaman	Gorton	Packwood
Boren	Grassley	Quayle
Boschwitz	Hatch	Randolph
Bradley	Hatfield	Riegle
Bumpers	Hecht	Roth
Burdick	Helms	Rudman
Byrd	Hollings	Sarbanes
Chafee	Huddleston	Sasser
Chiles	Inouye	Simpson
Cohen	Johnston	Specter
Cranston	Kassebaum	Stafford
D'Amato	Kasten	Stennis
Danforth	Lautenberg	Symms
DeConcini	Levin	Thurmond
Denton	Long	Tower
Dixon	Lugar	Trible
Dodd	Mathias	Wallop
Dole	Matsunaga	Warner
Domenici	Mattingly	Wilson
Durenberger	McClure	Zorinsky
East	Melcher	
Evans	Metzenbaum	

NAYS—2

Baucus Proxmire

NOT VOTING—19

Abdnor	Humphrey	Pressler
Cochran	Jepsen	Pryor
Eagleton	Kennedy	Stevens
Hart	Laxalt	Tsongas
Hawkins	Leahy	Weicker
Heflin	Pell	
Heinz	Percy	

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to explain the parliamentary situation we are in at the moment.

We have now adopted a conference report on the urgent supplemental. We have eight amendments in disagreement with the House that we will have to take up one by one. I believe that only one of them represents a controversy that has to do with Nicaragua.

At an appropriate time, I plan to move, as the manager of the bill, to rescind the Senate position on that issue, which would excise the whole Nicaraguan issue from the bill.

The only other controversy I know of is not a controversy, but an amendment that will be offered by the Senator from Montana relating to language in the bill dealing with commodity support aid which he wishes to change. There will be reluctance on the part of the managers of the bill to accept the change, primarily on the basis that we want to put this bill through as expeditiously as possible; and we have had so much delay in it already that there are many things in this bill that are now reaching a critical stage—the WIC Program, the Child Nutrition Program, the Summer Youth Program, and many others.

If we can hold this bill to the outline I have just given, it can be on the President's desk in very short order. That does not in any way address the merits of the case the Senator from Montana will offer in his amendment. It merely explains the procedure we are hoping to follow.

After we dispose of the amendment that will be offered by the Senator from Montana, it may then be possible to set this whole bill aside temporarily for the consideration of the State-Justice-Commerce appropriations bill and then come back and finish this bill at a later hour this afternoon.

I am told by the leadership that we plan on finishing both of these bills today, and I think we can do it rather expeditiously.

I merely wanted to outline that situation in the Senate now.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be in order.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. I have yielded to the Senator from Montana, I believe, for a question. I am happy to yield the floor.

Mr. MELCHER. No.

I just want the chairman to respond if he would. I thank him for yielding.

The procedure on the conference report on the urgent supplemental will be one, since it is a House bill, to return it to the House, and under their procedures they will vote then on concurrence with the actions taken by the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. HATFIELD. No. If the Senate is able to keep this clean, in effect, of changes, then it will be sort of a pro forma action taken under the precedent of 1944.

If the Senate then changes this bill, that is, if we add new language, then it has to be reconsidered by the House of Representatives. It opens then the bill up for all kinds of other actions the

House of Representatives may see fit to take.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, if the chairman will yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MELCHER. Does the Chair explain the parliamentary procedures of the House of Representatives?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. MELCHER. Then, if the chairman will yield further, I might state as a former House Member and one who has just recently checked on the general procedures in the House of Representatives, when this bill is returned to the House of Representatives without Nicaraguan aid or other actions we might take here, the usual procedure of the House will be to concur in the bill and probably take a voice vote.

Mr. HATFIELD. Let me explain it this way then: When I move to recede from the original Senate amendment dealing with Nicaragua, that totally excises the issue from the whole consideration. So, consequently, there is no new matter in issue.

If we vote to amend one of these matters and incorporate that as a Senate action and send that back to the House of Representatives, then that is a point of issue that has to be determined by the House of Representatives as to whether to incorporate it in the joint resolution.

Now they may decide to formalize the approval of the Senate excising the Nicaraguan issue. That is still within their prerogative. But they are required to deal with an amendment to the substance of an amendment in disagreement which I believe the Senator from Montana is going to attempt to do. That clearly requires further substantive House action on the action of the Senate.

That is my understanding, I say to the Senator from Montana. I am not an expert on House procedure, but I am told that that is the procedure the House of Representatives will have to follow.

I am also further informed that the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, the Congressman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], in all probability will oppose the change offered by the Senator from Montana if it is incorporated in an amendment in disagreement. Therefore, that almost assures House action from both the parliamentary procedure angle and from the policy question as well.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HATFIELD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BUMPERS. How many amendments are there in disagreement on this bill?

Mr. HATFIELD. There are eight.

Mr. BUMPERS. Let me see if I can say just for my own edification and have the Senator either agree or disagree with it. We can either recede on all eight points, in which case the bill is then passed, is that correct?

Mr. HATFIELD. The Senator is correct, concurrence with the House amendments will clear the measure for White House action.

Mr. BUMPERS. We can also amend any one of the eight amendments in disagreement, is that correct?

Mr. HATFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BUMPERS. In which case it has to go back to the House of Representatives and the whole thing is opened up again; is that correct?

Mr. HATFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BUMPERS. Is the bill amendable in any other way except on the amendment in disagreement?

Mr. HATFIELD. No.

Earlier on I suggested we take out the Nicaraguan one for separate consideration and one other for the amendable vehicle and adopt the others en bloc. There was some question raised at that point whether that would receive a unanimous-consent agreement.

So I was seeking to protect the rights of Senators who wanted to amend this in some way or another.

But the situation is as the Senator from Arkansas has stated it. If we made one change in this particular substantive issue on any one of these amendments it goes back to the House of Representatives for reconsideration.

Now, again, I emphasize if we remove any issue such as the Nicaraguan one on the motion that I will make at that time to recede from the Senate original amendment, which then excises the entire issue from the measure. There is no issue at hand because the House action was also to delete funds, as the Senator knows.

Mr. BUMPERS. Does the Senator from Montana propose suggesting an amendment to the Nicaraguan aid?

Mr. HATFIELD. No. The Senator from Montana is proposing to amend amendment No. 5, which is the first one, and the Chair lays before the Senate these amendments in the order in which they appear in the bill unless by unanimous consent others are superseded.

No. 5 provides up to \$90 million of Commodity Credit Corporation agricultural commodities may be sold for African food relief. That is the first amendment.

Otherwise, if we approved that amendment as the House has agreed to it, that removes that as an issue. If, however, it is amended by the Senator from Montana, then it forces the whole issue to go back to the House of Representatives.

Mr. BUMPERS. I thank the Senator.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT TO SENATE
AMENDMENT NUMBERED 5

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendment which will be the vehicle for the Senator from Montana to amend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment in disagreement.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the aforesaid resolution, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the matter stricken by said amendment, and insert: through March 31, 1985; and in addition not to exceed \$90,000,000, shall be available through September 30, 1985, from Commodity Credit Corporation inventory for sale on a competitive bid basis or barter to the African countries requiring emergency food assistance, or any country for use in assisting in emergency food assistance to Africa. In the event Commodity Credit Corporation stocks are not available, the Corporation may purchase commodities to meet emergency requirements.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, what I am going to propose is a correction of what I assume were good faith mistakes in understanding what the Senate had included in this bill when it acted on it several weeks ago. We passed here a sense-of-Congress resolution, and I will state it:

It is the sense of Congress that in cooperation with the Government of Mexico, the newly-enacted authority under section 416 of the Agricultural Act dealing with U.S. surplus wheat and dairy products shall be used on an expedited basis to make these commodities available to help feed the Guatemalan refugees in Mexico.

Mr. President, that is the sum and substance of the sense-of-Congress amendment that was adopted. But, when it got into conference, the House of Representatives believing that they were accomplishing the same purposes adopted language in this conference report.

And I will read that in its entirety. It is very short.

Amendment No. 36: Deletes Senate language expressing the sense of the Congress that in cooperation with the Government of Mexico surplus wheat and dairy products shall be used on an expedited basis to make commodities available to help feed Guatemalan refugees in Mexico. The conferees have agreed that such assistance should be provided to Guatemalan refugees and will expect that surplus agricultural commodities will be made available for such humanitarian efforts.

Mr. President, I do not have any problem with the general tone of the report language except it left out the key parts of the sense of Congress amendment dealing with this matter. Those key parts are this: Section 416 of the Agricultural Act is mentioned in

the sense of the Congress amendment but not in the report language and section 416 of the Agricultural Act deals with dairy products and, since we amended this last March and April, also wheat. So it deals specifically with those two commodities and only with those two commodities. And this is important and significant in that those are the commodities that we have in abundant surplus, and, therefore, are available at all times.

Second, the report language dropped the phrase "expedited basic," and that was in there very specifically to encourage and to require both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State, through the Agency for International Development, to finalize the regulations dealing with section 416. Without those regulations we find it very cumbersome for another country or for a private voluntary organization to apply for these commodities and get their application approved.

Now, these are significant problems and they are problems that have been dealt with by Congress in cooperation with the administration because the amendments that we adopted for section 416 were the same amendments that the administration approves of. So we are working in concert, trying to clear up the redtape that gets involved with food aid. We are at the point right now where the regulations need to be finalized and the language of my amendment is a method of just demonstrating Congress' intent that this be done so rapidly.

Now there is a third reason why the language that was adopted by the Senate is imperative, and that is this: It has been over 20 years since there has been any application from the Government of Mexico for food aid under title II of Public Law 480—Food for Peace from the United States. They have not applied for title II food aid of Public Law 480 during this past generation and indeed it has been their policy to believe that it was sort of a charity. Section 416, however, is not viewed that way by the Mexican Government and we have been working with them in adopting amendments to section 416 to get an acceptable method for them to accept food aid.

Now, the reason we want to get this food aid to the refugees is, first of all, humanitarian. There is no money involved in this, since 416 is surplus commodities that we have in our stocks under the Credit Commodity Corporation.

What we seek to do is to correct what are honest errors made in the conference in eliminating the specifics of the simple sense of the Congress amendment that is involved here.

The policy that we would like to emphasize is that the United States uses

food to help the hungry and to help those in most need of it.

Now, the Guatemalan Indian refugees are, in general, Mayans. They have fled their homeland and they are seeking safety and refuge in Mexico. The reason they have left Guatemala is harassment and brutality, sometimes actual killing by the Guatemalan army against mostly Mayan Indians. They live for the most part in rural areas; sometimes their homes are burned, destroyed; sometimes entire villages are leveled and destroyed.

I cannot understand this harassment and brutality and killing against the Indian population in Guatemala. But the result of it has been that the Indians have sought to leave Guatemala. They are not rebels nor insurgents against the Government of Guatemala, but the brutality and the killing has forced them to leave their land, to leave their homes, to leave their villages and seek asylum and safety in Mexico.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MELCHER. Yes; I am delighted to yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON. As one supporter of this amendment, I think all of us supported it when it was earlier in the Senate. I ask these questions as a supporter. First of all, this is only a sense-of-the-Senate amendment, is it not?

Mr. MELCHER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Second, this amendment was first passed by the Senate and was in conference but was rejected by the House conferees, and the Senate conferees therefore went along with this. So this has been disposed of in conference already, is that not correct?

Mr. MELCHER. Yes; it was relegated to the two or three sentences that I read in the committee on conference report.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. WHITTEN, continues to oppose this sense-of-the-Senate resolution, does he not?

Mr. MELCHER. Chairman WHITTEN has previously expressed to me the feeling that the sense-of-the-Congress resolution was adequately taken care of in the few lines in the report. He said he had no prejudice against it, but I think the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee has said that he has a feeling that Chairman WHITTEN is opposed to it and now I believe the Senator from Louisiana has expressed that feeling; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Well, really it is a question on my part. I have heard that he continues to be opposed to it, again, maybe not on the merits, but procedurally. And that being so, I wonder if we could not find another vehicle. This is an urgent supplemental. The WIC Program, the feeding programs,

the summer jobs programs, are all awaiting this. We could have this out and actually on the President's desk by this afternoon. If we will agree to recede and concur in all of these House amendments, we could have this on the way to the White House this afternoon.

That is the only concern I have. There are times, I submit to the Senator, when holding up the machinery of a bill like this is worth holding up because the issue is sufficiently deep and there is enough passion in it. But I would say a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, would the Senator not agree, particularly when the language is already included—the conference has already said that the conferees have agreed that such assistance should be provided to Guatemalan refugees and will expect the surplus agricultural commodities will be made available for such humanitarian efforts, and that is in the conference report. It seems to me the issue is covered, would the Senator not agree with that?

Mr. MELCHER. I would like to agree with that. But I will repeat what I earlier said. What has been dropped in the conference report has been the reference to section 416, which is vital, and the expedited procedure, which is also vital.

Let me explain.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It is only a sense of the Senate, though.

Mr. MELCHER. It is a sense of the Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I mean a technical reference to something in only a sense of the Congress resolution should not be that vital, should it?

Mr. MELCHER. Yes. I believe it is very vital for two reasons: One is that we want to be sure that we get some cooperation out of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State to make sure that the new regulations they are promulgating are gotten out quickly. That is No. 1. Second, it is very significant in that the Government of Mexico has felt adverse to accepting any food aid under title II of Public Law 480. They have expressed for the past 6 months an interest in accepting food provided by the United States through section 416. We are dealing with their sensitivities and their feelings. We are not just dealing with the United States saying, "Well, here it is. You can have it." In conjunction with the feelings of Mexico we are trying to emphasize section 416. But, Mr. President, the chairman and the ranking member of the committee seem to feel that this hinges on the attitude of the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee on what the Senate does. Perhaps I should update myself directly with what that chairman of the House Agriculture Committee feels. If you care to go to the other amendment, or put

in a quorum call, I will do it expeditiously.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I think that is an excellent suggestion. His amendment could be attached to any of these amendments. With the consent of the majority leader, we could lay this amendment No. 5 aside, and move onto the next item.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, with all due respect to my distinguished friend who is managing the bill on this side, may I say that we do have critical time problems with respect to this whole bill. I have conferred with the majority leader and others in respect to this. It is our hope that by late this afternoon we can dispose of this conference report, all the technical items of disagreement, and then do the necessary things with amendment No. 14.

What is my friend from Louisiana suggesting we might do?

Mr. JOHNSTON. We have a whole list of amendments in disagreement. The first amendment in disagreement is amendment No. 5. I am suggesting that we defer amendment No. 5 temporarily and move to the next amendment in disagreement, No. 8, while the Senator from Montana determines whether the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House continues to oppose this. If he does, then the Senator from Montana will reassess whether to bring up the amendment. In any event, it will not slow down the process, but will speed the process along by moving to the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. DIXON. May I say to my friend that I would not feel comfortable with that for this reason. The fact that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee alone would have no difficulty with what my friend from Montana wants to do will be no reassurance to this Member. There are 435 Members over there. We have a bill essentially in agreement—when we ultimately dispose of amendment No. 14—that can be disposed of hopefully late this day on the House side, and sent to the President's desk. This matter has been pending since March 4. Were I to tell my colleague and friend from Louisiana the history of this, how they were not going to conference in the first instance on this question in the House before this Senator went over there and met individually with all the Members in his own delegation, the Speaker four times, and everybody else—I would urge my friend from Louisiana to understand my concern—there is nothing that will assure at least this Member that things are safe on the House side with respect to this.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If the Senator will yield, I am not suggesting that we make acceptance or rejection of Senator MELCHER's amendment dependent upon what the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee says. All I

am suggesting is that since we have to deal with a set of eight amendments before we complete work on this bill, why do we not lay aside this first amendment to which the Senator from Montana's amendment would be attached and go ahead, dispose of that which we can quickly dispose of and save the time from the quorum call? Otherwise, the Senator is suggesting that he would have to put in a quorum call while he calls the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. That is all I am suggesting. I am not suggesting that we agree to his amendment depending on what the House Appropriations chairman says. I am just going to save time.

Mr. DIXON. I hesitate to be difficult about this and would not like to object to anything that accommodates my friends and colleagues, particularly a warm friend like my colleague from Montana. But we are going to have to deal with this sometime today. The fact remains, unless I interpret my colleague on the other side—granted that only he can address it correctly—it is my understanding that the manager, the majority leader, and at least myself on this side will object to this amendment at the appropriate time no matter what the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the House says. So how do we gain anything?

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, do I still have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I think we are talking past one another. If the Senator objects, we have not lost a great deal. So I yield the floor.

Mr. BAKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, let me say one thing that is only tangentially related to this particular controversy. I had hoped earlier today to be able to take up the State-Justice appropriations bill temporarily with the hope that we might finish it before the afternoon was out, and finish this conference report as well. That now seems unlikely. So we will be on this conference report until we finish, whatever time that is today.

Mr. President, as far as this particular amendment is concerned, and as far as this Senator is concerned, I have no objection to laying it aside temporarily and going to the second amendment provided we can do one other thing; that is, to provide that the majority leader after first consulting with the minority leader can lay aside the then pending amendment, and then return to the first amendment in disagreement. If the manager on the other side has no objection to that, and if the Senator from Illinois does not, I will now propound that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair. I thank all Senators.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT TO SENATE
AMENDMENT NUMBERED 8

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair now report the second amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the second amendment in disagreement.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 to the aforesaid resolution, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION
RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND

Notwithstanding section 502(d) of the Housing Act of 1949, from amounts previously made available from the Rural Housing Insurance Fund, in Public Law 98-151, for fiscal year 1984, \$1,610,000,000 shall be made available for low-income borrowers and \$690,000,000 shall be made available for very low-income borrowers: *Provided*, That up to \$230,000,000 may be transferred from low income amounts to very low income amounts if the Secretary certifies that qualified applicants are available.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT TO SENATE
AMENDMENT NUMBERED 10

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment in disagreement.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 to the aforesaid resolution, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs", \$850,000 for reimbursement for activities carried out during the 1984 International Games for the Disabled.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", \$2,000,000, for the period August 1, 1984 through September 30, 1984; *Provided*, That any unobligated amounts already appropriated under Public Law 98-78 shall remain available until September 30, 1984.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY CORPS OF
ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Notwithstanding current administrative procedures, the Secretary of the Army,

acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to implement immediately non-structural flood control measures such as relocation sites, flood proofing and flood plain acquisition and evacuation as described in the General Plan for Section 202 Program Implementation prepared by the Ohio River Division in April 1982 and as authorized by Section 202 of Public Law 96-367: *Provided*, That there is hereby appropriated \$21,000,000 to remain available until expended for the purposes of this paragraph.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, once again, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. BAKER addressed the Chair.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next amendment, which is amendment No. 14, dealing with Nicaragua, be temporarily laid aside under the same terms and conditions; that is to say, that at any time at the request of the majority leader, after first consulting with the minority leader, the Senate would return to the consideration of amendment No. 5 in disagreement to be followed by amendment No. 14 in disagreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT TO SENATE
AMENDMENT NUMBERED 16

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment in disagreement.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 to the aforesaid resolution, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration
Training and Employment Services

For an additional amount for "Training and employment services", \$100,000,000; for the summer youth employment and training program: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated hereunder shall be allocated to States so that each service delivery area composed (in whole or in part) of a geographic area served by a prime sponsor under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act receives, as nearly as possible, an amount equal to at least 90 per centum of the amount received for the comparable geographic area for the summer youth program under such Act for the summer of 1983.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I wonder if my friend, the majority leader, would indulge me, and permit me to move concurrence in connection with amendment No. 16, which is the \$100 million for summer youth employment programs.

Mr. BAKER. Yes, Mr. President. I appreciate the support of the Senator

from Illinois. I am happy to have the support of both Senators from Illinois, who have indeed been most active in seeing that this matter is brought to the attention of the Congress, and reaches the President's desk.

Mr. President, to say only semiface-tiously, I cannot recall in recent time when I have had two Senators from the same State who have been more determined to see that this measure comes to the attention of the Senate. I congratulate both of them for it. I am happy now to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I do make the motion to concur. May I say on behalf of my senior colleague, Senator PERCY, and myself that both of us appreciate from the bottom of our hearts the very kind support the majority leader has offered us at every juncture of this procedure which has taken so many weeks. Senator PERCY will be here later in the day to speak in favor of this proposition, as the majority leader knows.

On behalf of both of us, I express to the majority leader, the minority leader, the Speaker of the House, and everyone involved our profound gratitude for their efforts.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Senator from Illinois. It is really a delight to see two Senators from the same State working as closely as Senator PERCY and his colleague have been working. If Senator DIXON is prepared to make that motion at this time, that will be fine.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I do make that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT TO SENATE
AMENDMENT NUMBERED 20

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the next amendment in disagreement.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of Senate numbered 20 to the aforesaid resolution, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE
Operation and Maintenance, Air
Interdiction Program

For an additional amount for the acquisition (purchase of up to eight) of high-performance, interceptor/tracker aircraft and other related equipment for drug interdiction purposes, \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such aircraft be purchased through an open, competitive procurement.

Salaries and Expenses

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Customs district headquartered at

Bridgeport, Connecticut, shall be maintained as a Customs district until October 1, 1984, covering the same territory as covered by such district on January 1, 1984.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT TO SENATE
AMENDMENT NUMBERED 27

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 to the aforesaid resolution, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION EXPORT
CREDIT GUARANTEES

SEC. 106. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall utilize the authorities provided in the Charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation to expand the export of United States agricultural commodities through competitive sales, including shipping costs and credit terms, and donations as authorized by law. In carrying out the authorities and responsibilities imposed by the Charter, the Secretary shall assist in the financing of export sales of United States agricultural products, either through direct or guaranteed loans. The Secretary shall use the Commodity Credit Corporation, a revolving fund capitalized at \$25,000,000,000, to make available under the export credit program carried out by the Corporation short-term credit to finance export sales of United States agricultural commodities, and shall also use such other authorities as necessary to regain the rightful share of world markets for United States Agricultural commodities.

(b) For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make available under the Export Credit Guarantee Program (GSM-102) carried out by the Commodity Credit Corporation credit guarantees for not less than \$5,000,000,000 in short-term credit extended to finance export sales of United States agricultural commodities.

(c) The Secretary shall ensure that any guarantee authority made available, in the fiscal years ending September 30, 1984, and September 30, 1985, for credit guarantees under the Export Credit Guarantee Program (GSM-102) carried out by the Commodity Credit Corporation in excess of—

(1) the \$4,000,000,000 of guarantee authority available for fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and

(2) the level of guarantee authority contained in the President's budget for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985.

is used to further assist in the development, maintenance, and expansion of international markets, for United States agricultural commodities and products, including natural fiber textiles and yarns. Priority in the allocation of such guarantee authority shall be given to credit guarantees that facilitate the financing of (i) export sales to countries

that have demonstrated the greatest repayment capability under the export credit programs carried out by the Commodity Credit Corporation or (ii) export sales of commodities for which no blended credit (under which a combination of export credit guarantees under the GSM-102 program and direct export credits under the GSM-5 program is provided) will be made available.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT TO SENATE
AMENDMENT NUMBERED 34

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 to the aforesaid resolution, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 113. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, organizations reporting to the Assistant Secretary of Interior for Fish and Wildlife and Parks shall enter into contracts which result in releasing or transferring any Federal employees or liquidating any equipment or materials as a result of complying with the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 for the 62 activities scheduled for review by the National Park Service by March 30, 1984, and the 94 activities scheduled for review by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service by September 30, 1984, only after the following conditions have been met:

(1) the study supporting each contract required by the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 is completed, including the bidding process and review of bids;

(2) the organizations have had 30 days to review the bid results and to transmit recommendations to the appropriate House and Senate Committees as to which activities should be contracted; and

(3) 30 days have elapsed since the transmittal required by paragraph (2).

(b) All recommendations to be submitted shall be submitted by October 30, 1984.

(c) The organizations shall not solicit bids related to other Circular A-76 reviews before January 30, 1985.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, once again I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order, with one motion, to reconsider each of the motions which have been agreed to.

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

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I make that motion.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT TO SENATE
AMENDMENT NUMBER 5

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the question recurring before the Senate is amendment in disagreement No. 5, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BAKER. 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. MELCHER. 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. MELCHER. Mr. President, earlier I was discussing the previously adopted sense of the Congress resolution on food aid assistance for the Guatemalan refugees in Mexico. The gesture of the Government of Mexico in accepting these refugees is truly a remarkable form of humanitarian relief. The long-standing policy of Mexico is to accept all refugees who are seeking asylum in Mexico. There are an unknown number of Guatemalan refugees in Mexico at this time. However, estimates range as high as 300,000 Guatemalan refugees spread throughout Mexico. The Mexican Government in a very formal humanitarian move provided camps for 65,000 Guatemalan refugees. The ages of the refugees range from infancy to the very elderly. Many families have fled their Guatemalan homes, that is, left all they possessed, to walk miles, some as far as 200 miles, seeking asylum in Mexico. The camps are located in the State of Chiapas in Mexico, but because there has been harassment by the Guatemalan Army crossing the border, sometimes trying to take some of the refugees back into the country and otherwise marauding the refugee camps, the Government of Mexico is moving the camps further inland in the state of Chiapas and also in other neighboring states.

I must relate to the Senate that the United Nations High Commission on Refugees is assisting the Government of Mexico in running these refugee camps. From the viewpoint of the Guatemalan refugees, it is sort of—well, it is a dead end when they get into a refugee camp in Mexico. They are afraid to return to Guatemala. There is no work for the able-bodied in most of the camps. However, a few of the camps do provide some work and a small amount of income for those workers, but that is very limited and is very meager. The food that is available through the United Nations

High Commission on Refugees is rather limited also, and the part that the Mexican Government has to perform in distributing that food is not a small matter. The refugee camps themselves are a strain on Mexico. It is my intention in offering the original amendment to provide surplus wheat and dairy products from section 416 of the Agriculture Act from the United States for assistance in food aid for these refugees.

Let me explain that section 416 of the Agriculture Act, which we just amended this past spring, provides for monetarization of a portion of the surplus commodities from the United States. What that means is that a portion of the commodities can be sold on local markets commercially and the funds derived from selling a portion of the commodity can then be used for any processing or packaging or distribution costs of the rest of the commodity for the food aid in that particular country. With wheat products being unknown to the Mayan culture, let me stress that the monetarization of a portion of the commodities is extremely important because wheat, of course, when ground into flour would have to be baked in a different manner than is familiar to the Mayan refugees.

All of these things sound like little items, Mr. President, but for the hungry refugees, with their families under particular stress, it is of a life-saving nature. The fact that Mexico has provided this series of havens in these refugee camps for the refugees fleeing Guatemala is very commendatory.

The part we would play in this proposal would be to augment their purposes.

I spoke to President Miguel de la Madrid Hurtado when he was in the United States on his recent visit. I also have spoken to Secretary of Foreign Affairs Bernardo Sepulveda Amor and Secretary of Commerce Hector Hernandez, as well as one of the bishops in Chiapas, Bishop Rias.

I hope we can see our way clear to emphasize this meeting, this need for the refugees, in this cooperative effort with Mexico and the United Nations High Commission on Refugees, as our part in the overall assistance.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana for his cooperation in helping to expedite the supplemental we have before us. I assure him that I will be happy to assist in any way possible with his proposal as he seeks to raise the matter again when we get to the appropriations bill on State-Justice-Commerce.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, the chairman has graciously explained to me on several occasions his sympathy for and his support of this proposal. But, due to the circumstances in trying to adjust this bill to meet the

easiest flow in the House, he would prefer that we not amend any of these amendments.

I have spoken to the chairman and to the majority leader about the possibility of attaching something of this nature to the next appropriations bill, which I understand is State-Justice-Commerce.

Mr. HATFIELD. That is correct. It may be taken up later today.

Mr. MELCHER. I will be happy to do that. Therefore, Mr. President, I will not offer my amendment.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT TO SENATE
AMENDMENT NUMBERED 14

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 to the aforesaid resolution, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: "No funds are appropriated herein for the Central Intelligence Agency in fiscal year 1984 for purpose or which would have the effect of supporting, directly or indirectly, military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua by any nation, group, organization, movement, or individual."

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, this is the amendment dealing with the subject of Nicaragua, aid to Nicaragua. I now move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 14.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

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

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold, I was about ready to explain the motion. I think there are Members who wish to speak on this issue. I should like to have the Chair not rule on this point, on the adoption of this motion, until I have had an opportunity to explain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the action is vitiated.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, this is a motion to have the Senate recede from its original amendment, and that original amendment added \$21 million for the CIA for covert assistance to Nicaraguan rebels, when we first considered the House-passed measure last March. Although the House subsequently concurred in our amendment with a further amendment, this motion will have the effect of deleting the entire issue from this measure, so there will be no funds, and neither will there be any language, with respect to Nicaragua.

Mr. President, I make this motion in order, in effect, to strike from this bill all matters dealing with Nicaragua—money, language, otherwise.

I only speak briefly for the effect that, even though, in the consideration of this bill, I did oppose Nicaraguan aid, both in committee and on the floor, I feel that it is vital and important, with the action of the House—and what I hope will be the concurrence in my motion—that we not have in this bill any matter that relates whatsoever to Nicaragua.

I think it is important to delete it in this way, as it is to deal with the issue we see before us today in terms of what the House has sent us. It is important because, in effect, it totally eradicates, obliterates, eliminates everything relating to Nicaragua. This not only suits my own personal view, but I think, also, that it probably is the best way to handle this measure, considering the House action and considering the Senate action and the need for immediate enactment of other items in the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I note that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations committee has arrived on the floor, and I will yield the floor, but I hope we can dispose of this matter in this way, and expeditiously. We have the State-Justice-Commerce appropriations measure to dispose of today, and I think this is the smoothest way to execute the subject at hand.

Mr. DIXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon, my warm friend, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the manager of this bill, for this motion to recede on amendment No. 14 to House Joint Resolution 492. As he knows, I was prepared to offer a similar motion. I see my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, on the floor as well; and he has been prepared right along to support my position on this question.

This amendment, for \$21 million in covert assistance to Nicaragua, is the only item in serious disagreement in this conference report.

The resolution, making urgent supplemental appropriations for a number of vital programs, was originally passed in the House on March 6, and included only one item—Public Law 480 "Food for Peace" funds for 18 African nations which have suffered the most severe drought in decades. The Senate added amendments to this bill, including my own amendment for \$100 million for the Summer Youth Employment Program, in which I was joined by my colleague from Illinois, Senator PERCY, and Senators KENNE-

DY, HEINZ, METZENBAUM, BOSCHWITZ, MOYNIHAN, D'AMATO, LEVIN, RIEGLE, SARBANES, EAGLETON, SASSER, HUDDLESTON, LAUTENBERG, and GLENN. After a very long process, the House and Senate conferees met and agreed on items which were of an urgent nature. The House acted on the conference report and on the amendments in disagreement on May 24. Most of the items in disagreement are only in technical disagreement, and we have disposed of all those, except for amendment No. 14.

I have worked with the majority leader, and I am grateful for his concern, and his efforts to accommodate this Senator in the vote we are about to take today. I have visited with the Speaker of the House, and attempted to mediate between the two Houses to reach a compromise on covert aid to Nicaragua which would be acceptable to the three major players in this scenario—the Senate, the House and the President. I regret to say that there is no such figure, at least not on this vehicle. I am absolutely convinced of that.

This Senator has supported covert assistance in the past on this very measure, and more recently, on the defense authorization bill. This Senator would support a reasonable figure for assistance again, on a bill which is less time sensitive. But, Mr. President, this is not the right boat to Nicaragua.

There are other boats to accommodate covert assistance, but this particular boat has been too long delayed in feeding the hungry people of the nations of Africa, feeding the undernourished women, and putting teenagers of our Nation's cities to work this summer.

The vote we are about to cast is not on the merits of covert aid to Nicaragua, but rather, on the merits of the truly necessary funds which were urgently needed in April and are critically necessary today.

In all, there are 22 items upon which there is total agreement, or only technical disagreement, in the conference report. Is it reasonable for 1 item to hold 22 others hostage? According to a recent article in the Washington Post, "The Nicaraguan democratic force has enough money and equipment stockpiled to continue fighting through October * * * and Nicaraguan democratic force leaders here are declaring that their forces inside Nicaragua are expanding rather than cutting back." Indalecio Rodriguez of the rebel group's four-man civilian command stated: "The military situation has never been better."

This point was reiterated today, Mr. President. In this morning's edition of the Washington Post, Joanne Omang writes, and I quote:

Spokesmen insist, and most officials in the region agree, that the Contras now have enough materiel and funding to continue

operating without further appropriations from the U.S. Congress at least until next October . . .

So, to those who say this motion kills the covert aid program, I offer to you the words of the Contras themselves: they have enough materiel and funding to continue their operations through this fiscal year, at the very least.

That does not sound to me like the same kind of urgent need reflected by 3,076,414 women, infants, and children who depend on the WIC Program to meet their daily nutritional requirements. These current funds will run out July 10. There is \$300 million for continuing the WIC Program in this resolution.

In addition, there is an urgent need to put 100,000 youth in this country to work this summer. School is out in some of our States and will soon be out in all of our States. These are not middle-class kids looking for a way to fill their time. They are kids from poor families, and these jobs contribute up to 20 percent to their family incomes. The additional \$100 million in supplemental funds will be of little use if we do not act today.

This resolution is not just a piece of legislation for the cities. It contains funds for rural housing insurance—\$1.610 billion for low-income borrowers, and \$690 million for very low-income borrowers.

Likewise, there is an item of \$25 million for the revolving fund of the commodity credit corporation to finance exports of U.S. agricultural products and \$5 million in short term credit to finance exports of our agricultural goods. I don't have to remind anyone here of the huge and escalating trade deficit we face. We can grow sufficient quantities of food to feed the world, and this program helps our farmers market their products around the globe. Instead of exporting jobs, we need to export our crops.

This is a measure that will fight crime. There is \$25 million in this resolution to purchase up to eight interceptor aircraft and other drug interdiction equipment to keep illicit and illegal drugs from coming into this country.

I am gratified that over the past several days editorials have appeared in the Washington Post and the Los Angeles Times urging us to act, and to do so quickly.

I take this opportunity to thank the many organizations which have been so supportive of my efforts to see this through to a positive conclusion. They represent a very broad constituency. They include the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, the YMCA and YWCA, the National Alliance of Business, the AFL-CIO, the U.S. Catholic Conference, the Council of the Great City Schools,

70001, Inc., the National Child Labor Committee, Campfire, Inc., the National Urban League, United Neighborhood Centers, and a host of others too numerous to mention.

The time has come, Mr. President, for logic and reason to prevail. In order to release funds for important programs which are in jeopardy right now as a result of inaction on this resolution, amendment 14, which deals with covert assistance, must be deleted from House Joint Resolution 492. There is a proper place for the content of that amendment in a legislative vehicle passed by Congress, but it has become painfully clear that this legislation is not that vehicle. As I mentioned before, House Joint Resolution 492 is not the right boat to Nicaragua.

It is a matter of getting our priorities straight. It is a matter of hungry children, ill-nourished mothers, unemployed teenagers, and starving Africans. These priorities are more important in the big picture than insisting on this covert assistance on this resolution. Covert assistance can, more appropriately, be considered on another piece of legislation of a less timely nature.

I therefore, ask every Member of the Senate to rise above party and consider the greater good putting young people to work this summer, continuing nutrition programs which are literally a matter of life and death to people in our country and African nations, and addressing the other issues of vital importance to all of our States in this resolution.

I ask my colleagues to support the motion of my friend from Oregon in which I join, to recede from amendment number 14.

Mr. President, I am delighted to yield to my friend and colleague, my senior colleague from Illinois, who has said so long ago that he intended to support this matter and to rise above party, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who is prepared to support me in connection with this question.

SUMMER JOBS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, first I thank my distinguished colleague, Senator DIXON, for his support for this concept since the outset when we first talked about it last spring. Also, I thank the leadership of, particularly Senator HATFIELD, working with Senator BAKER in finding a way how we could separate this program, which is an absolutely urgent program, from aid to Central America. The Nicaraguan aid is not only highly controversial at this stage but also if we kept it in the same bill we would doom summer jobs in this country for our own youth. School is now out and these young people are looking for work. It would have been the height of folly for us to look for a program to

help other people, which is highly controversial, and bury both programs because we had not been able to separate them. I support fully the amendment of Senator HATFIELD to separate these two and support the judgment of the majority leader in taking that up as a separate issue on a separate vehicle at an appropriate time.

We can take up the question of \$21 million of aid for Nicaragua on another occasion but certainly not today, not this week when we are pressing to get out. To do so would have been to walk out on young people.

I wish to talk a little about summer jobs. I think we all tend to be somewhat personal when we think of these things.

A summer job I know in my own situation began very early in life. I was running errands for my mother and for some of her friends with my wagon on Saturdays, earning a dime for every time I would go shop with a little shopping list for women. It gave me a sense of pride. I could earn 50 cents on a Saturday, and it meant a lot to me.

Suddenly when I was pulling my wagon one day a car pulled up alongside me and a fellow beckoned me over from the car and said, "Young man, young man"—I was 5 years old—"how would you like to earn a dollar," and he held a dollar out in front of me.

Well, that looked awfully big to me, and I said, "Yes, sir," and he said, "Just sell this pile of magazines," and it was a pile of Saturday Evening Posts that were 5 cents apiece. And I went out and sold them that day.

The next week when he stopped by I said, "Give me twice as many," and everytime I went out on Thursday afternoon the Saturday Evening Posts came out I doubled my sales week after week and finally won in a couple years the scholarship to Evanston YMCA, which was a great prize.

I think I had the championship for selling more Country Gentleman in a city, in an urban area, than any other salesboy in the country. I sold a couple of them. It was in my father's bank where he was cashier, and I learned what clout really meant. But I know I felt really filled with pride. It gave me a sense of confidence that stood me in good stead, and I cannot think, since 5 years of age, when I was without a job.

During the depression when my father lost his job and ultimately had to go through a tragic bankruptcy problem, that money I brought home that I learned to earn and I really then had to earn it, really gave me a sense of participation, of contributing, a sense of importance.

I know the same story holds true for many others, including the story I heard the President tell just a couple weeks ago when we introduced the Youth Employment Opportunity Act of 1984 at a session at the White House. He told about how he picked

up a pick and shovel at age 14 and what it did to him as a young person to have a real job at that age.

A vote today to separate the Nicaraguan aid from this supplemental is a vote for restoring 100,000 jobs slated to be cut in summer jobs programs across the country, approximately 13,000 of these in Chicago. Actually, this is not an increase in the program at all. It will simply restore the program to last year's level. But Chicago would be cut 47 percent; as Senator Dixon and I have pointed out many times, a harsh cutback. And that would mean we would have a much smaller program this year, in a year when in some areas, the west side and the south side of Chicago, unemployment among minority youth runs as high as 75 percent. And this summer, with 13,000 fewer jobs, we could have utter despair.

The latest available unemployment figures for 16- to 19-year-olds in Chicago speak for themselves. No less than 40 percent of all teenagers are unemployed. It is estimated that between 150,000 and 250,000 teenagers will seek work and many will be unable to find employment this coming summer in Chicago and in many other cities across the country.

The proposed 47-percent cut in Chicago's summer job funding, the largest cut of any major city in the country, is simply unconscionable. And Senator Dixon and I were simply determined that we would have to do something about that, and now, at long last, we actually can, due to the motion that is before us now by Senator HATFIELD, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

This is why I was an original cosponsor with Senator Dixon of the amendment last spring which restored \$100 million to the Summer Jobs Program. There is no reason for this important program to be gutted over the Nicaraguan issue.

I have spent a great deal of time talking to young people in my State, especially in Chicago, East St. Louis, other such cities, such as Peoria, Rockford, Kankakee, and Danville, to just see what is the outlook, and the outlook has been rough this year.

I have seen what idleness does to young people in summer months when they cannot get work. As one high school principal warned, "Cuts in the Summer Jobs Program are going to make for many frustrations and a long, hot summer."

"People who are unemployed are more likely to get into all sorts of crime, particularly teenagers," said one of the program's organizers.

I am afraid that these youngsters and those who work day to day with them will simply not understand how their program was cut in half because we could not agree whether to send money to Central America.

Mr. President, I am one of the first to support efforts to reduce spending in order that we can reduce the deficit. However, we cannot expect one city, or one program, for that matter, to withstand a nearly 50-percent cut. This is not equitable.

I urge the Senate to adopt this motion, not as an indication of our support or opposition to Central American aid, but to show our compassion for thousands of young people in this country who are depending on us this summer.

I want to thank the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and their ranking members and opposite numbers on the minority side for their tremendous assistance in finding a resolution to this problem.

I would just like to close by indicating that government jobs are not the answer. Government jobs do not provide enough jobs, and obviously too many of those jobs are dead-end jobs. I still do feel as I felt 5 or 6 years ago when I met with labor leaders and presented the problem to them and said, "if you don't like a reduced minimum wage as an incentive for training for sometimes the first single job for a teenager will have in the summer time, then come forward with a better program."

To this day, they have never come forward with a better program. Despite the fact that in the last 17 months we have hired back 5.4 million people and put them to work in the economic recovery program that has been underway, there will still be extensive youth unemployment in this country this particular summer even with the money that we will be authorizing today and appropriating today.

But I do hope we will take a long look at some way—and I think the Youth Opportunity Employment Act of 1984 does provide that opportunity. I provides safeguards that no young people will ever be reduced in salary, no young people will ever replace an older person who has a job, but they will be offered an opportunity. And the estimates range that about 400,000 youth could be hired and trained in the private sector, put to work, given jobs, many of which will be brandnew jobs created at \$2.50 an hour, \$100 a week for a 40-hour week, and that is not an unattractive salary for a young person.

That is the long-term goal. We do not expect to be able to put that through in time for this summer, but let us keep it in mind. We have to find a way for young people to get that start in life that was given some of us early in life, and solve this problem in a more permanent sense than we are today. But I am deeply grateful for the measures that are being made that

will provide incentives to tens of thousands of young people this summer that would not have that incentive, not have that opportunity, the opportunity for self-assurance and to gain confidence in themselves, unless we take action today.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, when the Senate first considered this measure several months ago, I supported the appropriation of an additional \$21 million to aid the so-called Contras, who are opposing the Sandinista government of Nicaragua. Today, I will vote to delete those funds from this measure, and my reason for doing so is quite simple.

The Senate approved the \$21 million supplemental request on the clear understanding that it was necessary in order to keep some pressure on the Sandinista government and encourage it to stop its campaign to destabilize its neighbors. That has been our understanding each time we have provided assistance to the opponents of the Sandinista regime. That was the assurance of the President.

Shortly after we approved the \$21 million supplemental appropriation, however, it was revealed that some of the funds we had approved earlier had been used for actions which went far beyond the limited objectives to which the Senate had agreed and to which the administration had assured us it followed. This revelation suggested that we had moved away from a policy of occupying the attention of the Sandinista's massive military and intelligence operations and dangerously closer to a policy of trying to overthrow their regime. The latter is not a legitimate policy for the United States.

U.S. involvement in the mining of Nicaraguan harbors was revealed just after we completed work on the supplemental appropriation. The mining certainly harassed Nicaragua, but it did not command the attention of that nation's military to any significant degree. In fact, it posed a greater threat to the ships of neutral nations, including some of our closest allies, than it did to the Nicaraguans whose actions we are trying to influence. The Senate quickly and overwhelmingly voted to condemn CIA involvement in that activity.

Of greater concern, in my view, were the published statements of administration officials that the harbor mining was part of a "holding action" undertaken until some unspecified future date, at which time we would "really turn up the heat on the Sandinistas." Mr. President, that simply is not the arrangement to which the Senate agreed. Those accounts indicated very clearly that by the time we approved the \$21 million request we had moved beyond the narrow limits which the Senate intended and which the administration consistently assured us it

was observing. It is inappropriate to support an appropriation requested for one purpose but to be used, in part at least, for another.

I want to reiterate my belief that it is appropriate for us to assist the nations of Central America which have asked our help in their efforts to escape their beleaguered and oppressive past and to move into an era of reform and democracy. The burdens carried by these nations are great enough; they do not need the added threat of destabilizing activities sponsored by Nicaragua. The Sandinistas support for the guerrillas in El Salvador, their avowed support for "revolution without frontiers," and their establishment of a military force which dominates the region gives their neighbors ample reason for concern.

We must recognize, however, that our objective is a limited one. There are aspects of the Sandinista government which I find objectionable, but the removal of that government by force is not a proper policy of the United States. We can appropriately encourage democracy and human rights in Nicaragua by offering aid conditioned on progress toward those goals, but the normal internal policies of that nation do not warrant our military intervention.

We may be asked in the future to consider requests for aid to the Contras, and I will consider them as they are presented. I expect to support them only, however, if a clear and convincing case is made that the funds we provide will be used to prevent Nicaragua from intervening in the efforts of its neighbors to evolve and strengthen peaceful, democratic societies.

● Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my strong support for the motion of the Senator from Oregon on the issue of supplemental fiscal year 1984 aid for the rebels seeking to overthrow the Government of Nicaragua. Doing so will free urgently needed funding for summer youth employment, WIC and child nutrition programs. As you know, Mr. President, I do not support giving money to the so-called Contras in Nicaragua. But that is not the issue before us. The issue is whether the Congress ought to turn its back on unemployed teenagers, pregnant mothers, and newborn infants. The issue is whether we ought to hold these innocent victims hostage to the approval of the Nicaraguan Rebel Aid Program. That is the question before us, Mr. President, and I say the answer is "No."

In my own State of Ohio, what is at stake is almost \$6 million in additional funding for summer jobs for disadvantaged youth. And when youth unemployment is over 19 percent and black teenage unemployment is almost 45 percent, I say we cannot afford to play politics with the lives of our young people. If we do, the results will be

devastating. Cleveland, OH, for example, faces a reduction in funds of 42 percent. This tremendous loss of funds will not only mean that thousands of young people will be unable to find productive ways to spend their summer, but that they will be competing with unemployed adults for the few permanent jobs that are available.

But jobless teenagers are not the only Ohioans who will feel the pain if we continue along our present course. Ohio also has the Nation's fourth highest number of WIC participants—and their futures too are hanging in the balance. In fact, facilities providing special supplemental food to almost 166,000 high risk pregnant women and children will be forced to shut down early this summer if the supplemental funding is not approved quickly. And how devastating would this be? Well, let me tell you about just a few of the long-range repercussions.

A study conducted at the Harvard School of Public Health found that WIC caused a marked reduction in the incidence of low-birth-weight infants. As you may know, Mr. President, low birth weight is the eighth leading cause of death among children in the United States. It is also associated with such disabilities as blindness, deafness, and mental retardation. And I'm sure I don't have to remind you that the costs of these afflictions can be staggering. Indeed, the Harvard study found that WIC expenditures are incredibly cost-effective and that each \$1 spent in the prenatal component of WIC actually averts \$3 in post-natal hospital costs.

What all this means, Mr. President, is that the costs of doing nothing are high; unacceptably high—in human, social, and economic terms. Many young people who cannot find employment this summer will turn to crime, antisocial activities, and "hustling" in the underground economy. And the evidence of WIC's role in reducing infant mortality suggests that the WIC participants who will be denied services will suffer two-thirds more neonatal deaths than they otherwise would.

Mr. President, we have the means to prevent these tragedies from occurring. All we need now is the will—and I believe the Senate has a moral obligation to resolve this issue and to do it now. Further delay is unwarranted, unnecessary, and irresponsible. The Congress can take up the issue of Contra aid when we consider the fiscal year 1985 intelligence authorization bill. After all, there are only 3 months remaining in the current fiscal year. How can the Reagan administration possibly justify depriving our Nation's unemployed youth and risking the lives of mothers and children for the sake of 3 additional months of Contra

funding? We must say "No" to this unnecessary linkage, and we can do so by giving overwhelming support to the motion of the Senator from Oregon. ●

● Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, we have before us a motion concerning amendment 14, which provides \$21 million in covert assistance to Nicaragua. The effect of the motion, should it pass, is to remove the covert aid from the bill we are considering. In my judgment, the question of covert aid to the Contras in Nicaragua has no place in the bill before us, which deals with human needs mainly here at home in the United States. I support the motion and urge my colleagues to do likewise. I do not consider my vote to be one on the substance of the covert aid issue, but on the question of whether we are going to act and act promptly on the urgent supplemental. I am convinced that keeping covert aid in this legislation would make it impossible for us to pass the other badly needed programs in this bill.

The urgent supplemental for the Department of Agriculture that we are considering includes amendments which would provide funding for women, infants, and children [WIC]; child nutrition programs; the Summer Youth Employment Program; and emergency food assistance for Africa. In my home State of Pennsylvania alone, 144,323 disadvantaged pregnant women, depend upon WIC for supplemental food, nutritional training, and health counseling. On July 10, the funds for this program will run out, and unless we pass this bill almost 3 million people who are nutritionally at risk will lose this modest but badly needed help.

Also included in this legislation is \$300 million for the Summer Youth Employment Program and \$545 million for our Child Nutrition Programs. These are preventative programs the need for and merit of which is and has been clear to us for many years, especially since the relatively small investment we make now will save us far more money later. If we don't provide nutritional training for pregnant and nursing mothers, if we don't furnish one inexpensive but hot, well-balanced meal a day for under privileged children, and if we don't make available summer jobs for disadvantaged inner-city youth, then we leave the door open for having to provide them health and financial assistance for the rest of their lives. But by funding these programs now, we can teach young mothers proper nutrition for their children, so that the children will grow up healthy and strong. We can and should provide well-balanced meals at schools and day-care centers, so that these young people are better able to learn. And we can and should provide summer jobs to youth, so that they will be more likely to remain in school.

Mr. President, we should not hold these urgent human needs of our own people hostage to the President's desire to aid the Contras in Nicaragua, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this motion. ●

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. EAST. Mr. President, I would like to speak very strenuously in opposition to this motion to delete the aid of \$21 million to the Contras in Nicaragua.

First of all, it has not been made clear to me by the manager of the bill or the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee or Senator DIXON or anyone, period, as to where this matter would be appropriately reasserted and we could be guaranteed that this aid will be forthcoming promptly.

Mr. HATFIELD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. EAST. Before I speak against the motion, I would be happy to yield to the manager of the bill for purposes of inquiry as to what the plan of action would be, because I feel, as a substantive matter, it is the most important item that we have to deal with. It is more important than the underlying legislation. I will argue that strictly on humanitarian grounds, let alone the need that this be promptly dealt with.

So I yield for purposes of answering that question to the distinguished manager of the bill, the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. I would say to the Senator, in response to his inquiry, that I would like to delineate between my own personal view—and that is that I am absolutely opposed to any military aid whatsoever to Nicaragua, and sought to block it in the Appropriations committee, sought to block it on the floor, sought to block it in the conference, and I will continue to do that—but I would not want the Senator from North Carolina to construe that with what the action is here today and what this motion represents.

I have now the responsibility to carry the situation from a parliamentary point of view. First of all, the Senate position did prevail by adding \$21 million for covert aid to Nicaragua. That Senate position prevailed by a note of this body.

We went to a conference with the House on this supplemental and the House refused to accept it. And what the House did was to, in effect, delete the \$21 million; in turn, they substituted the language of Congressman BOLAND, and that was that no money in this bill be used for covert aid to Nicaragua. Well, that was redundant, because by deleting the money, there obviously was no money in the bill for aid to Nicaragua.

My motion today is for the Senate to recede from its original amendment. By receding from the original amendment, we excise the whole issue from the bill relating to Nicaragua. There is no money here today. In other words, when you vote for my motion, you are not voting to eliminate \$21 million for Nicaragua. It has already been eliminated by the House action.

Mr. EAST. By whom?

Mr. HATFIELD. By the House action. So this is one of those amendments in disagreement with the House. We are, therefore, voting on the House amendment as amending the Senate amendment. So, consequently, what we are called upon here today is conform to the measure which we received back from the House, which already eliminated the \$21 million by that amendment in disagreement that went back to the House floor, and was voted on by a House action.

The Senator asked when will we take up this matter? Again, we will have another appropriation vehicle; that is, the supplemental that is now on track in the House, or urgent supplemental, or spring supplemental, or whatever you want to call it. I think part of this determination will be made by the White House. The White House will have to decide when it wants to ask for money for covert action again. The White House is realistic at this point. They know they are not going to get it from this Congress. That is very clear, I think. But they are going to have to determine if they want to come up here, and put their request in again. If they do, then we will consider it on whatever vehicle is appropriate. I say whatever vehicle is appropriate. We have the spring supplemental. That is one such bill. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee—and the chairman can answer for that committee—would of course have to take some action if they wanted to take it from an authorizing point of view on whatever vehicle they want to use.

I can assure the Senator that I think that at this point the ball is in the White House court; that the White House wants to pursue this and put its head in a buzz saw, again that is up to the White House. I am not going to support it any more next time they come up here and ask for it than I did this time. But I do think we have this urgent supplemental to get through, because out of the \$1.4 billion we are talking about \$21 million.

We are talking about aid to women and infants in their care program that is coming to an end. We are talking about child nutrition that is coming to an end. We are talking about African relief. The famine is upon them. We are talking about summer jobs, children, and youngsters who are out of

school. If the Senator from North Carolina wants to block those programs because of the fact that we have already deleted the \$21 million, that is the Senator's privilege. But let me also assure the Senator that we are talking about \$1.4 billion in needed programs to alleviate human suffering in America, and elsewhere in the world; \$21 million is not in contest at this point. The \$21 million is gone.

It is up to the White House when they want to come up and ask for it again. We are now on a motion that I made to delete or in effect to recede from the Senate amendment which has to do with the original amendment which takes down the House language, and takes down, obviously, the \$21 million again because that is already gone. We are just reaffirming what we have done in conference.

Mr. EAST. I appreciate the very articulate explanation the manager has given me. But it seems to me what is being said is that the House refuses to go along with it, and that the Senate ought to accept this House decision. Indeed, we would be wrong headed, foolish, callous, and indifferent to human suffering in this country not to do so. I as one Senator am vigorously opposed to that.

I do not know what the intentions of the White House are. I am not privy to it. I am a Member of the U.S. Senate. I voted for this \$21 million in aid. Congressman BOLAND is against it, and apparently the House is against it. But I am still saying they are wrong. They are dead wrong. They are dead wrong on the humanitarian implications of it.

They are dead wrong on it being a symbol of the most fundamental issue facing this country, and this Congress at this time; namely, whether we allow Central America to fall under Communist domination and control.

The Ambassador to the United Nations, Jean Kirkpatrick, has pointed out that the aid currently going into Nicaragua from Havana and Moscow is being used to go across the border into El Salvador for the purposes of killing, murdering the people of El Salvador, destroying the infrastructure economically and socially of that country, and bringing on great humanitarian suffering.

What saith the opponents about that? They have no monopoly on humanitarian instincts here. I think the curious thing is that people like Eden Pastora who oppose the dictatorship of Somoza—and now we all—admit the revolution there by the Sandinistas has been betrayed for trying to fight to reclaim that lost revolution of democratic values. And the administration has said its concerns are even more modest; namely, to interdict the supplies going from Moscow, Eastern Europe, and Havana into Managua and across the line to kill, murder, de-

stroy the infrastructure of that country, and to bring on enormous personal suffering.

I am weary of hearing that those who support the underlying legislation are the great humanitarians and that for some reason or other those of us who insist—and I am one who does insist—that this aid remain, or I be given some assurance or guarantee that it will remain. Of course, the House is opposed to it. They have got a majority over there led by the Speaker who wants to do nothing for Central America. It is a policy of isolationism. It is a policy of simply allowing the area to fall under Communist control and domination. I think it is one of the great moral scandals of our time to sit idly by and watch those small revolutions that attempt to establish democratic values and democratic institutions be crushed.

When the President-elect of El Salvador, Jose Napoleon Duarte was here, who was trained at Notre Dame, trained under Father Hesburgh, one of the great democrats of our time, he said we need the aid in El Salvador. He said we need the Contra aid to prevent the interdiction of supplies coming in, trying to destroy, and abort our democracy.

Wherein lies the humanitarian instinct to deny that fine man the right to defend his country, that fledgling democracy? As he put it when he spoke to the Senate, if you have an army on one side that is armed and an army on the other side that is not armed, you will get a military solution. And you are going to get it. And it is going to be the Marxist, Leninist, totalitarian system that will control Central America. What is so humanitarian about that?

Nicaragua has fallen, and El Salvador is going to fall in time if we do not stop this aid. One way to interdict that aid is to give aid and comfort to the Contras. And we are deleting it rather casually, saying, oh, you must think of the humanitarian concerns that we have for those here at home.

Well, of course. But you are just now voting to give humanitarian aid to Africa and elsewhere in the world. What is so unhumanitarian about trying to protect the people of El Salvador from the bloody violence and murder, as Jeane Kirkpatrick has put it, that is being forced upon them?

I refuse to yield to the argument that some way or other the humanitarians are all on that side of the table and we on this side are the heavies.

We are repeating the error of the thirties. We thought we could avoid war, bloodshed, by allowing the dictators to have one more piece of territory.

In the 1930's, when Hitler went into the Sudetenland, we said, "Let them have it."

Neville Chamberlain came back and said to the British Parliament, "We shall have peace in our time because we have placated the dictators."

They did not get peace in their time.

Winston Churchill rose on the back seat of the British Parliament and said:

You will not have peace in our time. You will have the worst war you have known in our time because you cannot placate the dictatorship.

Then came the invasion of Austria and ultimately of Poland in 1939 and France in 1940. The Italian Fascist government went into Ethiopia and the Chinese went into Manchuria. Eventually, the very thing we hoped to avoid by appeasement, and isolationism, and indifference brought about the worst war we have known in our history. The bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941 awakened us.

Recently, we celebrated June 6 the landing at Normandy in which we paid a heavy price in blood to try to reclaim that which we neglected and ignored during the 1930's.

I say, *deja vu* the 1980's.

Southeast Asia now falls under Communist control and the Soviet Union expands its influence. It has the American base at Cam Ranh Bay. It sends Vietnamese forces into Cambodia and threatens Thailand and Singapore. It has Cuban troops in Africa, in Mozambique, in Angola, and Ethiopia. It backed Syria and the PLO against Israel in the Middle East and threatens the whole peace of that area.

It follows the Marxist-Leninist to a "T." As Alexandr Solzhenitsyn said:

I do not think the West has read the Communist Manifesto, in which they make it clear, Marx, Lenin, and Mao, that you will take the soft underdeveloped parts of the world and eventually the urban industrial democracies will fall like ripe fruit.

And that is occurring in our time. It has occurred in Southeast Asia, it is occurring in Africa, it is occurring in the Middle East and it is occurring now in Central America. And we lie impotent and indifferent. Here I am told on the floor of the U.S. Senate that it would not be a humanitarian thing to obstruct this bill by insisting upon this amendment.

(Mr. CHAFEE assumed the Chair.)

Mr. PERCY. Will the distinguished Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EAST. I say it is imperative that this aid be maintained.

I will yield for a moment for the purpose of a question from the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. PERCY. I would like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, if we moved ahead with the bill before us, about what he has mentioned is \$21 million of aid for one country. In the bill we now have before us we have a total of

\$1.123 billion. It includes \$61.75 million for military assistance for countries that need help, that need it urgently to protect their freedom, their liberty, their independence, and their position in the free world.

It includes \$7 million for refugees, one-half of a million dollars for juror protection in Central America and El Salvador. It includes \$60 million in Public Law 480 funds for Africa, certainly a humanitarian need, \$445 million for child nutrition programs in this country which are desperately needed, and \$300 million for women, infants, and children programs in this country, plus \$100 million for summer youth employment.

It does delete \$21 million in covert aid to Nicaragua, but it also deletes \$175 million in other Public Law 480 funding, \$5 million in food assistance to the Philippines and \$70 million for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which I think is one of the best investments that we can possibly make for the education of American adults as well as youths, in the finest programs that appear day in and day out 7 days a week on public broadcasting. But we have cut that program.

This program has been put forward as a compromise between the House and the Senate. It does not mean that we are not going to give consideration to other assistance for Central America. After all, as the Senator well knows, the majority leader has now committed himself to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that in that session of the Senate between the two conventions, July and August, we will take up as the first priority item the entire military assistance and foreign assistance bill. It will embrace in one program alone over a 5-year authorization, the first time we have ever had such an authorization, \$5 billion in military and economic assistance for Central America alone, as recommended by the bipartisan commission, the Kissinger commission, on Central America. It will contain military and economic assistance for our allies and friends all over the world for the fiscal year 1985.

I will consider taking up on a foreign military and economic assistance bill items that any Senator wishes to consider, including the issue before us today.

It is perfectly apparent that if we did not move forward with dispatch on this particular bill we would be frustrating humanitarian programs in Central America, around the world, in Africa, and particularly in the United States of America.

It is for that reason that I urge that we move right ahead and adopt this conference report with the motion made by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and then at an appropriate time, and certainly the next time we are back in session, the

foreign military and economic assistance bill will be the pending business of the Senate. That is the time to talk about helping our friends abroad.

The House has decided this vehicle is not the vehicle to do it on. They have taken it out. If we do not accept the motion now put forward, everything will be frustrated and we will simply pile up problems, and one problem, summer jobs, will be gone by the board. Those young people just will simply not have the opportunity that we must provide. We will be steeply cutting that particular program, which has been one of the better programs we have had through the years. We are deeply cutting it.

As I say, in our city of Chicago, it represents a 47-percent cut in that program from prior years, 13,000 jobs. We are urging our distinguished colleague to think in terms of just one job. What does one job mean to one child who might otherwise roam the streets, get into trouble, turn to drugs, turn to crime to make the money for drugs? We are not talking about one. We are talking about 100,000 jobs nationwide. Everyone who worked with this program, and Senator Dixon and I have worked with it for years, knows it is the salvation of our own young people. We are walking out on them this summer if we do not act and act promptly on the pending measure. I thank my distinguished colleague.

I leave the question with him, Is it not better for us to move ahead with this bill now and then take up aid to Central America, Nicaragua, whatever it may be, at the appropriate time which has been promised for us in the July-August time period between conventions?

Mr. EAST. Mr. President, let me just inquire—still, of course, maintaining my right to the floor here—let me inquire of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations: Can I expect him to support this aid on some appropriate vehicle? Would he personally support it?

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I have not taken a particular position on that. It has been reported out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It will be available on the floor. We could not reach agreement; we could not pass our amendment on Central America out of the committee because we did split on a 9-to-9 vote, with the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina voting with the minority on that particular issue for different reasons than they did. So we simply could not report the bill out. But we will bring the Central America bill up as an amendment. Obviously, any one can add that amendment on the floor and debate it.

Mr. EAST. I appreciate the thoughts of the distinguished chairman, Mr. President. If I might not personalize too much, I realize he could not guar-

antee what the Foreign Relations Committee might do. Would he personally support such an amendment?

Mr. PERCY. I have a briefing set up this week by the Central Intelligence Agency to update me on the effectiveness of this program. I am not in any way committing myself at this time, though in the past, I have supported the program. But I am not committing myself at this time. I have specifically asked, earlier today, that I be given a briefing. It has been established, because there are new facts that have been brought out recently, as the distinguished Senator well knows.

Mr. EAST. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations for his analysis and contribution. I am a great admirer of him, not only personally but because of the qualified expert leadership that he continually gives in the area of foreign policy. But I am going to put it bluntly, Mr. President: I am unmoved. I am unmoved. I think what we are seeing here is clearly not an intentional sleight of hand, but a rather skillful way of deep sixing this particular provision.

We will be told, well, after the various recesses, there will be various opportunities to take it up again. I do not find that terribly comforting.

I am not opposed to humanitarian assistance to the youth of the city of Chicago. I simply come back again and say if humanitarianism is the argument, do you not have any humanitarian instincts concerning the continued murder in El Salvador of the people there and of the great misery inflicted upon the country, as Jeane Kirkpatrick has pointed out, by the deliberate destruction of the economic and social fabric of that country?

Why is my humanitarian interest in that on a lower scale than your humanitarian interest in the youth of the city of Chicago?

Mr. DIXON. Will my friend yield at that point?

Mr. EAST. If the Senator will just allow me to finish the point, Mr. President.

In the Senator's case, I have no objection to that. I wish I could help them, and I wish to help them. But the notion that jobs for them are infinitely more significant and more compassionate and humanitarian on its face than this vague thing of \$21 million to aid those valiant people in Central America trying to fight off the imposition of a Marxist-Leninist totalitarian dictatorship imposed by Havana and Moscow—when will the U.S. Senate and the American people wake up to what is occurring? Will it take another Pearl Harbor?

If El Salvador falls, it will then be Guatemala, it will then be Honduras, it will then be Belize; the pressure will then mount on Mexico. We have seen

in the past, where Communists took control, at least 10 percent of the population would flee. Between the Rio Grande and the Panama Canal, there are at least 100 million people. You can expect at least 10 million, because they do not then have to go out in boats, to come across the Rio Grande. And they are going to do it. They are going to vote with their feet.

Listen: Look in the world today; wherever people can vote with their feet, they leave these brutal Communist systems.

I remember in Southeast Asia, and it still goes on, these poor people getting in boats and going out and drifting in the South China Sea, waiting for someone to come along and pick them up. How bad must it be?

Does the Senate realize that we have to put up fences and have strict new immigration laws to keep people out; the Communists have to put up walls and barbed wire and machine guns to keep them in.

I am saying this to the Senator: If we do not give these people the aid—moral and logistic—to defend their own countries so they do not have to come here, they are going to have to come here. And the world is finite geographically, and eventually, we shall be like—like what? People just fleeing into this country trying to escape the torment.

Is it not clear in historical perspective that the great threats to the democratic systems of the West in the 20th century, 40 years ago, were fascism, nazism, the totalitarianism of the right? And if it had not been for the likes of Winston Churchill, we would live under the swastika today, and it would have meant Dachaus and Auschwitzes and Buchenwalds—the great horror of that period. And if we allow the other great threat of totalitarianism in our time, the Marxist-Leninists, Maoists, the Stalinists, to prevail, the fruit is the same: the Gulags, the death camps.

Is that the legacy you wish to leave to your children and your grandchildren? Is that the great humanitarian instinct that motivates the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives?

The Speaker of the House not long ago went to China and he criticized the administration for allowing the defection of the Chinese girl who played tennis. Then later, when he was questioned about it, he said, "Well, I don't know much about foreign policy anyway." And how accurate that statement was. It is the Speaker of the House and a handful of people in the House who do not want to do anything to give aid and comfort to our friends in this world who seek to resist the imposition of the Marxist-Leninist solution.

Mr. KENNEDY. I wonder if the Senator will yield.

Mr. EAST. If I am the only voice in the U.S. Senate this afternoon to speak out against it, I shall feel the entire career that I have spent in the U.S. Senate, whether it turns out to be one term or two, or maybe even less than that, whatever the Good Lord wills, will be worth it to make a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my vigorous protest.

Every moral bit of fiber in my system tells me it is wrong, wrong, wrong for this country, the alleged leader of the free world, not to help those people. You say, "Well, it is a small amount, \$21 million." Well, then, why not leave it in? "It isn't big," you say; "it is small change."

Mr. DIXON. May I answer that?

Mr. EAST. When the Communists took over in Nicaragua and the Sandinistas took over, I was not in the Senate at that time but you voted like this to give them \$75 million.

Mr. KENNEDY. I wonder if the Senator would yield.

Mr. EAST. I have the floor and I shall not yield for the moment but I will in a moment.

You voted to give \$75 million to the Marxist Government of the Sandinistas, and the rationale was this would make them more amenable to democratic ideals and democratic institutions. It did not. You were foiled and conned. They slipped even further under the Soviet and the Cuban orbit. And now all we are asking for is \$21 million, less than a third that amount, to interdict the supplies going in there from Havana and Moscow to take over all of Central America. My heart weeps for those people there and the hearts of the American people ought to weep for them, to. It is a scandal. It is the great moral scandal of our time. We fiddle while Rome burns. We are excused by two facts: One, we do not know what we fiddle; and, two, we do not know that Rome burns.

The world continues to fall under the domination of the Soviet Union and her surrogates, exactly as the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Lenin, as expounded upon by Mao Tse-tung, predicted. And you are sitting here idly allowing it to happen and pleading, "Oh, Senator, please be humanitarian and allow us to get our aid for the city of Chicago." It is isolationism. It is the old heady brew of the twenties and thirties and it is going to bring great anguish to this country. I have heard no reason here this afternoon, and until I hear a clear and convincing argument that I am wrong in what I am asking for, and until I get clear, ironclad assurance that this aid will have the leadership support that it needs in the Senate to get it back in there promptly and the acquiescence of the House, I will not, I repeat, I will not accept that position. I will want to ask for the yeas and nays on it. And if I am defeated, I will

go home tonight and sleep with a clear conscience that I did my best because if I acquiesce—and we all in a great spirit of unity acquiesce—I would not blame them. The media, the national media will say, and why should they not, "It ain't a big thing. The Senate quickly and easily acquiesced." And this question will never come up again and we shall continue to see the fall of these countries in Central America. It is the great foreign policy issue of our time.

You know, we are always told in the analysis of American foreign policy that it is never the right time or place to make the effort. We were told Vietnam is not the place. That is far away. We were told that Africa, well, that is not really the place either, Agola, Mozambique or Ethiopia. We were told the Middle East is far away and we cannot do everything with the limits of power, and so forth and so on.

Have you ever noticed that it is only the Soviet Union that has national interests? We never do. We never have spheres of influence. And now we see right in our own front yard, or back yard, whatever you wish to call it, our own Central America slowly being Sovietized. You are going to see the whole Caribbean area and the Caribbean Sea become an area principally of Soviet, through her surrogate Cuba, dominance. The balance of power geopolitically is tipping against us.

Now, Alexandr Solzhenitsyn said that he felt psychologically the West had sealed its doom when it gave up in Indochina. And we lost that war here in the Congress of the United States when the aid was withdrawn. I was not here. That is where that war was lost. And Solzhenitsyn said psychologically, America lost the will to resist. I hope he is wrong, but he may be right. But I will say this: If we will not defend Central America, not only will he be proven right on the psychological point but geopolitically the balance of power is tipping against us and at some point will be irretrievable. We will have no alternative as the leader of the free world but to acquiesce in Soviet demands. They gain on us in terms of their military potential strategic. They gain on us in terms of their conventional capacity to wage war. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, John Vessey, has said in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, if the current trends are allowed to continue, they will eclipse the United States in terms of their military capability in every category, strategic and conventionally.

What is my point? We are following the follies of the 1930's—disarm ourselves, ignore the threat, pull into the concept of fortress America, "take care of our own and let the world go its own way." It is the fatigue of lead-

ership and yet here this afternoon it is pawned off in grandiose terms as, "Senator, where is your humanitarian heart?" Mr. President, I have the humanitarian heart and precisely what I want to avoid is seeing more Gulags in the world, just as in the 1930's I would have wanted to have headed off Dachaus, the Auschwitz, and the Buchenwalds. What is the answer to all of this? Am I wrong? Wherein lies my faulty analysis? Is the comparison ill founded?

Mr. MELCHER. Would the Senator yield for an elaboration on that point and a question?

Mr. EAST. Well, I am listening carefully and I shall yield for a comment or question from the distinguished Senator from Montana, but I will say this: I am placing the burden on my colleagues to convince their humble fellow servant and colleague here that what I have said this afternoon is wrong—

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, will the—

Mr. EAST [continuing]. Ill founded, ill considered, wrongheaded, and that we ought to drop this whole question and move on quickly to other matters; it is a pretty day, and on to recess, and we will take it up at some other appropriate time. I have been here long enough to know what all these code words mean. They mean it is over—no aid.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EAST. I have the floor, and I will yield in a moment.

It means, ultimately, no aid.

I cannot go home for the recess at the end of this week and live with a conscience that acquiesced in that.

I should like the Senate to go on record with a rollcall vote indicating that that is what it wants; and if that is what it wants, it will be, and that is the way democratic government works. But I will not put the stamp of approval upon it.

If we lose, we lose. I have lost before in here, and I will lose again.

Mother Theresa was once asked by a young reporter if she did not become discouraged with her work in India, working with the poor, and the indigent, and the dying, and there seemed to be no end to it, and she constantly was losing. Do you know what her reply was? "God called me to not succeed but faithfulness."

That is the spirit in which I approach this. If I lose, I lose. But at least I will have been faithful to something I feel is deeply necessary; namely, the willingness of this country, as the leader of the free world, to wake up and to respond and not to yield to the fatigue of leadership that now plagues the U.S. Senate, and it plagues the House of Representatives.

I say to Mr. O'NEILL—and I admire the Speaker—that he is wrong on this

one. I say that Representative BOLAND is wrong on this one. I say that the U.S. House of Representatives is wrong on this one. If a majority of the U.S. Senate cares to go along with them, I say they are wrong. I respect their right to do it. Let them do it. But there will be, I am confident, a strong vote of those who agree. It is immoral. It is not humanitarian.

What is going to occur is the continued Soviet-Cuban penetration of Central America, the subverting of our own best interests in this hemisphere, and jeopardizing the peace and the security and the freedom not only of our generation but also our children and our grandchildren. I refuse to have any part of it.

I yield to the Senator from Montana for a question.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. President, I have been listening with great interest to the Senator's discussion of this matter. Would not the Senator agree with me that since no armaments are made in any amount in Nicaragua or El Salvador, the best place to stop the arms flow from Cuba and from Russia into Nicaragua or El Salvador would be before the armaments reached Nicaragua?

Mr. EAST. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Montana is saying that he would support covert operations to go into Cuba to stop the flow out of Havana?

Mr. MELCHER. No. I do not want the Senator to misunderstand me. I do not advocate this covert action.

I am questioning whether the Senator agrees with me that it would be better to stop the arms flow into Nicaragua or El Salvador from Cuba or Russia before they get to Nicaragua.

Mr. EAST. How would the Senator propose to do that? I would be delighted to support an operation to overthrow the government of Fidel Castro. I would happily do that. But I suspect, will all due respect to the Senator from Montana, and I do not want to misrepresent him—he will correct me if I am wrong, and I will happily stand corrected—but he will probably be the first to rise and say what a scandalous thing it is for us to be giving covert aid to Cuban refugees in this country to overthrow the government of Fidel Castro. I would support it. Would the Senator from Montana? He is offering it as an alternative.

Mr. MELCHER. I would not want the Senator from North Carolina to misunderstand me. I am not talking about covert aid to anybody for the overthrow of Cuba. I am merely asking the question, whether the Senator would agree with me that it would be better to stop the armaments from coming from Cuba or from Russia into Nicaragua or El Salvador.

Mr. EAST. What I would like to do—

Mr. MELCHER. I would assume that we would have some basic agreement on that. Forget about covert aid. I am talking about doing something specific. We say to Cuba and Russia: "There is a Monroe Doctrine. There is a Treaty of Rio. We do believe that the Contadora Group is correct in saying that armaments should not come from Cuba or Russia or countries outside of this hemisphere into Nicaragua or El Salvador."

Would the Senator agree?

Mr. EAST. But as President Duarte has pointed out, simply saying it will not stop it. You must back it up with military muscle.

Mr. MELCHER. Let us start by saying whether or not the Senator from North Carolina can agree with me. That would be two of us.

Mr. EAST. But I do not think that the Senator from Montana—is it covert aid that troubles him? Well, I am willing to engage in open invasion, if that is what he wants, but he would be appalled even more at that.

Mr. MELCHER. I do not want the Senator from North Carolina to misunderstand me. I am not talking about covert aid. I am not talking about invasion. I am talking about what is stated in the Monroe Doctrine, what is stated in the Treaty of Rio; and what the Contadora Group seems to be saying, as I interpret it, is that they do not want the arms flow from Cuba or Russia or other countries into Nicaragua or El Salvador. I do not want those arms going into Nicaragua. I want to state it firmly. If the Senator from North Carolina and I agree on that, there are at least two in the Senate who have stated that.

Mr. EAST. Mr. President, reserving my right to the floor, the problem you faced with the army of Hitler is the same problem you face with the armies and the surrogates throughout the world of Moscow and Havana. They are unimpressed with words. They are unimpressed with our mere oral assertions of "Remember, gents, the Monroe Doctrine." The one thing they do respect is power and the effective use of it. Now they are using armed force in Central America.

How does the Senator from Montana—and in asking the question, I reserve the right to protect the floor for myself—propose, in the real world, to stop that penetration? Simply saying that the Monroe Doctrine is alive and well—well, the Monroe Doctrine is alive and well only to the extent that the United States has the will to back it up morally and logistically.

But what we are doing here is in fact not allowing the Monore Doctrine to be enforced.

Mr. MELCHER. I respond to the Senator from North Carolina that I think it is a pertinent question he posed. I respond to him by saying that

in the action that the United States took in Grenada, it was not an invasion of Cuba. It was a military operation on the basis of a request; however, people want to argue about whether it was a legitimate request from the people in Grenada and the surrounding islands to prevent any further arms buildup in Grenada.

The action was incisive, and it was decisive. It was not an invasion of Cuba, but it was a clear warning to Cuba that there would be no further military buildup in Grenada and a clear warning to Russia that there would be no further stockpiling of armaments in Grenada.

We have not had such a statement since then, either relayed through the State Department to Cuba or to Russia or from the President or from Congress, saying that it is intolerable for either Cuba to export armaments into Central America for the purposes of war, or for Russia to do it either directly or indirectly through Cuba to Central America.

I just state that as a matter of fact, and it has not anything to do with covert operations. It is simply a declaration and an exercise of policy, and this straightforward approach simply has not been debated here in this Senate to any extent.

I question the Senator from North Carolina, and I thank him for yielding to me and answering me to the extent that he has, on whether or not he agrees that the proper step is to prevent the arms flow from Cuba and from Russia into Nicaragua or El Salvador.

Mr. EAST. I do, and I say the only practical way to do that at the moment is to give this very small modest amount of symbolic aid for the use to carry on the Contra activities which will interdict the supplies going into Nicaragua that again I repeat, I hope not ad nauseam, that are again being infiltrated into El Salvador for the purposes of carrying on murder and killing, in the destruction of the infrastructure of that country.

That is what President Duarte has pointed out so carefully and artfully. Here is a true democrat with a little "d," and he not only needs the aid of his country but he supports this \$21 million. He says, "We cannot survive without it."

I understand what the Senator is saying, but I do not think he is responsive to my point. Grenada simply proves my point that—

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question which I think demonstrates his point?

Mr. EAST. Let me finish on the point the Senator made, and then I will be happy to yield.

In the case of Grenada, and incidentally, I remember the day this occurred, we had Senators pouring out on the opposition side, and I suspect

with great integrity and patriotism, and they were saying what a terrible thing this was. Yet we rescued 1,000 persons and for the first time since 1945 we reclaimed from the Communists a piece of territory. It was a time of rejoicing. But I remember on the opposition side, and I still hear from the opponents, "Oh, what a terrible thing the President did."

This is an infinitely more modest thing, conceded by the proponents of it. It is only \$21 million, but it is an important \$21 million. The timing is important and the symbolism is indispensable because if we this afternoon in the Senate simply quietly acquiesce, again I repeat, the national media will have no choice but to say the Senate has gone along with the House of Representatives, and the administration is alone and the President is alone.

I think President Reagan is right on this one, and I think the American people agree with him on this one. I think the beltway mentality is the one that is out of step. And I just cannot in good conscience sit here and let this one go down the drain without using the forum I have here as a U.S. Senator to say it is morally wrong, it is morally wrong and geopolitically it is disastrous.

I will tell the Senate what. If Central America falls under Communist domination and control, the opposition will quickly point to the White House and say, "Their policies failed. That is why it happened."

They said the same thing about the fall of Vietnam, but the Senator knows why Vietnam fell. It was because the U.S. Congress would not vote the funds to carry on the struggle, and I will tell the Senator Central America is going to go to Communists not because of the failure of leadership in the White House but because of the lack of vision, nerve, or will or something or other in the U.S. Congress.

It clearly is the majority opinion in the House of Representatives. So be it. I think they are dead wrong. And it may turn out to be the majority opinion in this body, and if so, so be it, but I say they are dead wrong.

But I have reached the point personally that I cannot in good conscience sit here and acquiesce in it. I do not know of any issue that has come before this body in the short time that I have been here that I feel more strongly about because of the symbolism it represents; namely, the will of this country to finally say enough is enough, we are going to draw the line, and we are drawing it in Central America.

Where else will we draw it? The Rio Grande? The Mississippi? Is there no intention ever to stop this?

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from North Carolina has correctly pointed out—

Mr. EAST. I am not yielding the floor. I want it clear to the Chair that I have the floor and I maintain the floor. I will yield for a question from the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the Senator from North Carolina. He has been generous in yielding and I appreciate that.

Mr. President, I believe the Senator from North Carolina has correctly pointed out a matter on which we have no disagreement, he and I, and perhaps many others, perhaps most others, in the Senate, that the Government in Nicaragua is Marxist, that it has ties with Cuba and through Cuba to Russia.

I do not defend that government, and I think their actions at times have been reprehensible.

But the Senator from North Carolina has brought up a very pertinent point, and that is that he believes that the arms flow is through Nicaragua to El Salvador and a lot of armaments are flowing from Nicaragua to El Salvador. I am not sure that we have surveillance to clearly state that that is indeed the case. But if it were, I would suggest that we step up our surveillance to determine when and how arms are coming to Central America and also strengthen our efforts to block them before the armaments reach Nicaragua.

But I do want to make one comment to the Senator, and that is this: It is not clear at all that the actions that the CIA has taken and is taking are contributing to any particular good because it was Eden Pastora before his injury, one of the leaders of the Contras on the Costa Rica border, who has stated publicly on several occasions that he would not deal with the CIA and with the aid that is being distributed to Contras in Nicaragua.

That is the opinion of one leader of the Contras group, that they do not want the CIA involved.

So I am not at all sure that we can draw the same conclusion that the Senator from North Carolina has drawn that the actions of the CIA have been meaningful and constructive.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. EAST. Mr. President, in responding to the Senator from Montana, for whom I have great respect, he has—and if I misstate his position, please correct me—throughout recent weeks when this issue has come up in one form or another personally opposed this aid. It seems to me, he is slightly, though not intentionally so, of course, somewhat disingenuous with me when he says that, "Well, Senator, the real problem is Cuba and the Soviet Union and we ought to stop it there."

Yet at the same time, I cannot get the Senator, I presume, to support a

covert action against Cuba. He does not even want to support this modest amount of covert action in Nicaragua. What he is suggesting, it seems to me, is that the real source of the problem is Moscow and Havana and that is where we ought to try to stint the supply. I agree.

That was true in Vietnam. We should have mined the Port of Haiphong to prevent the supplies from coming in from the Soviet Union. But we did not. We tried to interdict the supply lines. And then there was a hue and cry in the Congress and elsewhere that we could not even interdict the supply lines flowing down through the Ho Chi Minh Trail. So inevitably we lost. The way it was conceived and executed militarily, strategically, and tactically, as any person with a reasonable amount of military training would know, it was a blueprint for military defeat, which finally we were defeated and driven out and it is now under Soviet and Communist control. And Cam Ranh Bay, a former American naval base, is now a Soviet base being used to expand Soviet power into the South Pacific and to give aid and supplies to the Vietnamese Communists as they move into Cambodia and continue to threaten all of Southeast Asia.

Now I would have been willing at that time to mine the Port of Haiphong. But you could not even get people in this Congress to go along with interdicting the supply lines. To me this is déjà vu. You see, at that time we were told, of course, it is not in our national self-interest as to what occurs in that remote little area called Indochina.

Now I submit, Central America clearly is in the Caribbean and you are beginning to threaten the security, the legitimate national security, of the United States. And what we are talking about now is, how do we prevent that continued flow of supplies from Havana and Moscow, this time not into Haiphong, but into Managua?

I would say the other day we went through this when it turned out there was a very modest covert mining of the ports down there, a great hue and cry; it was a terrible thing we were doing. I did not think it was. I thought it was very appropriate.

If we had fought World War II on the terms we are fighting the current protracted struggle we would have lost it. And we are losing this one. I think we need to recognize that and the American people need to understand it. If they think that is in the best interest of this country and their freedom and security of this country, their children and their grandchildren, it is a democratic Republic and they have every right to do it, but that is what they are doing.

But I am simply asking, if I might draw the historical parallel, that we at

least interdict the supplies with a modest \$21 million, just as I would want to interdict the supplies going down the Ho Chi Minh trail.

But the Senator is saying, "Well, Senator, that is such a modest thing. Why don't we do something in Cuba or Moscow?"

Well, what would the Senator propose we do? He would not even support this modest effort. Do I understand the Senator to be saying he would support some sort of—if he is troubled with covert action—some sort of invasion from Guantanamo? I think he would be appalled at the thought of that.

I am simply looking for some sort of rational explanation as to at what point the Members of the U.S. Congress are willing to wake up to the military threat we face in this country. And I do not sense that it is there. There is no sense of urgency. There is no vision. There is no comprehension. It is the old isolationism, fortress America thinking of the 1930's and it was disastrous. It caused ultimately the death of hundreds of millions of people and our own sons gave of their blood more heavily than they have even done before.

I fear we are repeating that cycle. I am willing to listen to rational argument to the contrary, but we are repeating that cycle.

I know people will say, "Well, it is late, Senator, how much longer will this go on?" Well, it might go on another 15, 20 minutes, maybe a half hour, I do not know. But I do know this—

Mr. MELCHER. Long enough for me to respond.

Mr. EAST. I do know this: That if the United States refuses to give now the Congress this modest symbol of aid to Central America, the message will be clear, unequivocal to Havana and Moscow and our friends and allies throughout the world that there no longer is the will in this country to even defend its allies and its own interests in its own hemisphere. And that I think is catastrophic—one, morally; and, two, in the pure tough world of geopolitics.

As the junior Senator from North Carolina, I want the record to show for posterity that I opposed it with every bit of moral, intellectual, and physical vigor that I could muster—I thought it was wrong; dead wrong—and I could not go home for the summer recess without having expended every ounce of energy that I can to dramatize that point.

I greatly regret I must indulge the time of my friends in the Senate. But this is not a casual point. I think it is the most momentous foreign policy issue of our time, whether we have the vision and the will and the understanding to finally say enough is enough, we draw the line, we stand

firm, and we are going to begin to turn the tide of Marxism-Leninism back as we did in Grenada and we are going to do it in Central America and we are going to stand forward with pride and vigor.

That is what the President is giving us—vigorous leadership, hope, and confidence. I sense here in the Senate the leadership of fatigue, and fatigue of world leadership. It is a shame. It is wrong. It is scandalous. And I am not suggesting my colleagues are scandalous. I think their lack of understanding of it is wrongheaded, and I do not know any other way to dramatize the point. And I am looking for Senators to provide me with satisfactory answers as to where my analysis is wrong. This is a great deliberative body. This apparently is now the time and place to deliberate it. But I could not sit out there in the marble room, or in lobby, and let it slip through.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, I would like to respond to clarify my position, so there is no doubt, either in the Senator's mind or in the record on it. First of all, Mr. President, I do not compare Central America with Vietnam. I do not happen to be one who wishes to draw parallels between the two. Second, I do not back the covert aid because I do not think it has been successful, nor do I think it will be successful through the CIA's handling of it. I believe this should tell us to at least question ourselves, and to investigate carefully further covert aid. Edan Pastora, one of the leaders of the Contras in Nicaragua, states publicly that he will not deal with the CIA on their type of covert action. Third, I think it should be clearly stated that as I interpret the Contadora group's recommendation of Colombia, Panama, Venezuela, and Mexico, they do recommend stopping arms from coming from Cuba, from Russia, or anywhere else out of this hemisphere into Central American countries. I think it should tell us—at least I have concluded—that it is proper for us to instigate surveillance of those arms movements before they reach Nicaragua or anywhere else, and serve warning on both Cuba and Russia, or any other arms merchants that are selling armaments in there, that we intend to stop that flow. I do not believe that this is being debated here in the Senate. I think that is much more direct, easily understood, and more likely to be successful than the covert aid suggested of \$21 million for Nicaragua, or as the Senator from North Carolina has stated, some type of covert aid of Cuba itself to overthrow Castro. I think we can accomplish more by acting directly, by saying what we are doing, why we are doing it, do it with the Contadora groups, and every other country of this hemisphere. I do not think the Contadora group, those four, are the

limit of the countries in this hemisphere that would agree with what I am stating now. I think all other countries in Central America would agree, with the possible exception of Nicaragua, which obviously does receive arms from Cuba and, from Russia through Cuba, and therefore would not agree.

I thank the Senator from North Carolina for his graciousness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina still has the floor.

Mr. EAST. If the Senator from North Carolina still has the floor, I would be happy to yield the floor to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. What I want to do is make a brief statement. I would be perfectly happy to ask unanimous consent that I might do that without the Senator losing his right to the floor.

Mr. EAST. I would happily, without losing my right to the floor, yield to the unanimous-consent request to the distinguished majority leader or any other Senator—

Mr. KENNEDY. Reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object. I would like to inquire of my eloquent colleague from the State of North Carolina about how long he intended to continue to speak on this issue, and whether I would have an opportunity to speak to it this evening?

Mr. EAST. As the Senator from Massachusetts has probably seen, I feel very strongly on this issue, and I have received to this point no reassurance from anyone, anywhere, anytime, or anyplace that this issue will be brought up in a timely way, will enjoy the support that it needs to pass this body, and to carry the message loud and clear back to the House of Representatives. I am unimpressed with the Speaker's position. I am unimpressed with Mr. BOLAND's position. I am unimpressed with the House position. You might say well, they are equally unimpressed.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will withhold.

Mr. EAST. That is where the line is to be drawn. I see no reason why I should acquiesce in what they have done here. I think they have done a very wrongheaded thing. I do not know of any other way to alert the American people, to alert my colleagues to the error of their ways, and what I think is the error of their ways, than to engage in what I think is honest, intelligent, civil, forthright, and candid discussion of what I think is the greatest single issue facing this country at this time.

I have not made up my mind. I am not one who likes to unduly obstruct the flow of business in this body. I am weary of spirit, and weary of body. The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak after last week. I think for all of us not only is the flesh weak, but the

spirit is getting weak. But my spirit is strong on this one, and the flesh is holding up fairly well. I would like some sort of assurance from my colleagues that we are not just playing Judas, washing our hands of this, and doing it in the name of, oh, well, it will be taken up later; and, oh, well, do not forget the unemployed children of the city of Chicago, and appealing to some sort of humanitarian instinct. I submit nothing is more humanitarian than that we prevent the Marxist-Leninist juggernaut from imposing its brutal and bloody system upon the people of El Salvador and Central America. Where is the humanitarian, moral superiority, position, and posture that acquiesces in that? I would like to know. If I could get some satisfactory answer, I would cease and desist; or, if I could get some assurance that this issue would be taken up promptly in an orderly way with strong leadership in this body to restore it, to insist that the House restore it, and to back the President.

Mr. EVANS. Is there objection to the unanimous consent?

Mr. EAST. I do not find yet that kind of assurance nor that kind of response. So I wish to continue the debate and the deliberations, not unduly to hold up, but sometimes the only forum you have left in the U.S. Senate is simply to try to convey what you feel is exceedingly urgent I said a moment ago. And I will be happy, reserving my right not to lose the floor, to yield to the majority leader to make what explanations and other comments he wishes to make at this stage in the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The majority leader.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, a unanimous consent has been granted, I believe, that when I conclude, the Senator from North Carolina will not have relinquished his right to the floor. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BAKER. I do not know quite where to begin, Mr. President, because, you see, I have a dilemma as well because I, too, support, as does the Senator from North Carolina, the Nicaraguan program. Indeed, I helped lead the charge here in the Senate when only last week we won by a very comfortable majority on this issue. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Carolina requires assurance that the leadership in the Senate will attempt to restore this money for this purpose, I herewith give him that assurance.

If the Senator from North Carolina is asking for me to specify the bill on which that is done, I cannot yet do that. I hope the Senator from North Carolina will understand the requirement for that reservation.

He should also know that I will consult with the administration, with the State Department, and with others on that matter, as we progress.

I want the Senator to know that this Senator, this part of the leadership, intends to pursue this matter, even notwithstanding that the motion may prevail on amendment No. 14, as indeed I hope it will.

As to the administration, I never speak for the administration without making sure I understand what I am saying. I believe I am absolutely correct in what I am about to say now.

I am assured by the Secretary of State and by the White House that they accept this as a necessary move at this time to further promote and improve the possibility of continuing the Nicaraguan program. I have reconfirmed that by telephone to the Department of State at the Secretary's level and to the White House itself. I make that representation on my own authority. They accept this course of action, to remove by this motion amendment No. 14 from this conference report.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAKER. May I finish for a moment? I apologize to my friend from Mississippi, but I would like to finish.

Mr. President, I do not know how many bills there are to which this matter might be affixed in one form or another, either authorization or appropriations bills. But there is no shortage. I will consult with the Parliamentarian and we will try to identify them. I would guess offhand that there may be a dozen opportunities to do this.

Mr. President, in the final analysis, notwithstanding the brilliance and the diversity of this system of ours, with the magnificence of 535 of us in the Congress, finally somebody has to run the show, finally somebody has to make the decision on what is best to try to accomplish a purpose.

It is my representation, based on the communications I have just recited, that that purpose, the Nicaraguan program, is best supported by not trying to do it on this conference report, not trying to join issues on this amendment but, indeed, saving our fire for another time.

I would say in all candor to the Senator from North Carolina, this was not my idea. This idea evolved. It evolved after many consultations by me, by the Senator from Wisconsin, by others who are directly involved in this matter, with no doubt a dozen Members, including the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and others, on how best to proceed.

Mr. President, I guess what it boils down to is you do not fight every battle on every bill. It is my recom-

mendation, Mr. President, based on the information I have now imparted to the Senate, that we get on with the business of the motion before the Senate, which is a motion to recede from the Senate amendment to which the House added an amendment. It should be absolutely clear to everyone that, if that motion passes, I fully expect the Chair will rule that the Boland amendment also falls since it is an amendment to the Senate amendment. I believe there is precedent to that effect. The House may or may not have to take any further action on that score.

In 1944, I am told, they did concur in the action of the Senate. In 1913, they did not. So I do not know what the House will do, although I assume they will take some action in this respect.

My final entreaty, Mr. President, is this: Keep your powder dry. Fight this fight and we have a chance to win it, as we did last week. Let us not fight it here, or I think you will lose. Let us go along with the view that the best thing to do here is to support this motion.

I commit to the Senator from North Carolina, and anybody else who is listening, that I will help try and restore the money for the Nicaraguan program in which I believe.

Mr. President, I would hope we could do this by voice vote. I would hope we can get on with the business at hand and dispose of amendment 14 and send this conference report back to the House of Representatives.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield first to the Senator from Mississippi and then to the Senator from Arizona without the Senator from North Carolina losing his right to the floor.

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I think my remarks ought to come with the leader's remarks. I believe the Senator from Tennessee has rendered a service to the Senate. The question has been asked many times here on the floor if the administration's position is this or that or who has said so. We have never been directly assured. Now we are assured that the administration is in favor of dropping this amendment.

Mr. BAKER. I want to make sure I said the words I received; I want to be absolutely sure. The administration did not say they wanted us to do this. What the administration did say is they agreed it was the best thing to do and they accept this course of action.

Mr. STENNIS. That is very good.

Just last week, I supported this and I am going to vote now to lay the amendment aside. I judge it will come up again.

Mr. BAKER. I yield now to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I think the majority leader is making a point that should be well taken and paid attention to by my friend from North Carolina.

In the conference between the House and the Senate on the armed services bill, we have just today spent the whole afternoon on a subject closely related to what the debate today is over. The Senate did not pass any restrictive language relative to moneys to be used for sending troops, et cetera, et cetera, into that general area.

The House did, and we are now almost at an impasse where if the Senator's amendment fails, it could weaken our hand in the negotiations between the House and the Senate. Even if the amendment succeeds, it is not of sufficient strength to give us the strength that we would need to override the fact that the Senate says nothing about it.

I just mention that. I am not imploring my friend from North Carolina to do anything. I do think the majority leader's points are well-taken, that there will come a time a little later when the amendment could be offered and meet with great success where today I think the gamble might result in something that the Senate would not like.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Carolina for yielding, and I now yield the floor.

Mr. EAST. I thank the majority leader.

I would like to approach it as expeditiously as possible in this way: First, I would like to inquire of the majority leader on a question or two. That will be very brief. Then I would like to put a unanimous-consent request, without losing my right to the floor, to ask for a quorum call so that I might consult on a private basis with the majority leader. I would like to submit that unanimous-consent request in a moment.

Before doing that, I have two quick questions. I wonder if the majority leader would answer. I do not want to put him on the spot. Perhaps he does not know the answer. I deeply respect him and know of his great respectability and candor. There is no man in the U.S. Senate I admire more than the majority leader.

Rarely does one speak for all of his colleagues, but I think I can speak for the other 99: There is no man I admire in the U.S. Senate more than the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

First, I wish to say, with all due respect to the administration, I think they have been a bit remiss here in that I wish that their thoughts had been communicated directly to me. I have not heard from them, but respecting the great integrity of the ma-

majority leader, it seems to me that he is affirming to me here that this is in fact the wish of the President of the United States, via the Secretary of State, that this is neither the time nor the place to fight this particular fight. Though I know they are with me, as is the majority leader, they have not spoken with me—I would like the record to show that. I am not faulting them; I am stating the fact: I have heard neither from the President nor from the Secretary of State nor from anyone in the administration, period, that this is the way in which they would like to proceed. But I do so greatly respect the integrity of the majority leader that what he is saying is they have in fact, from President Reagan and from Secretary of State Shultz, communicated to him, one, that they would prefer to proceed in this way.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, once again, I do not want to evade the Senator's question, which is phrased a little differently than I stated in my assertion a moment ago. I would like to make sure that I do not say more than I am authorized to say. I believe the Senator is correct in his statement, but let me repeat for the record exactly what was given to me.

The first is the Secretary's office confirmed to me that the Secretary understands and agrees with this course of action.

The second is that a principal counsel of the President, at my request, consulted with the President—rather, that request was made, and I assume that is what he did—and came back and, by telephone call received a few moments ago, said that the President accepts this course of action and—well, accepts this course of action.

Mr. President, may I say that I suppose there are shadings of difference between supporting and accepting, but I think that is inconsequential here, because the fact of the matter is it must be taken in the context that the matter is pending and that I asked for a statement from the President on his position. It is clear that the President would prefer not to have to do this, but it is also clear that he accepts this as a necessary course of action.

Mr. EAST. So the junior Senator from North Carolina—to wit, myself—would be fully justified in believing that this is the wish of President Ronald Reagan and his Secretary of State, that this is not the time nor the place to carry on this particular battle—because I wish to support them. I support the President and I think he has been right all along in insisting on this. But as I understand the distinguished majority leader, I am being advised that the President and the Secretary of State would prefer, as a matter of strategy and tactics, that the battle not be fought here

at this time at this place; but that we will, we can be assured that it will be raised again.

And I presume—which leads to my second point—that it will be raised at such a time and in such a way that we will not jeopardize the people in the Government of El Salvador; that, in fact, ways can be found to give what aid is necessary not only to El Salvador but to those forces trying to interdict; that the administration, I presume, has at its disposal other ways that will allow us to accomplish the same end pending that time when we can then bring up this question of aid for the Contras.

To put it another way, the President's and the Secretary of State's position to the contrary notwithstanding, I am a little bit troubled—I do not wish to sound self-righteous or overly moralistic—at leaving stranded our good friends like Eden Pastora and those who are carrying on. Would we go home comfortably to our summer recesses here and the Democrats have their convention and so forth—I presume what they are saying is they will not be left in the lurch and we can be assured that that is the case. We are not leaving them in the lurch—I guess that is what I am asking the majority leader.

In short, two points: One, the President and the Secretary of State do not wish to fight this battle here and now at this time; second, the matter can be handled until such time as we can take it up on a more appropriate vehicle at a more appropriate time and place.

I am troubled with leaving these valiant people down there in the lurch, symbolically and in terms of the arms support that we could give them.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the first question is clearly answered in the affirmative. I think it is a correct interpretation of the language that I was authorized to use here. I think it is the only logical inference that flows from what I said.

On the second one, I simply do not know how to answer. I am not that familiar with the situation and I cannot give the Senator a good answer. I assume and I hope that that can be done, but I cannot represent that I know it can be done, because I do not know that.

Mr. EAST. I appreciate the majority leader's position. I suppose what he is saying to me, and it is not clear to me—I suppose it is the only thing he could say since he is not the President of the United States—is that it might be reasonable to assume that implicit in their response is that they feel they can carry on in some responsible way consistent with their own policies to ensure that the Government of El Salvador will survive in the interim. If that is what the leader is saying, it would seem to me implicit in their desire that we not fight this battle at

this time in this place. Obviously, the distinguished Senator cannot say, yes, I can guarantee that they have other avenues or ways to accomplish the same end.

I appreciate that perhaps I place an undue burden there on the majority leader, that he simply would not be in a position to make that kind of statement, guaranteeing what the President would or would not do or what his options might be. I think that is what the distinguished Senator is saying.

Mr. BAKER. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. EAST. What I would like to do and I deeply appreciate the time and patience that the majority leader has shown. He invariably, I think we all recognize, makes a joke of being a rank amateur in dealing with some of us in the U.S. Senate.

I would like to make this unanimous-consent request that, reserving my right to the floor, I may ask for a quorum call for the purpose of consulting with the majority leader briefly and, at the end of that period of consultation, we would, of course, lift the quorum call and proceed in a way that I think would grow out of the discussion that I might have with the majority leader.

Mr. President, I do submit the unanimous-consent request that, reserving the right to maintain the floor, I ask for the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, would the Senator let me suggest an alternative to that?

Mr. EAST. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. BAKER. The Senator from Massachusetts, I think, wishes to speak. I know he has been on the floor for a certain amount of time. He is holding up five fingers, which is the best offer I have had all day.

Would the Senator from North Carolina be willing to yield the floor so the Senator from Massachusetts may speak for 5 minutes, after which the Senator from North Carolina would be recognized? Would the Senator be willing to amend his request to accommodate that?

Mr. EAST. I would be willing to include in my unanimous-consent request at this point that the Senator from Massachusetts may be given 5 minutes in which, as I understand it, he wishes to speak, then to have the quorum call for consultation, because I always greatly enjoy hearing the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

I would not want to be involved in off-the-floor discussions while the Senator was speaking. I would want to hear what he had to say lest I might have a brief response to it. So, without losing my right to the floor, I would first then like to make a unanimous-

consent request that I yield the floor for 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for the purpose of making what comment he wishes, and the floor would then come back to me, I would then make a unanimous-consent request for a quorum call, at the end of which I again would resume my right to the floor that during that interim, which should be brief, I would have the opportunity to consult privately with the majority leader. In short, all I am saying is I would like to be present during the substantive debate. Certainly the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is a vital component of this debate, and I would enjoy hearing his thoughts on the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. EAST. So I make a unanimous-consent request that the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, reserving my right to the floor, would proceed to speak for a period of 5 minutes on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the majority leader for his intercession.

Mr. President, my views on the issue of U.S. assistance for the "secret war" in Nicaragua are well known to the Members of this body. I think it is just plain wrong. It is wrong morally, it is wrong legally, and it is wrong practically. It is inconsistent with our own principles and values as Americans, it is inconsistent, with our solemn obligations under international law, and it just does not work. I think that our assistance to the Contras should be halted—not just for fiscal year 1984 but for all time.

For these reasons, whenever and wherever this administration seeks to authorize or appropriate funds to support this "secret war," I will work to defeat it.

It is particularly unconscionable, however, that funding for this war in Nicaragua should be tied to programs—such as child nutrition, Public Law 480 emergency assistance for drought stricken Africa, and summer jobs—for those who are in need in the United States and abroad. I think it is a disgrace that this administration would tell the Members of the U.S. Senate that, in order to provide jobs for unemployed teenagers in our Nation's cities, the Senate must also vote to provide weapons for the Contras in Nicaragua. I think it is a disgrace that the administration would tell the Members of the Senate that, in order to provide needed food and medical care to women, infants, and children, the Senate must also vote to send guns

and bullets to the Contras in Nicaragua.

I note the statements that have in the last half hour been made about the change of policy by the administration, and that is certainly welcome. But the fact is the administration has been hard pressed to justify its previous position. I welcome the change in their announced position as stated by the majority leader.

Let us deal with the secret war on its merits. Let us not hold summer jobs of American teenagers hostage to the needs of the Contras in Nicaragua. Let us not hold assistance to the needy in the WIC Program hostage to assist to the Contras in Nicaragua. Whatever our views may be on the secret war, it is imperative that the critically needed funds contained in this legislation go forward immediately.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recede from the Senate's position on funding for the covert war in Nicaragua.

It is essential that we act quickly to provide the much-needed funds this bill contains not only for summer jobs, but also for the WIC, and Child Nutrition Programs. All of these programs are aimed at helping the most needy in our society—unemployed teenagers, pregnant women, and hungry children.

Of particular importance is the \$100 million this bill contains for summer jobs. No more serious domestic problem faces this Nation than the record levels of unemployment among our young people, especially those minority youth living in our cities. Unemployment among black teenagers is at 44 percent, 26 percent Hispanic youth are out of work. The problem is even more serious if we consider those who are so discouraged they've stopped looking for a job. While one in every two white teens is working, just one in three Hispanic youth is employed and tragically only one in every five black teenagers has a job.

I am not here to argue today for a comprehensive solution to this problem, though I believe that's what is needed and I would ask my colleagues to consider supporting the bill that Congressman Gus HAWKINS and I have introduced.

I am here asking you to support this additional money to put 100,000 unemployed teens to work this summer. The need is indeed urgent. Changes made in the formula under the Job Training Partnership Act, combined with a \$100 million reduction in funds has resulted in a significant loss of funds and summer jobs for several cities around the country—Gary, IN, will be cut 44 percent, Newark could lose 59 percent of its funding from last year, Phoenix stands to lose 32 percent. Cities in my own State of Massa-

chusetts, will lose 12 percent in funding, and the list goes on.

The proposal we are considering will not make every community whole, but it will restore a significant number of the jobs that would otherwise be lost.

Schools are out; summer is here, these 100,000 jobs are needed now. The young people of this Nation should not be held hostage to the covert war in Nicaragua. I urge my colleagues to avoid further delay and vote today to put our unemployed young people to work.

This may be one of the truly historic votes in the U.S. Senate.

The Senate has the chance now to join the House of Representatives in voting to end President Reagan's secret war against Nicaragua.

We may have other votes on this issue later this year. But I suspect that when we look back at the end of this Congress, we may well be able to say, this was the day the tide was turned—this was the beginning of the end of Senate support for the secret war, and the beginning of a genuine search for peace in Central America in voting to end President Reagan's secret war against Nicaragua.

I think we are making progress in our effort to end the secret war in Nicaragua.

For the first time in our continuing confrontations on the war, the Reagan administration has blinked.

I hope the Senate will strike these funds from the bill, and I hope we will continue to vote against the war on every occasion that we have in the future.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. EAST. Mr. President, I would like to again make a unanimous-consent request, without losing my right to the floor, to suggest the absence of a quorum, at which time we shall in due course suspend it and that I will pick up then the right to the floor and we can proceed accordingly. That is the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EAST. 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. EAST. Mr. President, I shall speak for about 1 or 2 minutes at the outside and then allow my position here to rest.

I have had an opportunity of speaking with many parties to this, including the White House. I have found in my conversations there is no lessening

in the commitment of the administration to the same goal that I seek, nor do I think is there any lessening of the commitment of the majority of the Members of the Senate to the position as I have stated it because previous rollcall votes on the issue have clearly indicated that this body and the administration share my goal.

I do dissent from the view expressed not long ago in his 5-minute remarks by the very able Senator from Massachusetts that this would indicate a vote for this measure without the \$21 million as a turning point in this debate of very significant proportions.

I think that would be an incorrect interpretation to place upon it. I think what should be understood by the American people and the American media is that this is no lessening of commitment on the part of the administration or the majority sentiments of this Senate as repeatedly expressed that there is a desire to give that aid and comfort and support that is necessary to prevail in Central America, that we have finally reached a point in the legislative process where we must move on and we will accept the measure without this aid, because there is much merit, of course, in the pending underlying bill, and I am very emphatic that I feel that the Senator from Massachusetts is in error and would himself be evincing some hostility to the underlying legislation by suggesting that by proceeding without the \$21 million this would represent a turning point in the whole policy of this country toward Central America.

I think rather it would have to be interpreted in an infinitely more narrow context; namely, as a change in legislative, strategic, and tactical maneuvering as to the appropriate time and place to reassert the deep commitment of this administration and the majority of this Senate to the need to do those things that are necessary militarily and economically to prevent Central America from falling under Communist control and Communist domination. And to put any other interpretation upon it would be incorrect, unwarranted, and contrary to repeated statements by the administration and by majority votes here in the U.S. Senate.

Because this is the point that, Mr. President, I have anguished over for some time, that by acquiescing to the House of Representatives on this matter, we some way or other indicate that we concur on the merit of their position. Clearly, the administration has assured me they have not lessened in their vigor and I have not seen any colleague here arise to indicate any lessening of their vigor in terms of repeatedly shown majority for the position that this aid is essential. This aid is essential. The aid to, one, El Salvador and, two, the aid to the Contras is

essential. It is modest and it is essential that this aid be made available to prevent, again, the Soviet Union and Cuba from imposing a military solution in Central America.

I think the Senator is aware that the great vast majority, portion, substance, of our aid to Central America is of an economic variety to help them build a viable economy and a viable democracy, and the motivations are humanitarian and positive and good and becoming of a great and free and benevolent country and people.

The amount we are talking about for military assistance is only a small fraction of that but, I repeat, as President-elect Duarte said when he was told and asked here and inquired of before the Senate whether the solution would not have to be political rather than military, he said, "Gentlemen, it is a very complex question. It is partly economic, it is partly social, it is partly political, and it is partly military."

Again, I repeat, but I think it is worth repeating, he said, "If you have an army on one side that is armed and an army on the other side that is not armed, you will have a military solution." And the military solution is the one imposed by the Soviet Union and Cuba.

And, as Mr Duarte said—he is a great democrat with a little "d"; probably would be a great Democrat with a big "D" if he sat here in the U.S. Senate, trained at Notre Dame, his mentor was Father Husburch; I do not think you could ask for finer credentials in terms of the democratic ideals—he said that what he did not want to occur in his country is to have military solutions imposed by the authoritarian right or the totalitarian left. And he could not do that without, one, aid for his own army and, two, he could not do it without aid being given to the Contra forces attempting to interdict the supply lines that were coming out of Managua via Havana and Moscow.

That is what he was saying, that you ought not to be allowed to shoot yourself into political power. I find that an eminently reasonable and responsible position.

I ask again and again of my colleagues, as the leader of the Free World, can we not support that honorable man in that eminently honorable position? I think the position I take is very responsible and I think it not only enjoys the support of this President and this administration but the majority of the Members of the U.S. Senate in a bipartisan way as has been shown in repeated votes on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I appreciate the indulgence of the Chair and I appreciate the indulgence of my colleagues this afternoon and I yield the floor.

(Mrs. KASSEBAUM assumed the chair.)

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, I thank the Senator from North Carolina. I know that he feels strongly about this issue and expressed himself today in very eloquent terms. Even though we disagree on the matter, I think the issue has had a good debate and good discussion and the record has been made.

Therefore, at this time, I move to table Senate amendment numbered 14.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, this is an important vote.

It does represent a lessening of the administration's commitment to the war.

And I say, "Amen."

Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] to table Senate amendment No. 14. The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. I announce that the Senator from S. Dakota [Mr. ABDNOR] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ARMSTRONG] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. EAGLETON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. HART], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. TSONGAS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] would each vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who wish to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 156 Leg.]

YEAS—88

Andrews	Danforth	Hatfield
Baker	DeConcini	Hecht
Baucus	Denton	Heinz
Bentsen	Dixon	Helms
Biden	Dodd	Hollings
Bingaman	Dole	Huddleston
Boren	Domenici	Humphrey
Boschwitz	Durenberger	Inouye
Bradley	East	Jepsen
Bumpers	Evans	Kassebaum
Burdick	Exon	Kasten
Byrd	Ford	Kennedy
Chafee	Garn	Lautenberg
Chiles	Glenn	Laxalt
Cochran	Goldwater	Leahy
Cohen	Gorton	Long
Cranston	Grassley	Lugar
D'Amato	Hatch	Mathias

Matsunaga
Mattingly
McClure
Melcher
Metzenbaum
Mitchell
Moynihan
Murkowski
Nickles
Nunn
Packwood
Percy

Pressler
Proxmire
Quayle
Randolph
Riegle
Roth
Rudman
Sasser
Simpson
Specter
Stafford
Stennis

Stevens
Symms
Thurmond
Tower
Trible
Wallop
Warner
Weicker
Wilson
Zorinsky

NAYS—1

Hawkins

NOT VOTING—11

Abdnor
Armstrong
Eagleton
Hart

Hefflin
Johnston
Levin
Pell

Pryor
Sarbanes
Tsongas

So the motion to lay on the table Senate amendment No. 14 was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. DIXON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, am I correct now that the vote just taken, which disposes of the last remaining amendment in disagreement, is the final action required by the Senate on this measure?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is correct.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, I was absent from the vote on the conference report on House Joint Resolution 492. Had I been present I would have voted "aye." On April 5, 1984, I voted in favor of Senate passage of this legislation.

DRUNK DRIVING AMENDMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, in the past few days, I have received numerous letters and phone calls in support of the Humphrey-Simpson-Symms drunk driving amendment. Today, I submit for the RECORD two noteworthy letters.

The first letter, written on behalf of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), indicates what I perceive is the essence of this issue: The development of a serious and consistent approach to drunk driving. Miles "Cap" Ferry, president of both the Utah Senate and the NCSL, points out several weaknesses of the punishment approach embodied in the Lautenberg bill, S. 2719, as amended. In addition, Senator Ferry echoes the practical value and significance of a comprehensive approach to drunk driving, a prime feature of our alternative.

The second letter, from Mr. Kenneth Eaton, Legislative Committee Chairman of the National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors, strongly endorses the Humphrey-Simpson-Symms "positive"

amendment. Mr. Eaton notes also the inadequacy of the penalty-based approach, that is the Lautenberg amendment. We must not enact legislation that is small in scope and fails to address the larger societal problem of drunk driving.

I am encouraged that these two groups in particular have endorsed our amendment. It is my hope also that my colleagues will review these comments, two of the many letters I have received in support of the positive and comprehensive direction of the Humphrey-Simpson-Symms amendment.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the two letters be printed in the RECORD.

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

JUNE 22, 1984.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing on behalf of the National Conference of State Legislatures to express our support for incentives that encourage states to raise their minimum drinking age to twenty-one years. The incentives approach suggested by Senators Humphrey, Symms, and Simpson deals in a positive and comprehensive way with the problem of young people who drink and drive.

The incentives approach is far better than the approach of imposing penalties on states that fail to raise their drinking age. Penalizing states by reducing their highway funds is not in keeping with the spirit of our federal system. Furthermore, reducing highway funds may preclude road repairs necessary for highway safety.

NCSL, therefore, urges you to oppose federal legislation requiring states to raise the drinking age of 21 or lose federal highway funds. NCSL believes that the serious problem of drunk driving should be addressed in a comprehensive manner through actions of state legislatures. A comprehensive approach to this problem will do more to further safe driving, and reduce fatalities than efforts to make highway funds contingent on raising the drinking age.

Again, NCSL urges your support for the Humphrey, Symms, and Simpson proposal. We believe the approach will save lives while respecting our federal system.

Sincerely,

MILES "CAP" FERRY,
President of the Utah Senate,
President, NCSL.

JUNE 25, 1984.

Senator GORDON J. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: We are aware of your plans to offer an amendment if and when a national drinking age proposal comes before the Senate. We strongly endorse your approach which provides appropriate fiscal incentives for those States which adopt a twenty-one year drinking age and which initiate other actions designed to reduce the injuries, deaths and other costs associated with drunk driving. This broad incentive approach is far more preferable to and will be much more effective than a simplistic and single focussed negative approach which penalizes States which need assistance.

We hope that other Senators will join with you in providing positive leadership on this complex national problem.

Sincerely,

KENNETH EATON,
Legislative Committee Chairman.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

(During the day morning business was transacted and statements were submitted as follows:)

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, a withdrawal, and a treaty, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations, withdrawal, and treaty received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill, which has been ordered held at the desk for not to exceed 10 calendar days on June 2, 1984, was placed on the calendar:

H.R. 5504. An act to apportion funds for construction of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways for fiscal years 1985 and 1986, to revise authorizations for mass transportation, to expand and improve the relocation assistance program, and for other purposes.

The Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from the further consideration of the following bill; which was placed on the calendar:

S. 1400. A bill to enhance the detection of motor vehicle theft and to improve the prosecution of motor vehicle theft by requiring the Secretary of Transportation to issue standards relating to the identification of vehicle parts and components, by increasing criminal penalties applicable to trafficking in stolen vehicles and parts, by curtailing the exportation of stolen motor vehicles and off-highway mobile equipment, and by establishing penalties applicable to the dismantling of vehicles for the purpose of trafficking in stolen parts, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-3433. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Agriculture transmit-

ting a draft of proposed legislation to require payment of fees for use of the National Forests; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3434. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Logistics transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the recent discovery and emergency disposal of a suspected chemical agent munition at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3435. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the certification of Panama Canal Commission estimated revenues for fiscal year 1985; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3436. A communication from the Acting Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States within the 60 days previous to June 18, 1984; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3437. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, actions taken during calendar year 1983 under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3438. A communication from the Acting Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a proposed alteration of Heart Butte Dam, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, North Dakota; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3439. A communication from the Acting Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a proposed alteration of Fruitgrowers Dam, Colorado; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3440. A communication from the Secretary of Energy transmitting, pursuant to law, the ninth report on the implementation of alternative fuels production; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3441. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the General Services Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, the prospectuses for alterations in Federal Buildings; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3442. A communication from the Deputy Chief for Natural Resource Projects, Soil Conservation Service transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Turkey Creek Watershed Plan, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3443. A communication from the Director of the Office of Private Sector Liaison, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Industry Policy Advisory Committee entitled, "A National Strategy To Increase the Competitiveness of American Enterprise in International Trade"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3444. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of his designation of a Chairman of the U.S. International Trade Commission; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3445. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the feasibility study of a Caribbean Trade Institute

in Harlem, N.Y.; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3446. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the U.S. Postal Service transmitting, pursuant to law, the first semiannual report on certain investigative activities of the U.S. Postal Service; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3447. A communication from the general manager of the Norfolk Naval Shipyard Cooperative Association transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the Norfolk Naval Shipyard Pension Plan for calendar year 1983; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3448. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "A Plan for Diagnosis and Prevention of Illness Related to Nuclear Resource Development on Indian Land"; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-3449. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General (Office of Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for comprehensive reforms in compensation of attorneys pursuant to Federal statute in civil, criminal, and administrative proceedings in which the United States is a party and in civil proceedings involving State and local governments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3450. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the prevention activities of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3451. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of Health personnel in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S.J. Res. 235: Joint resolution to authorize the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, Inc., to establish a National Law Enforcement Heroes Memorial (Rept. No. 98-528).

By Mr. PACKWOOD, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 1816: A bill to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, the Tariff Act of 1930, and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 to improve the labeling of textile fiber and wool products (Rept. No. 98-529).

By Mr. STAFFORD, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 2562: A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act and for other purposes (with additional views) (Rept. No. 98-530).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TOWER, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the following nominations: Lt. Gen. David E. Grange, Jr., U.S. Army (age 59), to be placed on the retired list; Maj. Gen. Bernard P. Randolph, U.S. Air Force, to be lieutenant general; Lt. Gen. John T. Chain, Jr., U.S. Air Force, to be reassigned in the grade of lieutenant general; Maj. Gen. David L. Nichols, U.S. Air Force, to be lieutenant general; Rear Adm. Robert E. Kirksey, U.S. Navy, to be vice admiral; Rear Adm. William F. McCauley, U.S. Navy, to be vice admiral; Vice Adm. Joseph Metcalf, III, U.S. Navy, to be reassigned; Rear Adm. Henry C. Mustin, U.S. Navy, to be vice admiral; Lt. Gen. Joseph T. Palastra, Jr., U.S. Army, to be reassigned; Maj. Gen. William H. Schneider, U.S. Army, to be lieutenant general; Col. John L. Fugh, U.S. Army, to be brigadier general; Lt. Gen. James W. Stansberry, U.S. Air Force (age 56), to be placed on the retired list; Maj. Gen. Melvin F. Chubb, Jr., U.S. Air Force, to be lieutenant general; Lt. Gen. George D. Miller, U.S. Air Force (age 54), to be placed on the retired list; Lt. Gen. William J. Campbell, U.S. Air Force, to be reassigned in the grade of lieutenant general; Vice Adm. Gordon R. Nagler, U.S. Navy (age 58), to be placed on the retired list; Gen. Billy M. Minter, U.S. Air Force (age 58), to be placed on the retired list; Lt. Gen. Charles L. Donnelly, Jr., U.S. Air Force, to be general; Maj. Gen. Charles J. Cunningham, Jr., U.S. Air Force, to be lieutenant general; Lt. Gen. Joseph K. Bratton, U.S. Army (age 58), to be placed on the retired list; Maj. Gen. James M. Rockwell, U.S. Army, to be lieutenant general; Gen. James V. Hartinger, U.S. Air Force (age 59), to be placed on the retired list; Lt. Gen. Robert T. Herres, U.S. Air Force, to be general; Maj. Gen. Duane H. Cassidy, U.S. Air Force, to be lieutenant general; Lt. Gen. Charles G. Cleveland, U.S. Air Force, (age 56) to be placed on the retired list; Lt. Gen. Kenneth L. Peek, Jr., U.S. Air Force, to be reassigned; Maj. Gen. Thomas C. Richards, U.S. Air Force, to be lieutenant general; Maj. Gen. Edward L. Tixier, U.S. Air Force, to be lieutenant general; in the Air Force Reserve there are 20 appointments to the grade of major general and below (list begins with Alfred B. Cole), and in the Army National Guard there are 2 appointments as Reserve Commissioned Officers to the grade of brigadier general (list begins with Nathaniel G. Troutt). I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

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

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, in addition, in the Air National Guard there are 31 promotions into the Air Force Reserve to the grade of lieutenant

colonel (list begins with Gary R. Baarson), in the Navy there are 715 permanent promotions to the grade of commander (list begins with Robert James Abbott), in the Naval Reserve there are 15 permanent appointments to the grade of captain and below (list begins with Timothy R. Bergfield), in the Marine Corps Reserve there are 102 permanent appointments to the grade of colonel (list begins with Charles L. Bacon), in the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve there are 462 permanent appointments to the grade of major (list begins with Charles R. Abney), in the Navy there are 406 promotions to the permanent grade of commander (list begins with Michael L. Adams), in the Army there are 805 permanent promotions to the grade of colonel and (list begins with Claude W. Abate), in the Marine Corps there are 12 appointments to the grade of captain and below (list begins with Dennis H. Mohle). Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to save the expense of printing again, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

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

(The nominations ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk were printed in the RECORD of May 22, May 24, and June 4, 1984 at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JEPSEN, Mr. DOLE, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. DeCONCINI, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. NUNN, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. HART, Mr. PROXIMIRE, Mr. PERCY, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. GORTON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. HUDDLESTON, and Mr. RIEGLE):

S. Res. 414. Resolution to congratulate and commend the USA Philharmonic Society; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 27

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL] were added as cosponsors of S. 27, a bill to provide for the conservation, rehabilitation, and improvement of natural and cultural resources located on

public or Indian lands, and for other purposes.

S. 462

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 462, a bill to amend section 1951 of title 18 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 875

At the request of Mr. MATHIAS, the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 875, a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to strengthen the laws against the counterfeiting of trademarks, and for other purposes.

S. 2380

At the request of Mr. HEINZ, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2380, a bill to reduce unfair practices and provide for orderly trade in certain carbon, alloy, and stainless steel mill products, to reduce unemployment, and for other purposes.

S. 2470

At the request of Mr. DENTON, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2470, a bill to provide for the national security by allowing access to certain Federal criminal history records.

S. 2618

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2618, a bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to promote expansion of international trade in telecommunications products, and for other purposes.

S. 2673

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2673, a bill to make permanent the prohibition of credit card surcharges.

S. 2719

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mrs. HAWKINS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2719, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to withhold a percentage of the apportionment of certain Federal-aid highway funds to be made to any State which does not establish a minimum drinking age of 21 years.

S. 2743

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. JEPSEN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM] were added as cosponsors of S. 2743, a bill to designate a portion of 16th Street Northwest, Washington, DC on which the Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is located, as "Andrei Sakharov Avenue."

S. 2766

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2766, a bill to amend chapter 44, title 18, United States Code, to regulate the manufacture and importation of armor-piercing ammunition.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 253

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 253, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate September 16, 1984, as "Ethnic American Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 267

At the request of Mr. CHILES, the names of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. EAGLETON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 267, a joint resolution to designate the week of September 23, 1984, through September 29, 1984, as "National Drug Abuse Education and Prevention Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 293

At the request of Mr. WILSON, the names of the Senator from Washington [Mr. EVANS], the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 293, a joint resolution to designate July 17, 1984, as "Spanish American War Veterans Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 317

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], the Senator from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. QUAYLE], the Senator from California [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], were added as cosponsors

of Senate Joint Resolution 317, a joint resolution to designate August 1, 1984, as "Helsinki Human Rights Day".

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 101

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. McCLURE], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. HART], were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 101, a concurrent resolution to commemorate the Ukrainian famine of 1933.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 118

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. JEPSEN], were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 118, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the portion of the street in the District of Columbia on which is located the Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the portion of any street in any other city in the United States on which is located a consular office or mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, should be named Andrei Sakharov Avenue.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 120

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 120, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the legislatures of the States should develop and enact legislation designed to provide child victims of sexual assault with protection and assistance during administrative and judicial proceedings.

At the request of Mrs. HAWKINS, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. QUAYLE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 120, supra.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 121

At the request of Mr. BOSCHWITZ, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 121, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the nondelivery in the Soviet Union of certain mail from the United States, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 412

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the names of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 412, a resolution to congratulate and commend the U.S.A. Philharmonic Society.

AMENDMENT NO. 3266

At the request of Mr. NUNN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska

[Mr. EXON], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON] were added as co-sponsors of Amendment No. 3266 proposed to S. 2723, an original bill to authorize appropriations for the military functions of the Department of Defense and to prescribe personnel levels for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1985, to authorize certain construction at military installations for such fiscal year, to authorize appropriations for the Department of Energy for national security programs for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 414—TO CONGRATULATE THE USA PHILHARMONIC SOCIETY

Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JEPSEN, Mr. DOLE, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. NUNN, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. HART, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. PERCY, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. GORTON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. HUDDLESTON, and Mr. RIEGLE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 414

Whereas the USA Philharmonic Society is a nonprofit corporation, organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, promoting the performance of music and dedicated to educational activities;

Whereas the goal of the USA Philharmonic Society is to inaugurate an orchestra unique in the United States and unique in the lives of the American people thereby providing an enduring cultural landmark for the Nation;

Whereas the first activity of the USA Philharmonic Society is the formation and maintenance of the USA Philharmonic, the only professional orchestra designed to assemble the best musicians between 18 and 28 years of age in the United States, and to belong to the entire Nation, based in the Nation's capital, which will, through its tours, generate international understanding of the musical talent that lives in our nation's youth;

Whereas opportunities for orchestral employment are limited since relatively few openings occur each year in major orchestras, thereby many talented music graduates are unable to begin their careers, the USA Philharmonic bridges this gap between formal training and the start of an orchestral career by providing professional experience and by assisting its members with placement in major United States orchestras;

Whereas other countries are draining United States talent by offering immediate employment to young musicians, USA Philharmonic offers a superior alternative for our young musicians trying to launch their careers, and provides a unique opportunity for them to participate in an international exchange of musical cultures as well;

Whereas more than forty years have passed since the musical genius of our Nation's youth has been shared with other nations, when through the leadership of Maestro Leopold Stokowski in 1940 and 1941, the "All-American Youth Orchestra" inspired nations in South America with its tours, USA Philharmonic will bring together musicians and musiclovers of other countries, not for political, but for artistic and spiritual interchange;

Whereas musicians for USA Philharmonic will be determined by two auditions in each of six regions, thereby offering participation to youth of all States, and coordinated by the Audition Committee with music associations, universities, colleges and independent schools of music to insure the broadest representation and the most outstanding talent;

Whereas USA Philharmonic on tour will present the classical repertoire and recent compositions from the United States and the host country, and, by alternating tours abroad with domestic tours, USA Philharmonic will showcase the musical genius of our Nation's youth, display the high standard of our Nation's musical invention, and play the first performance in the United States of prominent new music from other nations, including those of South America in 1984; and

Whereas the growth of the USA Philharmonic Society to date is due to the dedication of its many volunteers who have generously contributed their time and energy, and that the USA Philharmonic Society enjoys the support of a distinguished and very able Board of Directors: Mr. Michael L. Ainslie, Mr. Roger Alexander, Mr. Jahangir Amuzegar, Mr. Rick Barwick, Dr. John Bitter, Mr. Patrick J. Daly, Ms. Nancy Hyman, Mr. Paul Hume, Mr. Karl Jaeger, Mr. Afshin Khalatbary, Mr. Viktor von Lillienfeld, Mr. J. Walter Lund, Mr. Garrick Ohlsson, Professor Efrain Paesky, Mr. Richard Salmon, Mr. John Philip Sousa III, and Miss Elizabeth Taylor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Senate congratulates and commends the USA Philharmonic Society for its dedicated work on behalf of the Nation's young musicians, and its commitment to furthering better understanding among peoples of all nations through the universal language of music.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the president of the USA Philharmonic Society, Washington, District of Columbia.

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I am joined today by Senators KENNEDY, JEPSEN, DOLE, TSONGAS, MATSUNAGA, DECONCINI, ABDNOR, NUNN, SYMMS, GOLDWATER, COCHRAN, LUGAR, EAGLETON, WEICKER, HART, PROXMIRE, PERCY, BURDICK, SARBANES, CRANSTON, DODD, CHAFEE, THURMOND, JOHNSTON, LEVIN, STENNIS, HATCH, GORTON, LAUTENBERG, DIXON, BOSCHWITZ, MITCHELL, HUDDLESTON, and RIEGLE in submitting a resolution to congratulate and commend the USA Philharmonic Society, Inc., for its dedicated work on behalf of the Nation's young musicians, and its commitment to furthering better understanding among peoples of all nations through the universal language of music.

The USA Philharmonic Society is a nonprofit corporation organized and incorporated under the laws of the

District of Columbia which promotes the performance of music and which is dedicated to educational activities. The first activity of the USA Philharmonic Society is the formation and maintenance of a symphony orchestra—USA Philharmonic.

The USA Philharmonic, Mr. President, is the only professional orchestra designed to assemble the best musicians between 18 and 28 years of age in the United States. USA Philharmonic belongs to the entire Nation, is based in the Nation's Capital, and through its tours will generate worldwide understanding of the musical talent that lives in our Nation's youth.

One primary reason for creating this orchestra, Mr. President, is that it will provide young musicians with employment opportunities. Openings for orchestras are limited and only a relative few occur each year, Mr. President. As a result, many talented music graduates are unable to begin their careers with an orchestra. USA Philharmonic bridges this gap between formal training and the start of an orchestral career by providing professional experience and by assisting its members with placement in major U.S. orchestras. The experience working with leading conductors and soloists, combined with actual concert performances, is of tremendous importance to new careers. In this way we nurture and encourage the young talent of America.

Other countries are draining U.S. talent by offering immediate employment to young musicians. USA Philharmonic offers a superior alternative for young musicians trying to launch their careers, and provides a unique opportunity to participate in an international exchange of musical cultures.

More than 40 years have passed since the musical genius of our Nation's youth has been shared with other nations. Through the leadership of Leopold Stokowski in 1940 and 1941, the All-American Youth Orchestra inspired nations in South America with its tours. USA Philharmonic will bring together musicians and music lovers of other countries for purposes, not of political, but of artistic and spiritual interchange.

Musicians for USA Philharmonic will be determined by two auditions in each of six regions—Eastern, Southern, South Central, North Central, Northwestern, and Western. The audition committee will coordinate with music associations, universities, colleges, and independent schools of music to arrange the first audition. The second audition will determine the finalists. And, to maintain the highest standard, Mr. President, members of the previous year's orchestra must reaudition each year with new applicants.

USA Philharmonic on tour will present the classical repertoire and recent compositions from the United States and the host country. In 1984, USA Philharmonic will tour four countries in South America and in 1985 will tour the United States and Canada. By alerting tours abroad with domestic tours, USA Philharmonic will showcase the musical genius of our Nation's youth, display the high standard of our Nation's musical invention, and play the first performance in the United States of prominent new music from other countries.

Mr. President, the growth of the USA philharmonic to date is due to the dedication of its many volunteers who have generously contributed their time and energy. The USA Philharmonic Society presently enjoys the support on its board of directors of: Mr. Michael Ainslie, Mr. Robert Alexander, Mr. Jahangir Amuzegar, Mr. Rick Barwick, Dr. John Bitter, Mr. Patrick J. Daly, Ms. Nancy Hyman, Mr. Paul Hume, Mr. Karl Jaeger, Mr. Afshin Khalatbary, Mr. Viktor von Lilienfeld, Mr. J. Walter Lund, Mr. Garriek Ohlsson, Prof. Efrain Paesky, Mr. Richard Salmon, Mr. John Philip Sousa III, and Miss Elizabeth Taylor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Mr. Afshin Khalatbary, president of the society, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. Mr. Khalatbary emphasizes, out as a comparison, that a similar orchestra, the European Community Youth Orchestra, is supported by 10 member nations of the European Community. This is the only cultural project so supported by these nations.

Mr. President, it is my hope that many of my colleagues will join with me and the distinguished cosponsors of this resolution and see to it that it gets quick attention and speedy approval. Not only will young musicians in our Nation have increased opportunities to pursue their artistic endeavors, but the entire Nation will benefit from the outpouring of this talent and the good will associated with their performances both here and abroad.

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

USA PHILHARMONIC,
Washington, DC, May 15, 1984.

Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLINGS: My friend and colleague Rick Barwick suggested that I might seek your guidance and sponsorship for a bill granting a Congressional Charter to the USA Philharmonic Society. The Society is forming a professional symphony orchestra derived from the best of this nation's youth. The fact that no such orchestra yet exists is of valid concern.

It is necessary that I draw a comparison between the musical youth of Europe and the musical youth of the United States of America.

An extremely gifted young musician from Europe, who dreams of being in an orchestra of similarly gifted peers, aspires to being in the "European Community Youth Orchestra" (ECYO). The ECYO is the only cultural project in the European Community which is supported by all the member countries. The ECYO is powerfully endorsed by Heads of State, Chief Executives, Banking Houses and Corporations. The Heads of State and Chief Executives are:

BELGIUM

His Royal Highness King Baudouin, M. Wilfred Martens, Prime Minister.

DENMARK

Her Majesty Queen Margrethe II, H. Poul Schlüter, Prime Minister.

FRANCE

President Francois Mitterand, M. Pierre Mauroy, Prime Minister.

GERMANY

Professor Dr. Karl Carstens, President, Dr. Helmut Kohl, Chancellor.

GREECE

President Constantine Karamanlis, Andreas Papandreu, Prime Minister.

IRELAND

Dr. Patrick J. Hillary, President, Dr. Garret FitzGerald, Prime Minister.

ITALY

President Sandro Pertini, S. Amintore, Faffani, Prime Minister.

LUXEMBOURG

H.R.H. The Grand Duke Jean, M. Pierre Werner, President.

THE NETHERLANDS

Her Majesty Queen Beatrix, H.R.F.M. Lubbers, Prime Minister.

GREAT BRITAIN

Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister.

No orchestra of this calibre exists in the United States that can attract international focus and recognition of the collective representation of the best of this nation's musical youth. The irony should also be noted that the ECYO is receiving substantial backing from internationally recognized corporations such as The Coca-Cola Company and International Business Machines.

The USA Philharmonic Society looks to those in this country who have long been arbiters of this country's history, both cultural and political, and hopes to win their confidence and endorsement. The example of the ECYO is not called up idly as a quid pro quo comparison, nor is it the intention of the Society to replicate a carbon-copy of the ECYO in this country. Our intention is to provide an orchestra to which the best of this nation's youth can aspire, and be proud of, to an international and professional standard that can stand a comparison. In short, a standard that can be proudly flown anywhere in the world.

I hope our aims might merit your sponsorship for the Charter as proposed. It would indeed be an honor if this Charter of the United States Congress were the cornerstone of our foundation.

Yours sincerely,

A.R. KHALATBARY,
President,
USA Philharmonic Society. ●

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

TEXTILE FABRICS IDENTIFICATION ACT AMENDMENTS

GORTON AMENDMENT NO. 3333

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. GORTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1816) to amend the Textile Fiber Identification Act, the Tariff Act of 1930, and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 to improve the labeling of textile products and wool products; as follows:

At page 5, immediately following section 9, insert the following:

"TITLE II

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Comprehensive Smoking Education Act".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 202. (a) The Surgeon General has found that—

(1) cigarette smoking is the largest preventable cause of illness and premature death in the United States and is associated with the unnecessary deaths of over three hundred thousand Americans annually;

(2) cigarette smoking in the United States is a major cause of cancer of the lung, larynx, oral cavity, and esophagus and is a contributory factor in cancer of the urinary bladder, kidney, and pancreas;

(3) cigarette smoking is a major cause of chronic bronchitis and emphysema in the United States;

(4) cardiovascular disease accounts for nearly one-half of the deaths in the United States and it is estimated that one-third of the deaths attributed to cardiovascular disease are associated with smoking;

(5) pregnant women who smoke have an elevated risk of miscarriages, stillbirths, and premature births, and giving birth to infants with low birth weight;

(6) quitting or never starting cigarette smoking will reduce an individual's risk of illness or premature death; and

(7) Federal, State and private initiatives should be encouraged to convey to the American people information on any adverse health effects of smoking.

(b) It is the purpose of this title to provide a new strategy for making Americans more aware of any adverse health effects of smoking, to assure the timely and widespread dissemination of research findings, and to enable individuals to make informed decisions about smoking.

SMOKING RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND INFORMATION

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of Health and Human Services (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") shall establish and carry out a program to inform the public of any dangers to human health presented by cigarette smoking. In carrying out such program, the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct and support research on the effect of cigarette smoking on human health and develop materials for informing the public of such effect;

(2) coordinate all research and educational programs and other activities within the Department of Health and Human Services (hereinafter in this section referred to as

the "Department") which relate to the effect of cigarette smoking on human health and coordinate, through the Interagency Committee on Smoking and Health (established under subsection (b)), such activities with similar activities of other Federal agencies and of private agencies;

(3) establish and maintain a liaison with appropriate private entities, other Federal agencies, and State and local public agencies respecting activities relating to the effect of cigarette smoking on human health;

(4) collect, analyze, and disseminate (through publications, bibliographies, and otherwise) information, studies, and other data relating to the effect of cigarette smoking on human health, and develop standards, criteria, and methodologies for improved information programs related to smoking and health;

(5) compile and make available information on State and local laws relating to the sale, distribution, use, and consumption of cigarettes; and

(6) undertake any other additional information and research activities which the Secretary determines necessary and appropriate to carry out this section.

(b)(1) To carry out the activities described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a) there is established an Interagency Committee on Smoking and Health. The Committee shall be composed of—

(A) members appointed by the Secretary from appropriate institutes and agencies of the Department, which may include the National Cancer Institute, the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, the National Institute on Drug Abuse, the Health Resources and Services Administration, and the Centers for Disease Control;

(B) at least one member appointed from the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Education, the Department of Labor, and any other Federal agency designated by the Secretary, the appointment of whom shall be made by the head of the entity from which the member is appointed; and

(C) five members appointed by the Secretary from physicians and scientists who represent private entities involved in informing the public about the health effects of smoking.

The Secretary shall designate the chairman of the Committee.

(2) While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Committee, members of the Committee shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the manner provided by section 5702 and 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(3) The Secretary shall make available to the Committee such staff, information, and other assistance as it may require to carry out its activities effectively.

(c) The Secretary shall transmit a report to Congress not later than January 1, 1985, and biennially thereafter which shall contain—

(1) an overview and assessment of Federal activities undertaken to inform the public of the health consequences of smoking and the extent of public knowledge of such consequences.

(2) a description of the Secretary's and Committee's activities under subsection (a),

(3) information regarding the activities of the private sector taken in response to the effects of smoking on health, and

(4) such recommendations as the Secretary may consider appropriate.

LABELS FOR CIGARETTES AND CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

SEC. 204. (a) Section 4 of the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (15 U.S.C. 1333) is amended to read as follows.

"LABELING

"Sec. 4. (a)(1) It shall be unlawful for any person to manufacture, package, or import for sale or distribution within the United States any cigarettes the packages of which fails to bear, in accordance with the requirements of this section, one of the following labels:

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Smoking Causes Lung Cancer, Heart Disease, Emphysema, and May Complicate Pregnancy.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Quitting Smoking Now Greatly Reduces Serious Risks to Your Health.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Smoking by Pregnant Women May Result in Fetal Injury, Premature Birth, and Low Birth Weight.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Cigarette Smoke Contains Carbon Monoxide.

"(2) It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or importer of cigarettes to advertise or cause to be advertised (other than through the use of outdoor billboards) within the United States any cigarette unless the advertising bears, in accordance with the requirements of this section, one of the following labels:

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Smoking Causes Lung Cancer, Heart Disease, Emphysema, and May Complicate Pregnancy.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Quitting Smoking Now Greatly Reduces Serious Risks to Your Health.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Smoking by Pregnant Women May Result in Fetal Injury, Premature Birth, and Low Birth Weight.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Pregnant Women Who Smoke Risk Fetal Injury and Premature Birth.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Cigarette Smoke Contains Carbon Monoxide.

"(3) It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or importer of cigarettes to advertise or cause to be advertised within the United States through the use of outdoor billboards any cigarette unless the advertising bears, in accordance with the requirements of this section, one of the following labels:

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Smoking Causes Lung Cancer, Heart Disease, and Emphysema.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Quitting Smoking Now Greatly Reduces Serious Health Risks.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Cigarette Smoke Contains Carbon Monoxide.

SURGEON GENERAL'S WARNING: Pregnant Women Who Smoke Risk Fetal Injury and Premature Birth.

"(b)(1) Each label statement required by paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall be located in the place label statements were placed on cigarette packages as of the date of the enactment of this subsection. The phrase 'Surgeon General's Warning' shall appear in capital letters and the size of all other letters in the label shall be the same as the size of such letters as of such date of enactment. All the letters in the label shall

appear in conspicuous and legible type in contrast by typography, layout, or color with all other printed material on the package.

"(2) The format of each label statement required by paragraph (2) of subsection (a) shall be the format required under this section for label statements in cigarette advertising as of the date of the enactment of this subsection, except that the phrase 'Surgeon General's Warning' shall appear in capital letters, the area of the rectangle enclosing the label shall be 50 percent larger in size with a corresponding increase in the size of the type in the label, the width of the rule forming the border around the label shall be twice that in effect on such date, and the label may be placed at a distance from the outer edge of the advertisement which is one-half the distance permitted on such date. Each label statement shall appear in conspicuous and legible type in contrast by typography, layout, or color with all other printed material in the advertisement.

"(3) The format and type style of each label statement required by paragraph (3) of subsection (a) shall be the format and type style required in outdoor billboard advertising as of the date of the enactment of this subsection. Each such label statement shall be printed in capital letters of the height of the tallest letter in a label statement on outdoor advertising of the same dimension on such date of enactment. Each such label statement shall be enclosed by a black border which is located within the perimeter of the format required in outdoor billboard advertising of the same dimension on such date of enactment and the width of which is twice the width of the vertical element of any letter in the label statement within the border.

"(c) The label statements specified in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) shall be rotated by each manufacturer or importer of cigarettes quarterly in alternating sequence on packages of each brand of cigarette manufactured by the manufacturer or importer and in the advertisements for each such brand of cigarettes in accordance with a plan submitted by the manufacturer or importer and approval by the Federal Trade Commission. The Federal Trade Commission shall approve a plan submitted by a manufacturer or importer of cigarettes which will provide the rotation required by this subsection and which assures that all of the labels required by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) will be displayed by the manufacturer or importer at the same time."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect upon the expiration of a one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

CIGARETTE INGREDIENTS

SEC. 205. (a) The Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act is amended by redesignating sections 7 through 12 as sections 6 through 13, respectively, and by inserting after section 6 the following new section:

CIGARETTE INGREDIENTS

"Sec. 207. (a) Each person who manufactures, packages, or imports cigarettes shall annually provide the Secretary with a list of the ingredients added to tobacco in the manufacture of cigarettes which does not identify the company which uses the ingredients or the brand of cigarettes which contain the ingredients. A person or group of persons required to provide a list by this subsection may designate an individual or

entity to provide the list required by this subsection.

"(b)(1) At such times as the Secretary considers appropriate, the Secretary shall transmit to the Congress a report, based on the information provided under subsection (a), respecting—

"(A) a summary of research activities and proposed, research activities on the health effects of ingredients added to tobacco in the manufacture of cigarettes and the findings of such research;

"(B) information pertaining to any such ingredient which in the judgment of the Secretary poses a health risk to cigarette smokers; and

"(C) any other information which the Secretary determines to be in the public interest.

"(2)(A) Any information provided to the Secretary under subsection (a) shall be treated as trade secret or confidential information subject to section 552(b)(4) of title 5, United States Code and section 1905 of title 18, United States Code and shall not be revealed, except as provided in paragraph (1), to any person other than those authorized by the Secretary in carrying out their official duties under this section.

"(B) Subparagraph (A) does not authorize the withholding of a list provided under subsection (a) from any duly authorized subcommittee or committee of the Congress. If a subcommittee or committee of the Congress requests the Secretary to provide it such a list, the Secretary shall make the list available to the subcommittee or committee and shall, at the same time, notify in writing the person who provided the list of such request.

"(C) The Secretary shall establish written procedures to assure the confidentiality of information provided under subsection (a). Such procedures shall include the designation of a duly authorized agent to serve as custodian of such information. The agent—

"(i) shall take physical possession of the information and, when not in use by a person authorized to have access to such information, shall store it in a locked cabinet or file, and

"(ii) shall maintain a complete record of any person who inspects or uses the information.

Such procedures shall require that any person permitted access to the information shall be instructed in writing not to disclose the information to anyone who is not entitled to have access to the information."

(b) Section 7 of the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act added by subsection (a) shall take effect upon the expiration of the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

SEC. 207. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 3 of the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (15 U.S.C. 1331) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) the public may be adequately informed about any adverse health effects of cigarette smoking by inclusion of warning notices on each package of cigarettes and in each advertisement of cigarettes."

(b) Section 3 of such Act (14 U.S.C. 1332) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health and Human Services."

(c) Section 8 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1336) (as so redesignated) is amended to read as follows:

"FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

"SEC. 208. Nothing in this Act (other than the requirements of section 4(b)) shall be construed to limit, restrict, expand, or otherwise affect the authority of the Federal Trade Commission with respect to unfair or deceptive acts or practices in the advertising of cigarettes."

(d) Section 9 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1337) (as so redesignated) is amended—

(1) by striking out "of Health, Education, and Welfare" in subsection (a),

(2) by redesignating clauses (A) and (B) in such subsection as clauses (1) and (2), respectively,

(3) by striking out clause (A) in subsection (b) and by redesignating clauses (B) and (C) as clauses (1) and (2), respectively.

At page 1, between the enacting clause and Sec. 2, insert "Title I", and renumber sections 2 through 9 accordingly.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet on Tuesday, June 26, 1984, at 10 a.m., in SR-301, Russell Building, to consider pending legislative and administrative business.

The following items on the committee's legislative agenda are scheduled for markup: Senate Resolution 365, authorizing expenditures by the Select Committee on Indian Affairs; Senate Resolution 369, to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Senate to design and make available to Members an official Senate flag; and Senate Concurrent Resolution 122, to provide for a Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies.

Under administrative business, the committee will consider proposed contracts with the vendors selected to provide computer systems for Senators' offices. Committee staff will also present draft regulations on the allocation and installation of the computer equipment in senatorial offices.

For further information regarding this business meeting, please contact Carole Blessington of the Rules Committee staff on 224-0278.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, June 25, at 2 p.m., to hold a hearing on the following nominations:

Alberto Martinez Piedra, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Guatemala;

Clint Arlen Lauderdale, to be Ambassador to the Cooperative Republic of Guinea.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS REPLY TO HERITAGE FOUNDATION

● Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on June 12 I placed in the RECORD an article from the National Security Record published by the Heritage Foundation which discussed what was believed to be the legislative agenda of the Federation of American Scientists. The FAS has delivered a letter to me in which the group replies to the claim made by the Heritage Foundation. The FAS denies having written a basic document which appears to have been relied on by the Heritage Foundation in preparing its report.

In the interest of fairness, Mr. President, I now insert in the RECORD the complete text of the letter by the FAS.

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS,
Washington, DC, June 20, 1984.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: A recent article published by The Heritage Foundation, which you inserted in the Congressional Record, purported to be based on a copy of our "Agenda for 1984".

Since no such document exists, we have been investigating how this smear came about and wondered whether, in fairness to our organization, you might insert our conclusions in the Congressional Record.

The one-page typed document from which Heritage Foundation drew the so-called "Association's Agenda for 1984" is not on our letterhead, does not have our name typed on it, was not prepared by us and is certainly not our "Association Agenda for 1984". If the Heritage Foundation journalist preparing his report for its "National Security Record" had asked us, we certainly would have told him so.

Indeed, this one-page unnamed and undated document is not an "Agenda" at all but a list of options and is so entitled: "Legislative Options". It appears to have been passed out by some other organization, not by us, as a list of catch all possibilities for amendments to the defense budget for discussion at a group meeting.

But the Heritage Foundation journalist did more than attribute, without checking, a document to us. And he did more than elevate it from "Legislative Options" to "A Copy of the Association's Agenda for 1984". He actually doctored the document so that it would confirm to the change from a list of options to an agenda. (Thus where it gives two options for the B-1 bomber, one of which was to "Limit number of B-1s to 100", he simply deleted this option and left "Kill program". He similarly massaged options concerning the MX missile so that they could not be read as alternatives.)

As if this were not enough, he then editorialized: "The lobbying program goes on with pages of details; members of Congress to contact, bills to support or oppose, programs of working groups and liaison with pro-peace groups". To support this, all the Heritage Foundation has sent over to us are two FAS documents totaling 9 pages: one on Space Weapons and one on Ballistic Missile

Defense. With editorial skills and attitudes like this, the Heritage Foundation "National Security Reporter" doesn't really need reporters or telephones, they can make it up out of whole cloth.

For the rest, this article was more of a smear than an invention but one point should be mentioned.

Our organization, and our members, know from personal experience how useful it can be to have a dialogue with the Soviet Academy of Sciences on issues like the ballistic missile defense. Indeed, the Soviet Union was persuaded to sign the ABM Treaty of 1972 only after a decade of such discussions. And it was the Soviet scientists who infected the Soviet bureaucracy with a logic that was developed first in the U.S.

Thus our interest in continuing this dialogue is part and parcel of our interest in maintaining this Treaty a matter on which both Superpowers and almost all scientists have been agreed now for the last dozen years.

The Heritage Foundation's reporter is eager to characterize this as an invidious way as possible so he describes a proposed press conference as an effort to "show U.S. and Soviet scientists joining together in opposition to the Administration's defense program". We would describe it as an effort to show that the scientists of both sides do want to maintain the ABM Treaty—and we have no doubt but that virtually all of them do.

In any case, Senator Goldwater, we wanted to be sure that you and your colleagues knew that our "Agenda" if we had one would cover many other topics and handle them in many other ways. Since the article you submitted was based on a document that does not exist, we hoped that you might place this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to balance the Senate's record.

Sincerely,

JEREMY J. STONE.●

RETIREMENT OF CLAYTON FRITCHEY

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, last week, Clayton Fritchey, whose thoughts and writings have graced our Nation's newspapers for a half century, wrote his final column and retired from daily journalism.

Surely, 50 years hard labor in this field entitles anyone to retirement. Still, his departure is an occasion of sadness to his readers and to the newspapers he so ably served.

I have known Clayton Fritchey for considerably more than half the half century to which his writing has added so much. I have not always agreed with him, and assuredly he has not always agreed with me, but I attest to his unflinching intelligence and generosity.

Happily, for his many readers, he now embarks upon his memoirs. We await them eagerly.

Mr. President, without objection, I ask that Mr. Fritchey's final column, which appeared in the June 18, 1984 edition of *Newsday*, be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

FAREWELL PROPHECY: MONDALE'S CHANCES ARE WORTH A BET

The big surprise of the presidential campaign is on the horizon. All during the months of the primary contests, former Vice President Walter Mondale has been portrayed in the media as passive and lackluster, without fire or the capacity to arouse the voters.

It is true that he has pulled his punches. Even when critical of his principal rival, Sen. Gary Hart, it was evident that Mondale had no real stomach for attacking a fellow Democrat, especially one who had been a longtime friend and had a similar record on many issues.

At the beginning of the year, it appeared that Mondale would have little trouble winning the nomination, thus enabling him to use the primaries as a warmup for an aggressive all-out campaign against President Reagan in the fall. This strategy, however, had to be largely abandoned when, unexpectedly, Hart became a serious contender.

In the course of this battle, Mondale had little choice but to defend himself against Hart's attacks, and do some negative counterpunching of his own. But it was obvious he didn't relish it. The politician he was primed and eager to attack was Reagan, not another Democrat.

The upshot is that the public has not seen the kind of campaigner who will emerge after Mondale wins the Democratic nomination and launches the toughest challenge Reagan has ever faced. The well-seasoned former vice president will not be a patsy like Carter, either in debate or on the hustings. Moreover, during the recent primaries, Mondale has already had thrown at him everything that Reagan can throw.

But after a free ride to the Republican nomination, will Reagan be prepared to the exhaustive, relentless assault that is soon coming his way? In the past, Reagan has always been on the offensive politically, notably when he campaigned against Gerald Ford for the GOP nomination in 1976, and against Jimmy Carter and "Washington" in 1980. This time, Reagan himself is "Washington," and Mondale will not let him forget it.

Also, if Reagan tries to run against Carter again, it could well boomerang, for Mondale is only too eager to compare Reagan's dismal foreign policy record with Carter's historic achievements, including the Camp David accords for the Mideast, the normalizing of relations with China and the SALT II treaty with the Soviets. Carter was a bust as a politician, but history is going to be kinder to him than the voters were in 1980.

There is much talk about the primary clashes making party unity impossible at the coming Democratic convention. Actually, the Mondale-Hart duels were namby-pamby affairs compared to the Eisenhower-Taft knockdown fight at the 1952 GOP convention, or Lyndon Johnson's personal attack on John F. Kennedy and his family at the 1960 Democratic convention, or George Bush's attack on Reagan's "voodoo economics" during the 1980 fight for the nomination. In all three cases, the nominees went on to victory.

In Mondale, the Democrats have for the first time in years a mainstream candidate who is acceptable to all factions of the party, even if he doesn't arouse enthusiasm in all quarters. Rep. James J. Florio (D-N.J.) put it this way: "We know that he is a proven commodity."

I would like to make a prophecy: In 1948 I bet Harry Truman would beat Tom Dewey.

I think it's a good bet that Mondale will beat Reagan, even though the Las Vegas odds are now 4-1 against Mondale—they were 10-1 against Truman.●

SUPPORT FOR AN INDEPENDENT NATIONAL ARCHIVES

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I wish to state my strong support for S. 905, the bill to create an independent National Archives and Records Service. I have cosponsored this legislation in two Congresses—the 97th and 98th. I commend the Senate for its action in passing this measure on June 21, 1984.

This bill now has 51 cosponsors—more than half the Senate. And the President has indicated that he favors its passage. The legislation was favorably reported by the Committee on Governmental Affairs, on which I serve, on April 3, 1984.

Currently, the Archives is part of the General Services Administration. Historians and archivists have long had reservations about the wisdom of placing the custodian of the Nation's history under the administration of an agency with a very different mission. The General Services Administration is charged with watching the bottom line as it performs important house-keeping functions for the Federal Government. Unfortunately, the work of archivists and records managers is intangible and does not lend itself to productivity measures or principles of profit and loss. It is no wonder that the National Archives has suffered from a low priority status at GSA and from its lack of independence.

Resources—particularly budget resources—for the Archives have been severely restricted over the years. Many feel that this is because of the Archives' organizational placement within GSA. If the Archives were independent, it would be in a better position to compete for a fair share of the Federal budget.

I quote the words of the famous historian, Barbara W. Tuchman, in her testimony before the Governmental Affairs Committee on this bill:

One gets the impression, judging from budget cuts reducing personnel, that GSA thinks the Archives are crates of papers to be stored in the cellar. The National Archives should rather be accorded the same dignity as a university and the same independent status as the Library of Congress and the Smithsonian, and the Archivist Director should be on a par with the Librarian of Congress and the Secretary of the Smithsonian. Supervision could be exercised by a Board of Regents on the model of the Smithsonian Board which includes, as you know, several of your colleagues and members of the lower House and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court as chairman and a variety of distinguished laymen. Surely the National Archives deserves as much.

This year, 1984, is the 50th anniversary of the creation of the National Archives. It is very appropriate in this

golden anniversary year that we pass S. 905 to give the National Archives the independent status that it deserves.

Among the many organizations of archivists and historians supporting S. 905 is the American Association for State and Local History. The headquarters for this organization happens to be in Nashville, TN. With unanimous consent, I ask that a recent letter from Gerald George, the director of the group, be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR
STATE AND LOCAL HISTORY,
Nashville, TN, June 15, 1984.

HON. JIM SASSER,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SASSER: I write concerning S. 905, the bill to separate the National Archives and Records Service from the General Services Administration. My understanding is that you are among the 47 bipartisan sponsors of the bill, for which we are grateful. I also understand that Senator Hatfield is in possession of a letter from Joseph Wright, deputy director of the Office of Management and Budget, expressing the Administration's support for enactment of S. 905. Yet S. 905, even though reported in April, has not come to the Senate floor. Can you tell me why not? And can you help to get it moved to the floor before the end of this session of the Congress.

Our members are engaged in teaching and research in history, in historic site preservation and interpretation, and in the care and conservation of archival and museum collections. One way or another we are all devoted to the protection and use of the historic resources of this country, and the holdings of the National Archives are among the most important collections of historic resources that we have. Therefore we understand the need for the National Archives to be free of control of the GSA administrators whose area of expertise is not historic-resources management; to be free of political pressures that come with being under GSA; and to be free of the frustrations of trying to take responsibility for priceless national records and documents without power within NARS to control its own budget, program priorities, or appointments of personnel.

The protection of America's documentary heritage is an on-going responsibility that cannot be treated simply as any other government program. The national archivist must have the independence to meet that on-going responsibility in accordance with the highest standards of professional understanding and service, which has not been possible within the confines of the General Services Administration.

The bill is very important to our 7,500-member association, with national headquarters in Nashville. The National Archives cares for the documentary treasures that are so important for the study and understanding of our heritage. Thanks for your support and please let me know what additional steps to help you can take.

Sincerely,

GERALD GEORGE,
Director. ●

THE BERRY SUCCESS STORY

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, the recent grand opening of the Berry Wholesale Drug Co.'s new warehouse in Nashville is an event that deserves the attention of my colleagues.

It marked another successful turn in the development of this 26-year-old firm and it shows that the entrepreneurial spirit is strong and prospering and wholesomely evident in the person of the firm's founder and president, Allen D. Berry, Jr.

The Berry success story was outlined in a recent Nashville Banner article, and I ask that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

This success story is all the more remarkable, for it comes at a time when the American small businessman, the American entrepreneur, is still struggling with the aftereffects of the most severe recession since the Great Depression.

In 1983 there were 31,334 business failures in America, the most failures in a half century. Dun & Bradstreet reported last month that the rate of business failures was exceeding the record rate of 1983. To put it in other terms, this represents roughly 120 business failures every business day. And the overwhelming number of these businesses, the data show, are small businesses.

It is against this backdrop that the Berry Wholesale Drug Co. not only survived; it prospered and expanded. I want to take this occasion to applaud the firm and to commend its success story to my colleagues.

The article follows:

EXCITEMENT IN A DOUBLE DOSE AT BERRY
(By Mary Hance)

There was a double dose of excitement this week at Berry Wholesale Drug Co. as they celebrated 26 years in business and the grand opening of their \$2.5 million facility on Old Hickory Boulevard.

"We are very excited," said Allen D. Berry Jr., president and founder of the drug wholesaling concern. "The new facility is much more efficient—six times more efficient in terms of picking orders."

The Berry Company was founded in 1958 by Berry and other Nashville officials of the McKesson and Robbins Co. who wanted their own wholesale drug company here. Now the company serves almost 700 stores in the Mid-state area.

Berry was located at 128 Second Avenue North for a quarter of a century until late February when all operations moved to the new facility.

"This is one of the most sophisticated up-to-date drug wholesaler operations in the country," said Berry, proudly looking over the expansive new warehouse where more than 20,000 different over-the-counter and prescription items are stored.

A network of conveyors and automated systems increase efficiency and enable Berry employees to pull orders for stores across Middle Tennessee, Northern Alabama and Southern Kentucky much more quickly and efficiently than ever before, Berry said.

"We had outgrown the old facility," Berry said, adding that building a warehouse and office complex from scratch meant he could incorporate the latest and most effective warehousing systems into his plant very easily.

The building, which provides almost twice the space of the Second Avenue location, is located on six acres near Interchange City on Old Hickory Boulevard off Interstate 24-East. Walter Knestrick Contractor Inc. was the builder.

"There is room for expansion," said Berry, who observed that the drug wholesaling business is remarkably the same as it was 26 years ago when he and his partners opened.

Security has always been tight, the same number of drugs and over-the-counter items exist now as did then (although not the same ones), and the key to the business was—and is—the customers, he said.

"The biggest change I can see is the manufacturers' distribution policies have changed," he said.

"It used to be in the high 30 percent came through the wholesaler. Now it's about 60 percent. The rest is direct distribution.

"I guess we (the wholesaler) have become a more efficient way of getting the drugs out," he said.

Another change, he said, is that drugs have become more sophisticated and have more specific applications.

The company, which is a corporation with 15 stockholders, has about 90 employees. Berry said revenues have increased 20 fold since his first years in business and the volume has increased from about five to 10 turns merchandise annually.

"What we try to do is operate more efficiently all the time—to get things to work better," Berry said. "And I enjoy working with the people—our people and the customers." ●

TRIBUTE TO MERIDITH WILLSON

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on June 15, Iowa lost one of its greatest native sons, Meridith Willson. Mason City, IA's music man died and will be laid to rest in the hometown and State that he chronicled so movingly in lyric and song.

I would like to read one of the many moving tributes that have been made in the week since his passing. This article is from the Mason City Globe Gazette, June 16, 1984:

WILLSON—AWFULLY PROUD OF MASON CITY

It was Willson with two Ls. It was Mason City, not Mason. And it was Iowa, not Ioway or I-OH-wa.

Meridith Willson didn't worry much about how you spelled his name, although that second L came to worry a lot of writers and copy editors as his fame spread.

But the sound of how one referred to his hometown of Mason City or his home state of Iowa did bother the author-composer.

"We were awfully proud of being from Mason City," he once wrote. "We were always very quick to correct anybody from out of town who said 'Mason.' With a very superior and belittling tone we'd say: 'Mason City.'"

And he was awfully proud of Iowa. To spread its correct pronunciation, Willson wrote a song called "Iowa, It's a Beautiful Land." The song had enough merit to be in-

troduced by Rudy Vallee in the days when Vallee was THE popular male singer. And Vallee managed to sing the telling line as "Ioway, it's a beautiful name when you say it like we say it back home . . ." just like we don't say it back home.

Years later, Willson tried again by writing a number called "Iowuh!" for the "Music Man" show. Done in Indian war-chant fashion, there was no way to mispronounce it. "Iowuh!" survived through the nine years' work on the show and most of the 38 re-writes two weeks before opening night, it was one of the final things cut.

Willson, who had played his flute under the baton of Arturo Toscanini and admired the maestro's keen musical ear, once said of Toscanini: "The man could hear grass grow."

That is an Iowa-style description from an Iowan who was himself quite a listener—a listener to more things than how to say "Iowa."

"Sounds seem to stay in my memory longer than anything else," he wrote in his book "And There I Stood with My Piccolo." He remembered the homey Iowa sounds of burnt toast being scraped and screen doors slamming. Summer to him was the sound of coleslaw being chopped in a wooden bowl; fall was the sound of coal going down a basement chute; winter was the scrape of "Mr. Sale shoveling his walk next door."

"Next door" was next door to what is now 314 S. Pennsylvania, Willson's boyhood home. It then was Superior Street and, Willson argued, Superior sounds superior to Pennsylvania.

The sounds of Iowa, of Iowa talk, of funny Iowa family names, of an Iowa male quartet and an Iowa band all went into "The Music Man."

"I didn't have to make up anything," Willson said. "All I had to do was remember."

But Iowa wasn't just a matter of nostalgia. Willson was in the state often, and his boosterism wasn't a self-serving gimmick based only on memory. He wrote a composition called "The Band" for the University of Iowa. He wrote fight songs for the university and Mason City High School.

He contributed for a Christian education wing at the First United Congregational Church of Christ where his mother taught Sunday school. He was active in the drive to build the North Iowa Community Auditorium.

He was proud of his hometown's musicians. He once had Mason City vocal and instrumental groups join him in launching a national Christmas Seals campaign in Des Moines.

He knew and was proud of the instructors who were creating new generations of Iowa musicians. He praised longtime band teacher John Kopecky of Clear Lake. He attended the funeral of "March King" Karl King at Fort Dodge.

Iowa responded. The University of Iowa, the former Parsons College at Fairfield and Wartburg College at Waverly were among the institutions that awarded honorary degrees to Willson. In 1958, he received the Distinguished Iowan Award.

In Mason City he had friends all over town, and he kept in touch. About half of his high school graduating class remained here, he noted. A special friend who had shared youthful adventures with Willson was J.A. "Art" Swanson, who died in 1977. Willson told more than once, only partly kidding, of his regret that he never played a duet with Swanson. Swanson played tuba, and there was no music then written for a flute-tuba duet.

Another special friend was the late W. Earl Hall, longtime Globe-Gazette editor. Hall wasn't a native but he followed Willson's career as newsman and friend for many, many years. Hall also was a member of the Rusty Hinges, the quartet that inspired the School Board Quartet in "The Music Man."

If Willson never forgot Mason City, neither did Mason City forget its roving musical ambassador. The biggest honor this community can give is to have a person lead the Band Festival parade—especially if that person is a music man. Willson led some big ones.

The first "big" festival honoring Willson was in 1958, just after "The Music Man" became a smash hit on Broadway. Then came a bigger one, in 1962 when the show's film version had its press premiere "right here in River City," complete with movie stars and floodlights. There was a local "Music Man" production when Willson led the 1968 parade and historical emphasis when he took part in the 1976 bicentennial festival. But even before "The Music Man" was created, Willson had crowned a few Band Festival queens here, including one in the city's centennial year of 1953.

For all his "bragging" about Mason City, Willson never claimed his hometown was perfect. Once when a Pacific Stars and Stripes interviewer was trying to find out what was so great about Mason City, Willson was pinned down to listing the town's biggest events as the John Dillinger bank holdup in 1934 and the "Music Man" premiere of 1963.

So, the interviewer summarized, Mason City is distinguished by a fictitious musical con man, a famous real-life musician and a bank robbery—right?

Willson replied: "I am astonished that a journalist of your intelligence, your astuteness, your observation, your perception and knowledge would fail to grasp another salient fact about Mason City. It is exactly halfway between Minneapolis and Des Moines . . ."

Often Willson didn't go that far in trying to "explain" the virtues of Mason City to those who couldn't figure them out for themselves. He once told of a time he was invited to conduct the Minnesota Symphony Orchestra at Minneapolis:

"With baton uplifted, I remember telling the audience how proud I was to be a neighbor to Minneapolis, 'just as, I'm sure, you are proud to be neighbors to Mason City.' Then, before my remarks had a chance to sink in, I dropped the baton for the first note."

Many people have credited "The Music Man" success to a nostalgic yearning for some kind of golden age now gone. If there ever was a city and a state like the one in the show, it's said, there isn't any more. Willson didn't think that.

"The only change I can see in Mason City that really matters," he said, "is that she is still proving her beliefs."

That statement may look self-contradictory, but it sounds right. Meredith Willson knew that the sound of things says a lot. The sound of the word Iowa, for instance. ●

SPONSORS AND COSPONSORS

● Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, last Thursday, when I walked on the floor, I thought we were still in the midst of the considerations on the Department of Defense authorization bill because, practically every Senator who

had been on the floor during those long, hard days was there.

I got interested in the fact that they were there to introduce amendments, so, I asked the Library of Congress to compile for me a list of the Senators and the number of amendments, the number of sponsorships, and so forth, that they had engaged into during this session so far.

Surprisingly, they had this list right up to the minute on a computer and, within 15 minutes, I had my answer. So, thinking that my colleagues might be interested in seeing the number of amendments that each of us introduced, I ask that this compilation be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, when you see after a name, spon, that means sponsor of a bill, and, then, aspon means sponsor of an amendment, cosp means cosponsor of a bill, and acosp, means cosponsor of an amendment.

The compilation follows:

Senator Abdnor (spon=20; aspon=18; cosp=218; acosp=32).
 Senator Andrews (spon=35; aspon=8; cosp=253; acosp=33).
 Senator Armstrong (spon=30; aspon=23; cosp=100; acosp=25).
 Senator Baker (spon=96; aspon=9; cosp=86; acosp=9).
 Senator Baucus (spon=23; aspon=30; cosp=240; acosp=64).
 Senator Bentsen (spon=66; aspon=7; cosp=225; acosp=55).
 Senator Biden (spon=10; aspon=5; cosp=140; acosp=43).
 Senator Bingaman (spon=7; aspon=2; cosp=178; acosp=76).
 Senator Boren (spon=21; aspon=13; cosp=239; acosp=68).
 Senator Boschwitz (spon=49; aspon=26; cosp=296; acosp=60).
 Senator Bradley (spon=16; aspon=24; cosp=245; acosp=51).
 Senator Bumpers (spon=19; aspon=25; cosp=264; acosp=59).
 Senator Burdick (spon=11; aspon=1; cosp=336; acosp=43).
 Senator Byrd (spon=49; aspon=26; cosp=172; acosp=44).
 Senator Chaffee (spon=35; aspon=31; cosp=183; acosp=25).
 Senator Chiles (spon=29; aspon=10; cosp=222; acosp=37).
 Senator Cochran (spon=24; aspon=12; cosp=277; acosp=31).
 Senator Cohen (spon=23; aspon=23; cosp=220; acosp=37).
 Senator Cranston (spon=63; aspon=17; cosp=328; acosp=92).
 Senator D'Amato (spon=67; aspon=12; cosp=268; acosp=60).
 Senator Danforth (spon=39; aspon=17; cosp=141; acosp=22).
 Senator Deconcini (spon=44; aspon=24; cosp=303; acosp=64).
 Senator Denton (spon=25; aspon=12; cosp=199; acosp=31).
 Senator Dixon (spon=21; aspon=17; cosp=321; acosp=53).
 Senator Dodd (spon=27; aspon=5; cosp=204; acosp=37).
 Senator Dole (spon=71; aspon=661; cosp=223; acosp=35).
 Senator Domenici (spon=40; aspon=20; cosp=218; acosp=37).

Senator Durenberger (spon=71; aspon=13; cosp=291; acosp=55).
 Senator Eagleton (spon=19; aspon=4; cosp=167; acosp=40).
 Senator East (spon=10; aspon=24; cosp=173; acosp=26).
 Senator Evans (spon=2; aspon=3; cosp=39; acosp=11).
 Senator Exon (spon=18; aspon=10; cosp=196; acosp=73).
 Senator Ford (spon=12; aspon=6; cosp=200; acosp=56).
 Senator Garn (spon=58; aspon=16; cosp=168; acosp=20).
 Senator Glenn (spon=17; aspon=4; cosp=249; acosp=63).
 Senator Goldwater (spon=42; aspon=8; cosp=173; acosp=21).
 Senator Gorton (spon=46; aspon=20; cosp=175; acosp=23).
 Senator Grassley (spon=53; aspon=15; cosp=230; acosp=36).
 Senator Hart (spon=29; aspon=528; cosp=173; acosp=43).
 Senator Hatch (spon=95; aspon=31; cosp=241; acosp=26).
 Senator Hatfield (spon=32; aspon=48; cosp=151; acosp=37).
 Senator Hawkins (spon=41; aspon=17; cosp=298; acosp=40).
 Senator Hecht (spon=2; aspon=2; cosp=110; acosp=10).
 Senator Heflin (spon=46; aspon=8; cosp=281; acosp=45).
 Senator Heinz (spon=88; aspon=41; cosp=306; acosp=53).
 Senator Helms (spon=70; aspon=66; cosp=229; acosp=41).
 Senator Hollings (spon=25; aspon=10; cosp=398; acosp=63).
 Senator Huddleston (spon=29; aspon=16; cosp=302; acosp=68).
 Senator Humphrey (spon=31; aspon=31; cosp=155; acosp=35).
 Senator Inouye (spon=123; aspon=7; cosp=343; acosp=41).
 Senator Jackson (spon=8; aspon=10; cosp=77; acosp=15).
 Senator Jepsen (spon=35; aspon=21; cosp=272; acosp=59).
 Senator Johnston (spon=15; aspon=12; cosp=206; acosp=37).
 Senator Kassebaum (spon=14; aspon=11; cosp=150; acosp=21).
 Senator Kasten (spon=20; aspon=33; cosp=169; acosp=25).
 Senator Kennedy (spon=40; aspon=61; cosp=293; acosp=67).
 Senator Lautenberg (spon=15; aspon=4; cosp=192; acosp=48).
 Senator Laxalt (spon=19; aspon=9; cosp=182; acosp=13).
 Senator Leahy (spon=9; aspon=8; cosp=207; acosp=54).
 Senator Levin (spon=66; aspon=34; cosp=298; acosp=93).
 Senator Long (spon=8; aspon=12; cosp=90; acosp=22).
 Senator Lugar (spon=9; aspon=8; cosp=247; acosp=19).
 Senator Mathias (spon=114; aspon=23; cosp=135; acosp=36).
 Senator Matsunaga (spon=40; aspon=8; cosp=315; acosp=53).
 Senator Mattingly (spon=19; aspon=24; cosp=170; acosp=42).
 Senator McClure (spon=72; aspon=29; cosp=143; acosp=24).
 Senator Melcher (spon=31; aspon=28; cosp=288; acosp=87).
 Senator Metzenbaum (spon=31; aspon=488; cosp=183; acosp=52).
 Senator Mitchell (spon=30; aspon=12; cosp=182; acosp=51).

Senator Moynihan (spon=102; aspon=28; cosp=347; acosp=92).
 Senator Murkowski (spon=16; aspon=13; cosp=156; acosp=27).
 Senator Nickles (spon=21; aspon=9; cosp=195; acosp=42).
 Senator Nunn (spon=24; aspon=17; cosp=261; acosp=47).
 Senator Packwood (spon=53; aspon=8; cosp=101; acosp=10).
 Senator Pell (spon=31; aspon=12; cosp=330; acosp=69).
 Senator Percy (spon=87; aspon=42; cosp=271; acosp=57).
 Senator Pressler (spon=38; aspon=41; cosp=202; acosp=66).
 Senator Proxmire (spon=25; aspon=16; cosp=164; acosp=38).
 Senator Pryor (spon=25; aspon=24; cosp=264; acosp=69).
 Senator Quayle (spon=33; aspon=20; cosp=168; acosp=18).
 Senator Randolph (spon=13; aspon=3; cosp=341; acosp=134).
 Senator Riegle (spon=32; aspon=6; cosp=340; acosp=77).
 Senator Roth (spon=30; aspon=3; cosp=117; acosp=23).
 Senator Rudman (spon=6; aspon=7; cosp=82; acosp=28).
 Senator Sarbanes (spon=10; aspon=2; cosp=336; acosp=55).
 Senator Sasser (spon=34; aspon=4; cosp=231; acosp=78).
 Senator Simpson (spon=36; aspon=8; cosp=117; acosp=14).
 Senator Specter (spon=80; aspon=35; cosp=197; acosp=31).
 Senator Stafford (spon=43; aspon=15; cosp=191; acosp=55).
 Senator Stennis (spon=15; aspon=2; cosp=166; acosp=24).
 Senator Stevens (spon=43; aspon=57; cosp=205; acosp=25).
 Senator Symms (spon=28; aspon=20; cosp=245; acosp=35).
 Senator Thurmond (spon=104; aspon=39; cosp=338; acosp=42).
 Senator Tower (spon=30; aspon=56; cosp=117; acosp=19).
 Senator Trible (spon=23; aspon=6; cosp=133; acosp=19).
 Senator Tsongas (spon=36; aspon=7; cosp=302; acosp=47).
 Senator Wallop (spon=23; aspon=10; cosp=102; acosp=10).
 Senator Warner (spon=22; aspon=20; cosp=150; acosp=44).
 Senator Weicker (spon=27; aspon=20; cosp=117; acosp=22).
 Senator Wilson (spon=22; aspon=20; cosp=194; acosp=29).
 Senator Zorinsky (spon=10; aspon=17; cosp=224; acosp=42).●

the benefit of the thoughts of Mr. Blake who has served in the U.S. Foreign Service since 1951.

WE MUST HELP CENTRAL AMERICA

(By Mel Blake)

Nearly 500 years ago Saint Thomas a Kempis wrote of how mankind would yearn to participate if religious services were held at only one place in the world. Mankind similarly longs for fundamental freedoms such as the right to choose their leaders. I saw the fulfillment of that desire on May 6, as Salvadorans thronged to vote in their country's presidential runoff elections.

Even though the Salvadoran insurgents attempted to disrupt the elections and threatened reprisals against voters, the people took to the streets and highways in migrations reminiscent of the Biblical census as they exercised their democratic responsibility to vote. The magnitude of the popular effort (some 75 percent of the electorate turned out) and the people's fervor were dramatically illustrated in the town of Atigulizaya, some 50 miles from the capital.

In random fashion, we had spoken to voters at other polling places throughout the morning. As we approached the polls in this dusty village, we saw a young peasant standing in line, a beautiful girl of some three years before him and his wife at his side. Drawing near we realized that his wife was nursing an infant. The young farmer told us the family had walked two hours to reach the polling place. They had been in line for an hour and would be there another hour. Ahead was a two-hour walk home in the noonday tropical heat. In reply to our astonishment at the family's tremendous effort to vote, the husband answered simply that it was "for our country and for peace."

Two days later it rained on Maryland's primary day. The newspapers reported an even lighter-than-usual voter turnout.

Jose Napoleon Duarte, the winner of the runoff elections, was installed on June 1 as El Salvador's first democratically elected civilian president in 50 years. El Salvador thus joins Costa Rica and Honduras as examples of democracy in action. In fact, after the May 6 elections, my old friend Jose (Pepe) Figures, three times president of Costa Rica and the founder of that country's present democratic institutions, told me that the tenacity of the Salvadoran people in their quest for peace and democracy entitled them to be ranked alongside Costa Rica as a democratic model for the world.

The demand for peace and civic and human rights echoes throughout Central America: Nicaragua marches to a different drummer. How should we react to the desires of these near neighbors as they try to overcome centuries of social injustice and economic deprivation even while they fight off extremists attempting violently to exploit the peoples' misery for ideological gain? If the United States could assist Germany and Japan in their recovery from the ravages of World War II, can we not help nations so close to us, with whom we have never had a quarrel and, indeed, nations that have been our strongest admirers and supporters?

Just as the postwar European Recovery Plan rested on a bipartisan basis, so should our aid to Central America. In July 1983, President Reagan appointed a commission of distinguished citizens, representing both major political parties and labor, management and academe, to study the overall situ-

CENTRAL AMERICA

● Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, Mr. Mel Blake, a native of Lexington, MS, who now serves as the State Department's senior adviser on implementation of the recommendations of the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America, recently wrote an article which appeared in the Clarion-Ledger in Jackson, MS. Mr. Blake's article emphasizes the need for a bipartisan basis for our aid program for Central America.

I submit for the RECORD that article from the June 14, Clarion-Ledger in order that my colleagues may have

ation in Central America and to make recommendations on a long-range, comprehensive policy. After extensive deliberations, the commission submitted a report containing a range of recommendations in the political, economic and security fields, which met the policy tests set for it.

President Reagan sent proposed legislation to the Congress on February 17 to obtain authority to implement the commission's recommendations. The emphasis is on economic and development assistance and social reform, shielded to the extent necessary by security assistance. In the commission's words, the United States should transform "the crisis in Central America into an opportunity: to seize the impetus it provides, and to use this to help our neighbors not only to secure their freedom from aggression and violence, but also to set in place the policies, processes and institutions to make them both prosperous and free."

On May 10, the House of Representatives approved legislation to permit the administration to implement the recommendations of the National Bipartisan Commission. It is hoped that the Senate will act promptly. The needs of Central America are too urgent, the crisis too pressing, to admit delay. Given the proximity of Central America to the United States, it is in our enlightened self-interest that the proposed legislation be enacted this congressional session; to follow any other course would be perilous to our interests at well as to those of Central America.●

COSPONSORSHIP OF S. 2470—RELATING TO INSIDER SAFEGUARDS RULE

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to cosponsor legislation offered by my distinguished colleague from Alabama, Senator DENTON. This legislation, S. 2470, is designed to remedy a problem that arose when the Nuclear Regulatory Commission issued for consideration a new rule known as the "Insider Safeguards Rule." Under the provisions of this rule, a new section 73.56 would be added to title 10 Code of Federal Regulations. This section would require licensees of nuclear powerplants to conduct background investigations on all personnel who require unescorted access to the protected and vital areas of nuclear powerplants.

The goal of providing background for the employer to consider when hiring personnel at a nuclear powerplant is one I believe will enjoy wide, bipartisan support. The effectiveness of this regulation, however, is severely undermined because the criminal histories of said personnel are not available to the licensee. Consequently, Senator DENTON introduced S. 2470 to remedy that deficiency.

I support his legislation because I believe that such information is vital to the protection of the public health and safety. This is a timely piece of legislation I would urge all of my colleagues to support.●

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW
Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATORS PROXIMIRE AND BUMPERS AND FOR PERIOD FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, special orders be entered in favor of two Senators for not to exceed 15 minutes each; to wit, Senators PROXIMIRE and BUMPERS; to be followed by a period for the transaction of routine morning business until 11 a.m., in which Senators may speak for not more than 5 minutes each.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, it is the intention of the leadership on this side to ask the Senate tomorrow to turn to the consideration of the drunk driving bill, the State-Justice appropriations bill, if possible, perhaps the math-science bill, and other matters as they may be cleared on both sides. The two principal items that will be addressed by the Senate tomorrow, as I now anticipate it, will be the child restraint bill, which carries the drunk driving amendment, and the State-Justice appropriations bill.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10 A.M.

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I have nothing else to ask the Senate to address. I am willing to provide a time for the transaction of routine morning business if a Senator has the need to speak.

I see none seeking recognition. Therefore, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to and, at 6:34 p.m., the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 26, 1984, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 25, 1984:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert J. Ryan, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Mali.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Jorge L. Mas, of Florida, to be a member of the Advisory Board for Radio Broadcasting to Cuba for a term of 2 years. (New position—Public Law 98-111 of October 4, 1983).

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Judith D. Moss, of Ohio, to be a member of the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs for a term expiring May 8, 1987, reappointment.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

Margaret Phelan, of Kansas, to be a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for a term expiring July 1, 1988, vice Phillip A. Sprague, term expired.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following Air National Guard of the United States officers for promotion in the Reserve of the Air Force under the provisions of section 593(a) of title 10 of the United States Code, as amended:

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant colonel

- Maj. William M. Berg, [REDACTED]
- Maj. William E. Bonnell, [REDACTED]
- Maj. Paul J. Boyack, [REDACTED]
- Maj. John S. Chanda, [REDACTED]
- Maj. Roy C. Chase, [REDACTED]
- Maj. Donald L. Durbin, [REDACTED]
- Maj. Thaddeus D. Evans, [REDACTED]
- Maj. Richard C. Gould, [REDACTED]
- Maj. James E. Holmes, [REDACTED]
- Maj. Dennis M. Hyatt, [REDACTED]
- Maj. John P. Kelly, [REDACTED]
- Maj. Lee W. Kirkwood, [REDACTED]
- Maj. Larry D. Pace, [REDACTED]
- Maj. Russell Padula, [REDACTED]
- Maj. Christopher Pantos, [REDACTED]
- Maj. James C. Perkinson, [REDACTED]
- Maj. Julius V. Przygocki, [REDACTED]
- Maj. Robert P. Smart, [REDACTED]
- Maj. Derle M. Snyder, [REDACTED]

LEGAL

- Maj. Lyman L. Frick, Jr., [REDACTED]

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

- Maj. Hedley W. D. Greene, [REDACTED]

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following distinguished graduates, U.S. Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps, for appointment as second lieutenants in the Regular Air Force, under the provisions of section 531, Title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

- Adams, Bryan C., [REDACTED]
- Adams, Mark L., [REDACTED]
- Agena, Keith K., [REDACTED]
- Alickson, Dennis C., [REDACTED]
- Alvord, Kirk W., [REDACTED]
- Andrews, Allen R., [REDACTED]
- Aristov, Andrey, [REDACTED]
- Avery, Eleanor E., [REDACTED]
- Babin, Brian J., [REDACTED]
- Bachman, Thomas T., [REDACTED]
- Backes, Gary J., [REDACTED]
- Baczowski, Leonard J., [REDACTED]
- Bagnani, Valentino, [REDACTED]
- Bailey, Brian L., [REDACTED]
- Bailey, Donald P., [REDACTED]
- Baker, Robert E., Jr., [REDACTED]
- Bassler, Susan L., [REDACTED]
- Bayless, Benjamin M., [REDACTED]
- Beatovich, Gary, [REDACTED]
- Beatty, Steven J., [REDACTED]
- Belt, Cary D., [REDACTED]
- Belt, David L., [REDACTED]

Berger, Beth Anne, xxx-xxxx
 Beyer, Mark A., xxx-xxxx
 Biernesser, Stephen A., xxx-xxxx
 Blaine, Russell J., xxx-xxxx
 Blunt, Joseph W., xxx-xxxx
 Blyler, Stephanie A., xxx-xxxx
 Booker, Daniel R., xxx-xxxx
 Bowen, Kelvin C., xxx-xxxx
 Boyko, David R., xxx-xxxx
 Bradley, Harold W., III, xxx-xxxx
 Braman, Michael T., xxx-xxxx
 Bray, Robert E., xxx-xxxx
 Broeking, Timothy D., xxx-xxxx
 Brown, Ernie L., Jr., xxx-xxxx
 Brown, Jeff L., xxx-xxxx
 Brown, Lawrence E., xxx-xxxx
 Broyles, Brian E., xxx-xxxx
 Brozona, David J., xxx-xxxx
 Burchard, Jeanette L., xxx-xxxx
 Burns, Anthony P., xxx-xxxx
 Burns, Brian P., xxx-xxxx
 Burns, Mark E., xxx-xxxx
 Bury, Susan M., xxx-xxxx
 Buschor, Daniel C., xxx-xxxx
 Bushnell, James F., xxx-xxxx
 Butler, Dennis W., xxx-xxxx
 Butler, Lawrence W., xxx-xxxx
 Butts, Amy M., xxx-xxxx
 Byrne, Michael T., xxx-xxxx
 Carlin, Bernard T., Jr., xxx-xxxx
 Cartwright, Brian T., xxx-xxxx
 Case, Brian H., xxx-xxxx
 Cash, Clay H., xxx-xxxx
 Cashman, Douglas J., xxx-xxxx
 Cantanzaro, Wayne, xxx-xxxx
 Cheves, David A., xxx-xxxx
 Chilcott, Roger W., Jr., xxx-xxxx
 Childs, Troy B., xxx-xxxx
 Choi, Yanghee M., xxx-xxxx
 Christensen, Allan R., Jr., xxx-xxxx
 Cintron, Roberto, xxx-xxxx
 Cleland, Cheryl L., xxx-xxxx
 Cloud, Melvin E., xxx-xxxx
 Clynch, Christa A., xxx-xxxx
 Coe, Lori A., xxx-xxxx
 Cook, Henry G., xxx-xxxx
 Cox, David W., xxx-xxxx
 Culkin, Rodger T., xxx-xxxx
 Cunningham, Robert E., Jr., xxx-xxxx
 Czuba, Karen M., xxx-xxxx
 Dale, David S., Jr., xxx-xxxx
 Danielson, Dewayne F., xxx-xxxx
 Danzi, Susan M., xxx-xxxx
 Darko, Katherine H., xxx-xxxx
 Davis, Shugato S., xxx-xxxx
 Dearth, Anthony M., xxx-xxxx
 Declairmont, Ralph T., xxx-xxxx
 Desautel, Stephen C., xxx-xxxx
 Didomenico, Steve G., xxx-xxxx
 Digeorge, David A., xxx-xxxx
 Disler, Edith A., xxx-xxxx
 Dittmer, Dale R., xxx-xxxx
 Dotson, Treva, xxx-xxxx
 Draper, Mark A., xxx-xxxx
 Duffy, Francis D., xxx-xxxx
 Dunn, Lorraine M., xxx-xxxx
 Dutton, Dennis R., xxx-xxxx
 Edman, Thomas F., xxx-xxxx
 Ellis, David E., xxx-xxxx
 Ellis, Mark W., xxx-xxxx
 Emmack, Nicholas C., xxx-xxxx
 Farrell, Deborah A., xxx-xxxx
 Fell, Steven E., xxx-xxxx
 Finnla, Mark A., xxx-xxxx
 Fischer, William E., Jr., xxx-xxxx
 Fiske, Brian D., III, xxx-xxxx
 Forbes, Lance A., xxx-xxxx
 Fyfe, John M., xxx-xxxx
 Gabriel, Dale S., xxx-xxxx
 Gaines, Therese S., xxx-xxxx
 Garcia, Efren V. M., xxx-xxxx
 Gardner, John D., xxx-xxxx
 Gardow, David G., xxx-xxxx
 Garstka, Michael T., xxx-xxxx
 Gast, Cynthia B., xxx-xxxx
 Gellinas, Keith R., xxx-xxxx
 Gemmill, Thomas L., xxx-xxxx
 Gerber, David K., xxx-xxxx
 Gerfen, Kevin A., xxx-xxxx
 Gibson, Brock E., xxx-xxxx
 Gifford, Robert T., xxx-xxxx
 Gleason, Garrett L., xxx-xxxx
 Goodwin, Mark D., xxx-xxxx
 Gordon, Peter J., xxx-xxxx
 Graves, Michael J., xxx-xxxx
 Grechniw, Mark, xxx-xxxx
 Green, Justin L., xxx-xxxx
 Grier, James B., Jr., xxx-xxxx
 Grimmig, Carol A., xxx-xxxx
 Guthrie, Brian C., xxx-xxxx
 Gydesen, Paul W., xxx-xxxx
 Hamilton, Marion K., xxx-xxxx
 Hand, Mark C., xxx-xxxx
 Haney, Kim R., xxx-xxxx
 Hansen, Craig A., xxx-xxxx
 Hansen, Eldon J., xxx-xxxx
 Haralson, David G., xxx-xxxx
 Hardiman, Scott C., xxx-xxxx
 Harpe, Randall S., xxx-xxxx
 Harrington, Milton D., xxx-xxxx
 Hawkins, Kevin C., xxx-xxxx
 Hayes, Timothy W., xxx-xxxx
 Heasley, Joseph E., xxx-xxxx
 Hertberg, Robert B., xxx-xxxx
 Hill, Joseph M., xxx-xxxx
 Hofstad, Chris E., xxx-xxxx
 Hogg, Lindsey W., xxx-xxxx
 Holbrook, Jeffrey P., xxx-xxxx
 Holmes, Bryan D., xxx-xxxx
 Hren, Michael M., xxx-xxxx
 Hughes, Harry M., xxx-xxxx
 Inman, Christopher S., xxx-xxxx
 Johnson, Patrick W., xxx-xxxx
 Johnston, Dale A., xxx-xxxx
 Jolliffe, James A., xxx-xxxx
 Jones, Bradley K., xxx-xxxx
 Joseph, Barry S., xxx-xxxx
 Karczewski, David C., xxx-xxxx
 Kastenzholz, Charles V., xxx-xxxx
 Kelley, James A., xxx-xxxx
 Kennard, Katherine, xxx-xxxx
 Kibbe, Douglas S., xxx-xxxx
 Kimbrell, James R., xxx-xxxx
 Klatt, John P., xxx-xxxx
 Kloppel, Kirk, xxx-xxxx
 Koehler, Scott P., xxx-xxxx
 Koger, John J., xxx-xxxx
 Kolmer, Thomas C., xxx-xxxx
 Korn, Patricia J., xxx-xxxx
 Krause, Christina S., xxx-xxxx
 Krieghleming, Dru H., xxx-xxxx
 Kunzweiler, Timothy P., xxx-xxxx
 Labernik, Laura E., xxx-xxxx
 Labrosse, Michelle A., xxx-xxxx
 Larkin, Charlene Marie, xxx-xxxx
 Larson, Andrew R., xxx-xxxx
 Lavelle, William A., xxx-xxxx
 Lento, Eileen M., xxx-xxxx
 Levinson, Scott W., xxx-xxxx
 Lihani, Robert F., xxx-xxxx
 Lindahl, Valerie A., xxx-xxxx
 Listak, Charles M., xxx-xxxx
 Lobermeier, Jeffery J., xxx-xxxx
 Lyon, Nancy B., xxx-xxxx
 Magee, Gregory J., xxx-xxxx
 Mallory, Dean P., xxx-xxxx
 Marek, Michael S., xxx-xxxx
 Martin, Jeffrey B., xxx-xxxx
 Martz, Susan L., xxx-xxxx
 Masih, Das Clement, xxx-xxxx
 Matthews, Mary K., xxx-xxxx
 Matthews, Van E., xxx-xxxx
 McCalfee, Daniel H., xxx-xxxx
 McCray, David H., xxx-xxxx
 McGraw, Bryan K., xxx-xxxx
 McMahon, Michael I., xxx-xxxx
 McPherson, Steven H., xxx-xxxx
 Messenger, Brus D., xxx-xxxx
 Meyer, Joseph A., xxx-xxxx
 Miller, Keesey R., xxx-xxxx
 Miller, Richard R., xxx-xxxx
 Mitchell, Jack E., xxx-xxxx
 Mitchell, Michael J., xxx-xxxx
 Mitchell, William E., xxx-xxxx
 Monahan, Thomas, xxx-xxxx
 Monsen, Kathleen P., xxx-xxxx
 Montecalvo, Anthony J., xxx-xxxx
 Morgan, John N., xxx-xxxx
 Moring, John L., III, xxx-xxxx
 Mosteller, Randy D., xxx-xxxx
 Mullen, Daniel V., xxx-xxxx
 Murray, Letitia D., xxx-xxxx
 Murray, William R., Jr., xxx-xxxx
 Myers, Marcus S., xxx-xxxx
 Nasellius, Karen A., xxx-xxxx
 Nobbs, Sandra S., xxx-xxxx
 Nowack, Mark L., xxx-xxxx
 Nuti, Joseph C., xxx-xxxx
 O'Brien, Michael G., xxx-xxxx
 Orino, John R., xxx-xxxx
 Orr, David L., xxx-xxxx
 Ostroski, Michael J., xxx-xxxx
 Otto, Stacy L., xxx-xxxx
 Pannell, Dennis B., xxx-xxxx
 Park, Michael B., xxx-xxxx
 Park, Michael R., xxx-xxxx
 Parker, Terry D., xxx-xxxx
 Patterson, Karen M., xxx-xxxx
 Pauchey, Jean J., xxx-xxxx
 Penning, Michael R., xxx-xxxx
 Peschel, Mary C., xxx-xxxx
 Peters, Mary L., xxx-xxxx
 Piatt, Kevin P., xxx-xxxx
 Plante, Randall S., xxx-xxxx
 Pollard, John K., xxx-xxxx
 Pool, Michele J., xxx-xxxx
 Prestgard, Greg A., xxx-xxxx
 Propst, William M., xxx-xxxx
 Przygocki, James V., xxx-xxxx
 Pyle, Gregory L., xxx-xxxx
 Quinn, Michael H., xxx-xxxx
 Rasmussen, David S., xxx-xxxx
 Rausch, John T., xxx-xxxx
 Ray, Emily W., xxx-xxxx
 Raymond, John W., xxx-xxxx
 Reece, James L., Jr., xxx-xxxx
 Reed, James D., xxx-xxxx
 Reeves, Nancy P., xxx-xxxx
 Reynolds, Gary S., xxx-xxxx
 Rice, Darren L., xxx-xxxx
 Richard, Robert S., xxx-xxxx
 Rizzuto, Patrick J., Jr., xxx-xxxx
 Robinson, John A., Jr., xxx-xxxx
 Roblyer, Dwight A., xxx-xxxx
 Roman, Robert R., xxx-xxxx
 Rompolo, Randolph R., xxx-xxxx
 Roth, Lissa M., xxx-xxxx
 Rothermich, Mary K., xxx-xxxx
 Roush, John M., xxx-xxxx
 Ruff, Michael C., xxx-xxxx
 Rumney, Randell C., xxx-xxxx
 Sanders, Steve A., xxx-xxxx
 Sandifer, Robin T., xxx-xxxx
 Sandige, David J., xxx-xxxx
 Sargent, William J., xxx-xxxx
 Sasdelli, Edward M., xxx-xxxx
 Sawyer, Mary P., xxx-xxxx
 Scanlon, James J., III, xxx-xxxx
 Schalle, Robert, xxx-xxxx
 Schanck, Michael D., xxx-xxxx
 Schibly, James A., xxx-xxxx
 Schooff, Richard M., xxx-xxxx
 Schumacher, Charles A., xxx-xxxx
 Scorsone, John J., xxx-xxxx
 Scott, Michael B., xxx-xxxx
 Shinnors, William D., xxx-xxxx
 Sieg, Carl N., xxx-xxxx
 Slocum, John D., xxx-xxxx
 Smick, Jeffrey P., xxx-xxxx
 Smith, Phillip A., xxx-xxxx
 Snadecki, Eric A., xxx-xxxx
 Snapp, Gary T., xxx-xxxx

Snow, Stanley U., [REDACTED]
 Solmonson, Steven M., [REDACTED]
 Steele, John B., [REDACTED]
 Stewart, Cynthia A., [REDACTED]
 Stocking, Timothy A., [REDACTED]
 Story, Steven L., [REDACTED]
 Stratton, Marc F., [REDACTED]
 Stubblefield, Mark E., [REDACTED]
 Swanson, David A., [REDACTED]
 Taber, Phillip P., [REDACTED]
 Tarrant, Patricia L., [REDACTED]
 Taylor, Gregory S., [REDACTED]
 Thomas, James V., [REDACTED]
 Tibbitts, Brandt K., [REDACTED]
 Trask, Thomas J., [REDACTED]
 Troutman, Daniel Mark, [REDACTED]
 Tucker, Elizabeth A., [REDACTED]
 Turner, Joseph L., [REDACTED]
 Uchida, Ted T., [REDACTED]
 Villa, Paul J., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Wabrowetz, Steven, [REDACTED]
 Walle, Mark J., [REDACTED]
 Walsh, Deborah A., [REDACTED]
 Warnick, Mark M., [REDACTED]
 Wasserman, Richard A., [REDACTED]
 Watson, Thomas E., [REDACTED]
 Weiher, Timothy L., [REDACTED]
 Welch, Gary L., [REDACTED]
 Wesley, David C., [REDACTED]
 Whalen, Paul V., [REDACTED]
 Whiting, Leslie A., [REDACTED]
 Whitney, Russell G., [REDACTED]
 Wiggins, George W., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Wilcox, Richard S., [REDACTED]
 Wilkins, Mark A., [REDACTED]
 Williams, Robert, [REDACTED]
 Winham, Charles H., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Wolfe, Jon G., [REDACTED]
 Woltz, George R., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Wolver, Gary A., [REDACTED]
 Woods, Darrell W., [REDACTED]
 Young, Scott J., [REDACTED]
 Zalud, Kerry M., [REDACTED]
 Zastrow, Roderick C., [REDACTED]
 Zins, Richard P., [REDACTED]
 Zlotnicki, Kristina M., [REDACTED]

IN THE ARMY

The following named officers for appointment under automatic integration in the Regular Army of the United States, in their promotion grades, under the provisions of sections 531, 532, and 533, title 10, United States Code:

To be lieutenant colonel

Spence, Avery C., [REDACTED]

To be major

Albro, Scott T., [REDACTED]
 Brown, Stephen D., [REDACTED]
 Bowman, Rodney H., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Kichen, Lee F., [REDACTED]
 Martin, Lavelle, [REDACTED]
 Munson, Charles A., [REDACTED]
 Nance, Richard A., [REDACTED]

The following named cadet, graduating class of 1984, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of sections 531 and 4353, title 10, United States Code:

Burgess, Rene G., [REDACTED]

The following named distinguished honor graduates of officer candidate school for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of sections 531, 532, and 533, title 10, United States Code:

Rogers, Jack B., [REDACTED]
 Zehnder, Daniel J., [REDACTED]

IN THE NAVY

Air Force Cadet Kimberly F. Walker to be permanent ensign in the line or staff corps

of the U.S. Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 531.

The following named Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps Program candidates to be appointed permanent ensign in the line or staff corps of the U.S. Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 531:

Becker, Walter D. Harris Christopher
 Beyer, Douglas C. N.
 Bjerg, Paul W. Hileman, Rebecca E.
 Burke, Gregg A. Maletz, Stanley D.
 Carpenter, Bradley Morgan, Tony F.
 A. Ptiney, Michael P.
 Eldson, Brian E. Roberson, Jamie P.
 Green, Vincent R. Scroggs, Steven D.
 Haas, Russell E. Sims, Johnny D.
 Hall, William H. Williams, Joseph P.
 Hansen, Robert C. Winter, Daniel H.

Michael J. Sirey, Navy enlisted candidate, to be appointed permanent ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the U.S. Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 531.

The following named Naval Reserve officers to be appointed permanent ensign in the line or staff corps of the U.S. Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 531:

Ikeda, John T. Stevens, Maurice

Jon K. Garman, ex-Naval Reserve officer, to be appointed permanent commander in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Naval Reserve, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 593.

The following named U.S. Navy officers to be appointed permanent commander in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Naval Reserve, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 593:

Hedges, John C. Weber, Daniel J.
 Schneider, Gerald L.

IN THE NAVY

The following named lieutenants of the line of the Navy for promotion to the permanent grade of lieutenant commander, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 624, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER

Achorn, Ted Glen
 Adamo, William Richard
 Adams, Jan Marie
 Agor, Michael Patrocinio
 Aker, Winfred Gary
 Alberg, Chris Leonard
 Aldrich, David Andrew
 Alexander, James Harvey, Jr.
 Alft, Robert Anthony
 Alger, Daniel Francis
 Allen, Craig L.
 Allen, William Howard
 Anderson, James R.
 Anderson, Thomas Robert
 Anderson, William Bruce
 Andres, Eric Robert
 Anthony, Mark H.
 Applegate, David James
 Arms, David H.
 Armstrong, Floyd Douglas
 Armstrong, Peter A.
 Arumae, Eric Nmn
 Asher, Gerald David
 Assel, Michael D.
 August, Randal J.
 Ayala, Richard Joseph
 Azzarello, Jon Joseph
 Baird, Portia A.
 Baker, Clinton Bernard
 Baker, Keith Dean
 Baker, Michael Allen
 Balaconis, Roy Joseph

Baldy, Mary Bernadette
 Ball, John E.
 Ballard, Michael Alfred
 Ballard, Vivian Heacox
 Barbee, Melvin Norman, Jr.
 Barngrover, Lyle L.
 Barrett, David Bruce
 Barrett, John Harry, III
 Barstow, John Thomas
 Bashore, Timothy C.
 Bauer, David Alan
 Bauer, Thomas George
 Baumgartner, Edward Martin
 Baumstark, Robert P.
 Bealer, David Ellis
 Beaton, Scott Allan
 Bedsole, James Wendell
 Beeks, Kenneth D.
 Benedict, Tod D.
 Benfield, Paul K.
 Benn, Anthony J.
 Benson, Mark Marvin
 Bird, Douglas Lacy
 Blair, Kenneth Marion
 Blair, Lindell Gene
 Blankenship, John Doyle
 Blaser, Stephen J.
 Blevins, Kenneth William
 Blitz, Victor Edward, Jr.
 Blume, Frederick Louis
 Boeckman, Dale Anthony
 Boger, Jeffrey R.
 Booker, Gordon William Jr.
 Borden, David S.
 Bouchard, Joseph Frederick
 Boulden, John Searles, III
 Bowen, Edward Charles
 Bowes, John Leonard, Jr.
 Boyce, Gary Linden
 Bradfieldsmith, Wendy Lee
 Bradley, Cecil Douglas
 Braynon, Oscar James
 Brennan, Thomas J.
 Brenny, Michael Kenneth
 Bridgeman, John Benjamin
 Bringle, Donald Godwin
 Britt, John Allan
 Brown, Charles Granville
 Brown, George Gilbert, Jr.
 Brown, Gordon Russell
 Brown, John Martin
 Brown, Peter Gibson
 Brownell, John Michael
 Brownley, Trenholm L., Jr.
 Bruce, Robert Laverne, Jr.
 Bruder, Mark A.
 Brueck, David Lloyd
 Brunner, Brian Lee
 Bryant, Ermond Richard, Jr.
 Bryant, Russell E.
 Bulke, Kim Smith
 Bullock, Dennis E.
 Burchard, Steven Neil
 Burke, Caryl Scott
 Burke, Jeffrey D.
 Burkholder, Earl F.
 Burns, Douglas E.
 Burns, William S.
 Burrell, Roger Evon
 Bush, Charles Thomas
 Busse, George K.
 Butler, Hoyt Carl
 Butler, James George
 Butt, Robert Alan
 Byus, Fred
 Cackowski, Jean Marie
 Cahill, John Henry, III
 Cain, Patrick Maurice
 Calahorrano, Jose
 Campagna, Michael S.
 Campbell, Cromwell Bowen, II
 Campbell, Debra Suzanne
 Campbell, Thomas John
 Capalbo, Joseph J.

Capron, Nicholas Joseph
 Carey, John Edward
 Carlson, David Leo
 Carlton, James Guy, Jr.
 Carnes, Charles Burton
 Carnot, Russell S.
 Carper, Ricky Lowell
 Carrizales, J. Javier
 Carte, Constance Joanne
 Carter, Harold T.
 Carter, Steven Michael
 Case, Paul Harrison
 Casey, William E.
 Cashbaugh, David M.
 Cass, James L.
 Cech, James Vincent
 Celano, Joseph
 Cepak, Timothy James
 Cernohorsky, Richard Lee
 Chapman, Robert S.
 Charis, Thomas S.
 Chase, Richard E.
 Cheatham, Kevin M.
 Chenault, Alanson Trigg, IV
 Chenoweth, Emory Leigh
 Childers, Clarence Ester, Jr.
 Chinberg, Charles Allison
 Chlebanowski, Joseph Stan, Jr.
 Chukes, Frank, Jr.
 Clark, Alfred Wayne
 Clark, Billy Lynn
 Clark, Randall
 Clark, Robert L.
 Clausen, Jan Marie
 Clausen, William A.
 Cleveland, Charles Rivers
 Clifford, Nolan D.
 Cochran, Donnie L.
 Coggan, David Elliot
 Colby, James Stephen
 Collins, Steven Patrick
 Colville, John Edward
 Combest, Philip J.
 Compton, Byron P.
 Concannon, Timothy J.
 Coniglogue, Cheri Lynn
 Conklin, Donald Denton
 Connelly, Robert Jeffrey
 Conner, Thomas Lee
 Conniff, Frederick R.
 Converse, Vincent W.
 Cook, Philip Remington, III
 Cooper, Don Gordon
 Corini, Gene J.
 Cornell, Peter Alan
 Correll, Steve A.
 Corsi, Joseph Albert, Jr.
 Cotton, Lawrence S., Jr.
 Coumes, Thomas Michael
 Coverick, John Martin
 Cowen, Sherry Timothy, III
 Coyle, Duane
 Craig, Janet Elaine
 Crandall, Woodruff Mentz
 Crawford, Thomas A.
 Cregge, Michael John
 Crime, Steven E.
 Crochet, John Michael
 Cryer, John P., III
 Cuninghame, Craig T.
 Cunningham, David Thomas
 Cuppett, Bruce Jeffrey
 Curry, Kenneth William
 Curry, Phillip E., Jr.
 Curry, Thomas W.
 Curtis, Derwood Clayborne
 Dahlmeier, Michael Curtis
 Daspit, Peter Randall
 Davenport, Paul Arthur
 Davis, Kirk Everett
 Davis, Larry H.
 Davis, Thomas Wayne
 Davison, Jimmy Lovorgia
 Daze, William Rock

Deal, Wiley Robert, Jr.
 Dean, Ralph Jeffrey
 Deford, David Foster
 Degeus, Dennis Charles
 Deml, Robert John
 Denman, Keith Jay
 Deppe, Paul Richard
 Dewey, Edward Clayton, II
 Dial, Michael Scott
 Divis, Conrad Bruce
 Dixon, Jeffrey Ellis
 Dlugos, Stephen Michael
 Doernhoefer, Mark A.
 Dolenti, John E.
 Dollard, Thomas S.
 Donadio, Giuseppe
 Donovan, Daniel Lafayette, II
 Dooley, Thomas G.
 Doong, Lawrence Kwong Cho
 Dorsey, Gordon O.
 Dowell, Thomas Alexander
 Drennan, Frank Miller
 Duke, Douglas B.
 Dullea, James Peter
 Duplessis, Donald Leslie
 Durant, Robert Shannon
 Dvorsky, Michael L.
 Earl, Christopher Robert
 Earle, Margaret Randolph
 Easter, David Paul
 Easton, Roger C., Jr.
 Edmonds, Michael D.
 Edwards, Michael Vernon
 Elison, Michael James
 Elliott, Robert Wendell
 Elrod, Suzanne Marie
 Emerson, Mark T.
 Emmett, Thomas W.
 Engler, James Howard
 Erickson, Todd A.
 Etheridge, Michael Stephen
 Etter, Randy Lane
 Evancoe, Paul Ralph
 Ewell, Stephen Allen
 Fair, Welch C., Jr.
 Farley, Danny G.
 Felte, Calvin Jon
 Fennell, David W.
 Filler, Robert J.
 Fischer, David L.
 Fitzpatrick, Walter Francis
 Flacco, Nicholas Louis
 Fleischman, David Roswell
 Flentje, Michael
 Ford, Alfred Daniel
 Ford, Neil Spencer
 Forshay, Bruce E.
 Foster, George Terrance
 Francis, Curtis John
 Frasier, Don Alan, Jr.
 Frech, Robert Walter
 Fredrick, Theodore David
 Freeman, Gary Michael
 Fritch, Kevin William
 Fritz, Edward
 Froehlich, Carl Terry
 Fuhrman, Robert Eugene
 Gallagher, Richard Keith
 Gallagher, Robert H.
 Garcia, Marcial Edward
 Gardner, Eric S.
 Gardner, Thomas Allen, Jr.
 Garvey, James Edward
 Garwood, Bruce Wilson
 Gehring, Thomas Stephan
 Gelenter, David Alan
 Gershon, Robert Michael
 Giancatarino, Patrick Joseph
 Gibson, James William
 Gillingham, David Robert
 Ginader, Kenneth L.
 Glenn, Thomas Eugene
 Glenney, William
 Gliniak, Richard Marian

Godlewski, John Stephen
 Goodson, Scott Willard
 Gordon, Graham H.
 Gorman, John P.
 Gorrell, Walter Harrison, Jr.
 Gorsuch, Thomas E.
 Graham, Allen Wynne, Jr.
 Graham, James M.
 Grant, John Lawton
 Grant, Peter McPherson, III
 Graves, Scott Friedrich
 Gray, David Reynolds, III
 Gray, Steven Andrew
 Grazel, Christopher Porte
 Green, James Eugene, Jr.
 Green, Johnny Wayne
 Grella, William Albert
 Grey, Elmer Kenneth, Jr.
 Gritte, Brian Roland
 Grom, Rudolph J.
 Gross, Debra Anne
 Groves, Allen Woodrow
 Gull, Carl Ramond, II
 Gustafson, Walter Alfred
 Guthe, Douglas B.
 Gygax, Gene
 Hack, Joseph, III
 Haertling, Robert Allan
 Hagen, Gary David
 Haines, David Marshall
 Halloran, John J.
 Halsall, Archibald C.
 Hambrick, Michael James
 Hambrook, Paul Eugene
 Hammerer, John J., Jr.
 Hansen, Allen Carsten
 Hansen, Bertel Joseph, Jr.
 Hanson, Craig I.
 Hanson, Mark W.
 Hardee, Robert C.
 Hargrove, George T.
 Harmatuk, Peter James, Jr.
 Harmon, James Loren
 Harmon, Randall Gene
 Harper, Scott J.
 Harrell, Gary Douglas
 Harris, David Jay
 Harris, Peter Webster
 Harrison, David C.
 Hart, James Martin
 Hart, Jefferson Lawrence
 Hart, Julian L.
 Hartwell, Daniel Newman
 Hasson, Michael
 Hatch, Duane B.
 Hathon, Gerald Michael
 Hauge, Pamela Lyle
 Hauge, Samuel Alexander
 Hawkins, David A.
 Hawn, William O.
 Hegeman, John G.
 Hegland, David Kenneth
 Heise, Otto Erich
 Henderson, Steven J.
 Henderson, William D.
 Hensel, Gerald Robert
 Hentz, Gary Theodore
 Herb, Michael Curtis
 Herbert, Edward William, III
 Hertsgaard, Barry C.
 Hibbs, David A.
 Hicks, Alan B.
 Hinck, Peter Joseph
 Hindersinn, Kenneth R.
 Hinman, Michael H.
 Hinrichs, Stuart
 Hirsh, Deborah Duggin
 Hissem, Steven Dean
 Hitchcock, Eric Augustus
 Hitchcock, Jeffrey W.
 Hixenbaugh, Paul Noel
 Hoffman, John Scott
 Holbrook, Roy Lee, III
 Holland, Robert D.

Hollie, William James
 Hollinger, Frederick R.
 Holloway, Richard Thomas
 Holm, Chris Lansing
 Holmes, Gary L.
 Holmes, Lawrence G.
 Holt, Richard Jamand, Jr.
 Holzworth, John George
 Honaker, Warren C.
 Honey, Robert Mark
 Horne, Fred Bowen
 Huber, Craig Michael
 Huchowski, John Albert
 Hudson, Richard F.
 Huete, Michael C.
 Huffman, James Merritt
 Hughes, Ronald Douglas
 Humphrey, John Douglas
 Hunnicutt, Thomas Gerald
 Hunt, Richard Wayne
 Hunter, Kenneth William
 Hutson, David Virgil
 Hutton, James Francis, Jr.
 Immel, Dale Robert
 Ingebrigtsen, Nils M.
 Ingram, John Thomas Andrew
 Jackson, Jennetta W.
 Jacobs, Carl Leon
 Jacobs, James William
 Jacobs, Patrick Alan
 Janiec, Christopher Alan
 Jeffords, Terry Alan
 Jelinek, Michael Lester
 Jenkins, Martin Edward, II
 Jennings, Carlton Rex
 Jewett, Carlton Boyd
 Joachim, Christopher Mark
 Joganic, Joann NMN.
 Johnson, David Lefevre
 Johnson, Edward G., Jr.
 Johnson, Frederick G.
 Johnson, Michael A.
 Johnson, Samuel D.
 Johnston, William Scott
 Jolicoeur, John R.
 Jones, Donald R., Jr.
 Jones, Kenneth W., Jr.
 Jones, Lawrence M.
 Jones, Michael Albert
 Jones, Patrick Walker
 Jones, Steven E.
 Jorczak, Rick Eugene
 Julias, Joseph W.
 Jump, Donald Henry
 Kaczmarek, Joe M.
 Kalb, Karl Harpel
 Kanuck, Ann Fincher
 Kardos, Andre
 Katana, Thomas Edward
 Kaufman, David L.
 Kauphusman, Jerome L.
 Kazules, Stephen Charles
 Keilty, John P.
 Keim, James Richard
 Kelley, John W.
 Kelly, Douglas Michael
 Kendall, Herbert Jasper, III
 Kendall, Walter Anthony
 Kennedy, David Michael
 Kenny, Robert Louis
 Ketchum, Timothy Genter
 Kilbourn, Edward
 King, Mark Gregory
 King, Robert Lawrence
 Kirtley, John Delee, Jr.
 Kitchin, Doyle Ray
 Kleefisch, Joseph Gerard
 Klinger, Karl Ernst
 Klugh, David Carl
 Knapper, Robert Anthony
 Knight, James Wilford, Jr.
 Knight, William Lewis, Jr.
 Knize, Donald J.
 Knock, Melvin R.

Knox, Fred Davy, Jr.
 Koenig, Daniel John
 Kohler, John Theodore
 Kolakowski, Ronald G.
 Kolbeck, John Benedict
 Koogle, Grayson Leroy
 Kopang, Chris Warren
 Koprowski, John R.
 Kranyak, Dennis Andrew
 Krause, Peter J.
 Kreutner, Steve Martin
 Kriewaldt, Edward J.
 Kroshl, William Mark
 Kuehn, John Leighton
 Kuhse, Bruce E.
 Lai, Janice
 Lambert, Alexander Doane
 Lane, John Howard, III
 Lang, Leslie June Peterson
 Langford, Calvin Paul
 Lanier, Patrick R.
 Lanier, Richard Columbus, Jr.
 Large, Cyrus Randy
 Larson, Keith W.
 Larson, William C.
 Larson, William Jed
 Lastinger, Roc Aaron
 Laughlin, John M.
 Lavender, Stanley Chandle, Jr.
 Lawson, Altman Lee
 Lee, Mary Patricia
 Leighton, Timothy Davis
 Leininger, Robert Bradford
 Lenahan, Timothy James
 Lenhart, David Steven
 Lewis, Dewey T., Jr.
 Lincoln, Horatio Alonzo
 Lindberg, Peter Leonard
 Little, Thomas R.
 Lobdell, John Dewitt
 Lockbaum, George J.
 Locks, John Taylor
 Lofquist, Eric A.
 Logan, John Wesley
 Logsdon, David L.
 Lombardi, George Justin
 Lombart, Kenneth
 Lorenzo, Thomas Norman, Jr.
 Lowery, Donald Ray
 Loye, John Francis, III
 Luallin, Lloyd E.
 Luginbuhl, Michael Wayne
 Luigart, Craig Blaine
 Lustig, Scott Eliot
 Lyon, David C.
 MacDougall, Robert Burne
 Mack, Michael Leroy
 MacKowski, James A.
 Macris, John James
 Maddox, Agnes Virginia
 Magill, Marvin Dale
 Mahoney, John G.
 Malagonfajar, Manuel Ambrosi
 Males, Charles George, Jr.
 Manko, Dennis
 Manzi, Alfred Anthony
 Mark, Joseph Francis
 Marquez, Edward James
 Marsh, Ernest Francis, Jr.
 Marshall, David E.
 Marshall, Joseph Benjamin, Jr.
 Martin, Clifton Carl, Jr.
 Martin, John Campbell
 Martz, Ronald Byron
 Mason, Richard P.
 Mathews, Richard Thorne
 Matzelevich, William Walter
 May, Zachary Phillip
 McBride, William Patrick
 McCabe, Walter Scott
 McCafferty, Douglas Lee
 McCallum, James Jerome
 McCarthy, Robert Morton
 McCarty, Scott Edwards

McCluskey, William Robert
 McCormick, Mark Dodge
 McCray, Andre Tyrone
 McCully, Timothy Vickers
 McDonald, Daniel Wright
 McDonald, Danny Oneil
 McDonald, Douglas D.
 McElroy, Elliott Andrew
 McFee, Richard A.
 McGraw, Michael J.
 McHugh, Richard A.
 McKernan, John Francis
 McKinney, Gary Ralph
 McKinnon, Lee Oatice, Jr.
 McNally, Mark Thomas
 McNamara, Kevin P.
 McWilliams, Kenneth Lynn
 Melick, Donald R.
 Mentas, Michael Wayne
 Mercado, Hilario Norman, Jr.
 Mestrez, Robert Edward
 Mette, Dennis W.
 Miano, William Delbert
 Michael, Gilbert Stewart
 Michael, Gina Marie
 Middlebrook, Curtis Edward
 Miller, Edward M.
 Miller, Peter Georg
 Miller, Ronald J.
 Milliman, Daniel L.
 Mills, Gary Bond
 Mishkel, Lloyd Stanley
 Mittleider, Michael Robert
 Moore, Daryce Lianne
 Moore, Georgie
 Moore, John S.
 Moore, Wade Corydon
 Moormann, Eric Ronald
 Moran, Wayne Alan
 Moro, John Joseph
 Morris, Carl A.
 Morris, Robert W.
 Morrison, Comer Carlton
 Morrow, John J.
 Morton, Eric Ernst
 Mosig, Joanne Marie Fletcher
 Moss, Lee Owen
 Mott, Rex Myron
 Moxie, David
 Mueller, William Henry, Jr.
 Muhlenberg, Barry V.K.
 Mulliner, Jeffrey Lawrence
 Murphy, Larry James
 Naeger, Henri William, Jr.
 Nakaguma, Spencer Tomatsu
 Nash, John A.
 Nash, Ray C.
 Naville, Timothy Joseph
 Neboshynsky, Walter
 Neidlinger, Eric Christian
 Nelms, Dovard Wayne
 Nelson, Kenneth J.
 Nelson, Robert Wayne, Jr.
 Nerheim, Steven William
 Nesselrode, Mark Cullen
 Nevitt, Patrick Oliver
 Newberry, Garry Dean
 Nicely, Kip Wilson
 Nicholson, Gerald Leonard
 Nichols, Samuel H.
 Nimitz, Stephen Clark
 Nimmich, Drury C., Jr.
 Nisley, Rodger Eric
 Noble, Richard Riley
 Noell, John
 Noffke, Mark Louis
 Nolan, Clifford John
 Norgart, Timothy S.
 Norton, Richard James
 Novacek, Forrest Ernest
 Nuss, Terry D.
 O'Brien, Robert
 O'Brien, Steven Michael
 O'Connell, John Michael

O'Connor, Stanley Robert
 Ogden, James Ellis
 O'Hanlon, Richard
 Olberding, David Lee
 Olenick, Michael A.
 Oliver, Dennis Lee
 Olson, Lawrence William
 Orihuela, William Ralph
 O'Rourke, Shawn T.
 Ortiz, Richard Paul
 Ortloff, Frederick Pitney
 Outten, Milton Arthur
 Owens, Michael John
 Pabst, Richard A.
 Pagan, John Richard
 Palmer, James A. T.
 Palmer, Richard A.
 Parafiorito, Ted Michael
 Parcher, Donald Scott
 Parker, Carlton Dennis
 Parker, Gary Bruce
 Parker, John Stephen
 Parker, Linda Faye Warren
 Parker, Thomas Anthony
 Parks, Kenneth P.
 Parr, James Earl
 Parsons, Stanton Vanderhoef
 Paskulovich, Robert Steven
 Patchin, Alan E.
 Paterson, David Edwin
 Patterson, James Roderick TA.
 Patterson, Torkel Lloyd
 Payne, William Holland
 Pearson, Perth Franklin, Jr.
 Pearson, Steven Craig
 Peebles, Gerald Carlton
 Pereira, James Frank
 Perkins, Jay D.
 Perry, Marcia Lynn
 Peterman, Robert Clayton
 Peters, Wayne Douglas
 Peterson, Harley Howard
 Pitts, Andrew J.
 Plebani, Caniel J.
 Plehal, John V.
 Pokorny, William A., Jr.
 Pollard, Thomas Glenn
 Pollard, William Jeffery
 Poole, James Lesley Jr.
 Poole, Joseph William
 Poole, Russell John
 Poulos, Dennis Duane
 Price, Thomas McClintock
 Prins, Orville NMN
 Pugh, Kenneth Scott
 Purdy, Thomas Edward
 Putt, Raymond Paul, Jr.
 Queen, Gregory A.
 Quilici, Leo Joseph, II
 Quinn, Patrick John
 Quitter, James Timothy
 Rader, Charles Leroy
 Raithel, Albert Lawrence
 Raley, Frederick Vajghn
 Rammel, Patrick Fletcher
 Randall, William D.
 Rathbun, Patricia Maria
 Rauch, Henry Terence
 Reddix, Mason C.
 Redmond, Billy Glenn, Jr.
 Reilly, Thomas John
 Renaud, David George
 Richards, Thomas R., Jr.
 Richey, Truman Anclie, Jr.
 Rifkin, David Evan
 Rigazzi, Richard Antony
 Rinicker, Tommy Lee
 Rivers, Timothy Clifford
 Roberts, Robert Lee, Jr.
 Roberts, Stephen John
 Robertson, Carl Dean
 Robertson, O. Zeller, III
 Roe, James Robert
 Roelant, James Gregory

Roemmich, Gary L.
 Roesener, Stephen Joseph
 Roeske, Ernest J.
 Roeske, Tomi Elliott
 Rogers, David Andrew
 Rohman, Michael Christopher
 Rose, Stephen Wayne
 Rosemond, Julian Brown, Jr.
 Rosenberg, Lee Harold
 Ross, John Leroy, Jr.
 Roth, Glynn Edward
 Rudin, William Eugene
 Rusinko, Jeffrey D.
 Rutkoff, David NMN
 Ryder, Christopher M.
 Saenz, Ernesto Gonzalez
 Salazar, Antonio Marcos
 Salazar, Gary Mathias Franci
 Sander, Jeffrey R.
 Sanford, James A.
 Sarao, John Francis
 Saunders, Frank Wendell, Jr.
 Sayers, Clay S., II
 Saylor, Bev Lee
 Scanlon, William M.
 Schaefer, John A.
 Scheffler, John W.
 Schenck, Lyndle Wade
 Scheuermann, Michael Francis
 Schildhouse, Rex Allen
 Schluckebier, Daniel Carl
 Schmidt, Albert William
 Schnabel, Albert Olen, Jr.
 Schneider, Jeffrey Allan
 Schuller, Ronald Carl
 Schumacher, John David
 Schwanz, John J.
 Scoppa, Christopher J.
 Scott, Craig Charles
 Scott, Gary Don
 Scout, John B.
 Sears, Richard Francis
 Seedorf, Roger William
 Seelenbinder, Mark A.
 Seifert, Alfred Ralph
 Seifert, Michael Lewis
 Selby, Brenda Fay
 Sevald, Andrew G.
 Shaffer, Roderick Orrin
 Shattuck, Christopher T.
 Shelor, James Lester
 Shepard, Kim R.
 Sherry, Thomas Edward
 Shimabukuro, Norman K.
 Simmons, Carlton Anthony, Jr.
 Simpkins, William E.
 Simpson, Carl Thomas
 Simpson, William Jack, Jr.
 Sinclair, Randolph K.
 Singleton, Gary Wayne
 Singleton, Steven O'Neal
 Skoog, Paul Odin
 Slaton, Don Eugene
 Smith, David E.
 Smith, George Joseph, Jr.
 Smith, James Chapin
 Smith, Marlin Bari
 Smith, Thomas John
 Smolski, Stefan Lani
 Smoot, Byron Gordon
 Snow, Richard Louis
 Snowdon, Jay Snyder
 Snyder, Jonathan William
 Snyder, Robert Edward
 Soto, Ralph M.
 Southworth, Richard E.
 Spagna, William Steven, Jr.
 Speight, Steven Lee
 Spinnato, Joseph Charles, III
 Spraitzar, Gerald
 Sprowls, Timothy Jay
 Stack, Larry James
 Standridge, George Robert
 Starnes, Charles R.

Starnes, George Keith
 Steadley, Joel Franklin
 Steinhauer, Ralph
 Stemp, Roger
 Sten, Gregory David
 Stephenson, Neal Bevan
 Stetson, William S., Jr.
 Stevenson, Richard Thomas
 Stewart, John P.
 Stewart, Thomas Newton
 Stewart, William Brantly
 Stinson, Ralf Hale, II
 Stivers, John Victor
 Stoessel, Timothy Francis
 Strange, Joe C.
 Strickland, Richard Frede, Jr.
 Striewe, Josph Gary
 Stroyneck, Kevin Roy
 Struble, Daniel H.
 Struth, Robert G. Jr.
 Stuart, Alfred E.
 Stuller, James Clayton
 Stutsman, Bruce Edward
 Sullivan, Stephen M.
 Swaney, Mark Joseph
 Sweede, David Eugene
 Sweet, William Jeffrey
 Swift, Harvey Gerald
 Swirmicky, Mark E.
 Symonds, James A.
 Tandy, Jon Sitton
 Tastsides, Robert George
 Tate, Robert Perry
 Taunton, Colleen Ann Oconnor
 Taylor, David W.
 Taylor, Ernest Norman, Jr.
 Taylor, John Fleming, III
 Tellefson, James Chester
 Tenaglia, Joseph Anthony
 Terrell, Arthur Robert
 Testa, Ronald Paul
 Teuscher, James Howard
 Tharp, Mark Eugene
 Thieman, David H.
 Thomas, John R.
 Thomas, Kevin James
 Thomas, Richard Laurel
 Thompson, James Hamilton
 Thompson, Jimmy NMN
 Thompson, John Scott
 Thomson, Robert Gemmel, III
 Thornton, Karen Irene
 Tibbetts, David K.
 Tjepkema, Russell Peter
 Topp, Allan R.
 Tosso, Emile Euchre, III
 Towne, Raymond Patrick
 Tracy, Patrick Alan
 Traynor, Lawrence Gilworth J.
 Treon, William J.
 Truelove, Michael Ray
 Trump, Donald Erdell
 Tryon, Jodi Elizabeth
 Trzeciak, Robert J.
 Tully, Brian Edwin
 Tuozzolo, Charles
 Turcotte, Stephen Allan
 Turpen, Charles Ralph
 Tuttell, Robert J.
 Tye, Charles Richard
 Tyler, Hansford D., III
 Tyson, Glenn R.
 Uhle, Robert Stephen
 Uchron, Mark Alan
 Ulbricht, Randall J.
 Vandam, Gerald Edward
 Vanourney, Kenneth Leonard
 Vasquez, Alberto E., Jr.
 Vaughn, Charles Michael
 Vaught, John Wesley
 Vazquez, Maurice Valdivieso
 Venlet, David J.
 Vermillion, George M.
 Villemez, Raymond Joseph

Viriden, John Dwight
 Virgallito, Larry Dominio
 Wade, Clifford L. J.
 Wakefield, Charles Douglas
 Waldrip, Randall Wayne
 Wallace, Myron Antonio
 Wallis, Lars Allen
 Walls, Keith Allan
 Walstrom, Terry L.
 Walters, Charles Elwyn
 Ward, Michael Nicolie
 Wargo, Linda Ellen
 Warner, Charles J.
 Watkins, Donald Paul, Jr.
 Watkins, Jon Jay
 Watkins, Thomas Vance, III
 Watson, Curtis Lee
 Watson, Kenneth Thomas
 Watson, Wilbert John
 Weast, David Howard
 Weaver, Frank Hill
 Weaver, Keith Thomas, II
 Weber, Ewald W.
 Weeks, Robert Lawrence, Jr.
 Weisert, Roy Edward
 Weiss, Robert Francis, Jr.
 Welch, David Milton
 Wells, Walter C.
 Wendel, Lennart, Jr.
 Wendt, Michael P.
 Wentzel, Philip Edward, Jr.
 Weppler, Jeffrey F.
 Wetherbee, James Donald
 Weyrick, Richard
 Whalen, Harold R.
 Wheeler, Russell Phillip, Jr.
 Whitby, Peter Kevin
 Whitman, Charles E.
 Wice, Michael David
 Wick, Harvey Carl
 Wickliff, Phillip Max
 Wierenga, Michael Andrew
 Wieringa, Jeffrey A.
 Wiley, Stephen Nelson
 Williams, Dale Jay
 Williams, Danny Ben
 Williams Warren Wright
 Williamson, Charles F., III
 Willis, John Robert
 Willson, Thomas David
 Willy, James Michael
 Wilson, Edmond George
 Wilson, James Owen
 Winkler, Robert J.
 Winship, Charles Harris, III
 Wirt, David L.
 Wisniewski, Mark E.
 Wolfe, Robert Roswell
 Wolters, William Alan
 Wood, George Leslie, III
 Woodfin, William Cutler
 Wooldridge, Edmond Tyler
 Wright, Lohn Francis
 Wroblewski, John Joseph, Jr.
 Yarger, Frederick Daniel
 Yoos, Paul Edward
 York, Guillermo Augusto
 Young, Patti A.
 Youngborg, Eric D.
 Zacharsuk, Joseph, Jr.
 Zawiska, Jack Lee
 Zellbor, Thomas E.
 Zobel, William C.
 Zumstein, Edward Howard

ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICER

Anderson, John Austin
 Berkman, Richard Lewis
 Booth, Richard L.
 Bosworth, Michael Lane
 Boykin, Jerry Wayne
 Brunson, Steven James
 Bry, William Arthur
 Bryant, Gregory Russell
 Bush, Charles Arthur

Cava, George Leonard
 Chrijapin, Victor
 Closs, Joseph Vincent
 Daughety, Steven Floyd
 Davenport, Frederick, Jr.
 Dew, Dwight David
 Drucker, Carl J.
 Edwards, John A.
 Ellison, Stephen Kennet
 Fitzgerald, James Edward, III
 Forkel, Frank Kenneth
 Gain, Timothy James
 Galik, Daniel
 Gariano, Patrick, Jr.
 Geary, John Welch
 Hale, Patrick Charles
 Hampey, John M.
 Heffron, John Sutherland
 Heidgerken, Ricky A.
 Heilstedt, Martin Ralph
 Hepburn, Richard Daniel
 Herbert, Larry E.
 Hernandez, Bonifacio G., Jr.
 Hetteema, Charles Dean
 Hilder, David S.
 Hunn, James M.
 Jamison, Richard L.
 Jenkins, James Logan
 Jones, Jerry William
 Jurey, Steven Neal
 Kershner, Paul Author
 Kleinholz, Adam Francis
 Knaebel, Michael Lee
 Koreisha, Nicholas A.
 Lively, Kenneth Allan
 Lyman, Kathleen Marie
 Malaret, Hiram Anthony
 Mason, Bradley J.
 McGowen, Thomas Leon
 McNair, Tommy H.
 Mills, Max Edward
 Milster, Percy F.
 Nelly, David C.
 Nelson, Eric E.
 Newman, Lawrence Gregory
 Ohare, Mark Stephen
 Oliphant, Lee Lewis
 Oster, Stephen Bruce
 Paquette, Joseph Louis
 Pellin, August F., III
 Petroka, Robert P.
 Proctor, Walter Noel
 Reid, William Roy
 Ricketts, Steven Donald
 Ruesch, Rehe Edward
 Shultheis, Charles Frederick
 Speer, Bradford Arthur
 Steele, Robert Douglas, Jr.
 Stoeberl, Paul Henry
 Stowell, Thomas Leo
 Terrell, James Manson
 Thompson, Robert Michael
 Tramel, William P., Jr.
 Turner, Edward Richard
 Wales, Carl Alzen
 Wright, Frank Xavier
 Zivich, David Mark

AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICER
(AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING) (151X)

Hart, Robert Howard
 Kuper, Daniel Thomas
 Milton, Dale Alan
 Shelley, Kenneth Lawrence

AVIATION MAINTENANCE DUTY OFFICER
(AVIATION MAINTENANCE) (152X)

Barrett, Richard Oliver
 Bent, Rex Alan
 Boone, James Delbert, Jr.
 Bradbury, William Ralph
 Bush, Hershell Douglas
 Carr, William Frederic, Jr.
 Clarke Stephen Paul
 Crosby, William Richard

Faust, David Phillip
 Fletcher, Owen Robert, Jr.
 Gallagher, Maurice John
 Gorman F. Sean
 Gottschalk, Lawrence Edward
 Hanson, Steven Louis
 Heinicke, Robert Scott
 House, Kenneth Stephen
 Hurlburt, Timothy Lawrence
 Kanewske, Robert Holden
 Klimas, Richard James
 Ladd, Richard Sherman
 Laszcz, Peter James
 Ledebauer, Galen J.
 Martin, James Hildrith
 Maxwell, Michael D.
 Moore, Michael Lee
 Paul, Stuart L.
 Rice, Ray Howard, III
 Ritter, Kevin K.
 Romero, Michael N.
 Shutt, Donald Joseph
 Smith, Frank Jackson
 Stanley, Rolland Virgil
 Stolle, Robert Carl
 Stone, Maurice Clyde
 Tsioutsias, Drake Dorian
 Walker, George Daniel
 Wiener, Gregory Paul

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICER (CRYPTOLOGY) (161X)

Benson, Jay Hayden
 Caffey, Troy Ray
 Carmichael, David Lee
 Couvillion, Albert Leo
 Fuller, Jeffrey D.
 Hawkins, Darrell Blaine
 Isosaari, Robert Matthew
 Ketterer, Barry Linn
 Kurzanski, Edward Joseph
 Linthicum, Richard C.
 Loo, Alexis Sandria
 Mansfield, Gregory Frederick
 McCaffrey, Thomas M.
 McCarty, Larry J.
 Metcalf, Mark Leslie
 Mitchell, Gregory D.
 Morris, David Victor
 Oakes, Dale Roger
 Pumphrey, Thomas Franklin
 Shimp, David Keith
 Sneed, Charles Leon
 Stafford, David Spencer
 Tucker, William R.
 Wojdyla, Ronald Joseph
 Yungk, George Lee

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICER (INTELLIGENCE) (163X)

Ambroselli, Anthony A.
 Anderson, Michael Lee
 Armstrong, Diane Lee
 Betz, Charles Havard
 Blythe, James Taylor
 Bortmes, Leroy Thomas
 Bourgeois, Karl Francis
 Cobery, Charles William
 Cunningham, Brian Frederick
 Davis, Ricky A.
 Dennis, Timothy J.
 Driver, Robert Kevin
 Duke, Paul S.
 Dundas, Janice Marie
 Elders, Garron Lee
 Fowler, Douglas E.
 Grice, Gary Getson
 Hamm, Bernard Anthony, Jr.
 Harmon, William Cary
 Hedlund, John William
 Henley, Van Allen
 Hoey, James Meredith, III
 Ingham, Bruce
 Knight, Samuel Bruce
 Kubat, Michael Jan
 Machak, Thomas Michael
 Mader, John Frederick

Marineau, Charles Robert, Jr.
 McIntyre, Thomas John
 McKee, James Henry, III
 Meadows, Lee
 Miller, Jeffrey David
 Muir, Daniel James
 Noll, Michael A.
 Peranich, Robert Joseph
 Ramsay, Steven A.
 Rogers, John Wiley
 Rowe, Robert Brian
 Sadler, Stephen Roy
 Santez, Stephen Francis, Jr.
 Silirie, Kevin Paul
 Stefansky, Stanley Gene
 Stoll, Gerald Adam
 Surratt, Margaret Anne
 Thomas, Joseph Garfield
 Williams, Columbus, Jr.

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICER (PUBLIC AFFAIRS)
 (165X)

Arterburn, George Keith, Jr.
 Carman, John William
 Dooley, Alan Jay
 Goforth, Hunter Bradford
 Tull, John Thomas, Jr.
 Vandyke, Mark Arden

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICER (GEOPHYSICS) (180X)

Akerman, Russell Stewart
 Allen, Robert Lloyd, Jr.
 Blanchard, Joe Lane, II
 Bosse, Thomas Edward
 Curtis, Jan
 Donovan, Barry Matthew
 Ebersole, Kenneth Allen
 Garner, Janice Permella
 Garrett, Robert P.
 Hervey, Suzanne Plott
 Howard, Stephen John
 Markham, David Gregory
 McPherson, Terry Russell
 Meanor, Denis H.
 Oloughlin, Michael C.
 Rutsch, Arno Helmut
 Schultz, Mark Evans
 Selsor, Harry Dewayne
 Summers, Steven J.
 Swaykos, Joseph Walter
 Tielking, Terrance Allan

LIMITED DUTY OFFICER (LINE) (61XX/62XX/
 63XX/64XX/655X)

Anderson, Kenneth S.

Asbury, Virgil Wayne
 Barclay, Bruce M.
 Bishop Emory Lamar
 Boyce, Richard Austin
 Briggs, Terry George
 Britton, Scott George
 Bruce, Jay David
 Cayse, James Frank
 Chambers, Keith Van
 Clark, Michael Arthur
 Clausen, Paul Kenneth, Jr.
 Combs, Samuel Charles
 Couch, William S.
 Cox, Robert Edward
 Datson, Dick
 Delaney, Charles Joseph
 Dickerson, Larry G.
 Dillingham, John Morgan
 Dooling, Franklin J.
 Driver, Perry Davis
 Ducom, Eugene Morgan
 Dunn, James P., Jr.
 Elliot, James A.
 Ellis, James Paul
 Feldhaus, Frederic Francis
 Flowers, Donald Henry
 Gentry, Ronald E.
 Gerhart, William Charles
 Greer, Bernard
 Grosz, Gary D.
 Harris, William James
 Heacock, Jerry David
 Holbrook, Larry Edward
 Hudgen, Earther L.
 Hunt, David Lamar
 Hunt, John H., Jr.
 Hutchins, George Ralph
 Jens, Jeffrey Paul
 Jones, Kenneth Wayne
 Jordan, Austin T.
 Junker, Dwayne Neal
 Kruse, Lance Merit
 Lashbrook, James Edward
 Lucero, Daniel Raul
 Lund, Rodney Gene
 Malone, Lawrence P.
 Maples, Gene D.
 Mariani, Stephen R.
 McClimon, Donald Eugene
 McDaniel, Eldon L., Jr.
 Meadows, John Randolph
 Moore, Robert C.
 Morin, James Robert
 Murphy, Curtis Owen

Overton, Robert Wallace, Jr.
 Phillips, Frankie L.
 Powell, Bobby Keith
 Proctor, James Roger
 Pugh, Ray E.
 Putnam, Bruce Colin, Jr.
 Ratliff, Ruben Mitchel
 Reeves, Richard Dale
 Roberts, Richard H.
 Robinson, Gerald Lloyd
 Rossi, Michael A.
 Schmidt, Stanley Littleton
 Scott, Michael Randolph
 Setterlund, Charles Edgar
 Sisemore, Marion R.
 Slade, George Walker
 Smith, Donald Jeffrey
 Snyder, Robert G.
 Spillers, Jerry W.
 Squier, David Wayne
 Sterling, Garl Vance, Jr.
 Stoneking, Robert Herman
 Tanner, Richard F.
 Temple, James Mack, Jr.
 Thorson, Robert C.
 Touchon, Andrew
 Turner, Lee Oliver
 Turner, Phillip Arnold
 Waltemyer, Clyde Leverne, Jr.
 Waterfield, James Leon
 Welsh, Kenneth Henry
 Wendell, Bertrum W., Jr.
 White, William R.
 Whiting, Daniel E.
 Wicham, Larry R.
 Williams, Leversia
 Wilson, David Kent
 Wright, Wardell Conklin Sr.
 Wroolie, Brad Lee
 Yoshida, William Romain

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn
 from the Senate, June 25, 1984:

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Leslie Lenkowsky, of New York, to be
 Deputy Director of the U.S. Information
 Agency, vice Gilbert A. Robinson, resigned,
 to which position he was appointed during
 the last recess of the Senate, which was sent
 to the Senate on January 24, 1984.