SENATE—*Thursday, September 22, 1983*

(Legislative day of Monday, September 19, 1983)

The Senate met at 11 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Our prayer this morning will be delivered by the Reverend Dr. Paul Currie, minister of the First Presbyterian Church at Caruthersville, Mo. He is being sponsored here by Senator JOHN C. DANFORTH. He comes from the Eighth District of Missouri, of which Mr. EMERSON is the Congressman.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Paul Currie, minister, First Presbyterian Church, Caruthersville, Mo., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, we gratefully acknowledge our debt to You and humbly acknowledge our dependence on You. We seek Your guidance of the Senate trusting in Jesus' promise that whoever seeks finds.

O God of peace, we pray for peace—for the coming of the day when nations shall beat their nuclear swords into plowshares and shall not learn war any more. In these tense and troubled times when the way to peace is confusing and complicated, show us the way and give us the will.

Just God, in the face of countless competing interests, help this Senate to be just toward all. And, O God, give all of us special compassion toward those who are weak.

Our Father, we pray for our Senators knowing that they have their needs as all of us do. Assure them of Your love and Your all-sufficient grace. In Jesus' name, we pray. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

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

THE REVEREND DR. CURRIE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate, I thank the Reverend Dr. Paul Currie for those words of encouragement to Members of the Senate.

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, today after the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order and two special orders, the Senate will have a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 12 noon. It is the intention of the leadership to proceed at that time to the consideration of S. 1342, the Department of State authorization bill, followed by consideration of S. 869 the Export-Import Bank bill.

The majority leader is hopeful the Senate will complete action on these measures in a timely manner today.

The majority leader has described, on numerous occasions during this past week, the work that is before us before the October break. Indeed, Mr. President, my staff calls it a heavy legislative menu that must be completed not only prior to our break, but a great portion of it prior to the end of the fiscal year, which ends Friday, September 30.

THE U.S. COAST GUARD

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the U.S. Coast Guard has had responsibility for the security and safety of our navigable waters since 1790. Today the Coast Guard has a complex set of missions. These include search and rescue, boating safety, aids to navigation, merchant marine safety, environmental law enforcement, and port safety. The Coast Guard has done a remarkable job in discharging these complex and far flung duties with a relatively small number of personnel and a limited budget.

The role of the Coast Guard is particularly important in Alaska. In a State with a coastline longer than that of the contiguous 48 States, a small and scattered population, and extreme weather and water conditions, Alaskans depend on the Coast Guard to protect life and property on the water. For that reason, Alaskans are very concerned about the continued vitality and effectiveness of the Coast Guard.

I am concerned that increasing demand for existing or new services coupled with rapidly aging vessels and equipment may soon impede the ability of the Coast Guard to respond whenever and wherever needed. These services are too important to allow this to happen.

An excellent article on this problem entitled "Today's Coast Guard: A Study in Insufficiency," by Vincent C. Thomas, Jr. was recently published in the August 1983 issue of Sea Power. I recommend this article to all those who have an interest in maintaining the safety and security of our navigable waters.

With that in mind, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

TODAY'S COAST GUARD: A STUDY IN INSUFFICIENCY

(By Vincent C. Thomas Jr.)

"USCG traditions stand alongside the finest and proudest of the nation. They are worthy of 'protection.' They are known and respected . . . and emulated . . . by maritime nations and mariners around the world. They reflect the very fiber of American character."

"The last thing the USCG needs is yet another study. Twenty-five were done in the last year or two. Responding to studies is absorbing a massive amount of time that could be spent on solving the problems whose symptoms lead to studies. Please—no more!"

These two quotations from the Coast Guard's response to yet another study of its roles and missions effectively describe the situation in which the Coast Guard finds itself today: a proud service which simply hopes to continue to serve the nation, as it has most ably for 193 years, yet is beset from all sides by well-meaning agencies which can't agree on what the Coast Guard is now and what it should be in the years to come.

A KEY QUESTION FROM NACOA

The prestigious National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere (NACOA), which conducted the latest study, asks the key question that many in the Coast Guard and the general public also ask: "Why is it that such a relatively small agency, employing only 45,000 and operating on less than $2 billion a year, somehow finds itself the subject of so many studies?" The committee's answer: "One reason, of course, is that the Coast Guard sounded the alarm that—all other things being equal—increasing duties, rising operating costs, and decreasing resources presented an unbalanced equation. Another reason for the scrutiny, we believe, is that the Coast Guard is a governmental conglomerate charged with a mixed bag of missions: military and civilian, regulatory and service-oriented, lifesaving and law-enforcing. The Coast Guard's complexity contributes to its vulnerability."

The NACOA study and the Coast Guard's response, considered together, indicate that there is a sizable gap between the Coast Guard's view of the importance of its various missions and the views of those outside the service. The Coast Guard's response to NACOA's comments on search and rescue (SAR) missions illustrates that gap. Said the Coast Guard: "Categorizing a 'nonemergency' [SAR] assist as 'convenience' is misleading. . . . A person stranded in an inoperative boat which is anchored in sheltered water is not usually in any danger of losing his or her life . . . but he or she can be

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

subjected to considerable hardship if not assisted. Unlike being in an automobile that has broken down, there is no way to walk away from a boat, and there is often no shelter from the elements."

Given this disparity of views and its potential impact on Coast Guard funding, people, resources, missions, and responsibilities, perhaps the next question is: How is the Coast Guard faring?

The quick answer is that the multi-mission service appears to have survived the stresses and strains of the last five turbulent years without undue lasting hardship. Further, it is operating at the moment with somewhat newer resources, both at sea and in the air, than it has had available for many years. It has few "people" problems. Its leadership is quietly impressive and highly professional. Finally, and perhaps most important in the long run, there appears to be a far greater degree of public appreciation for what the Coast Guard does, and why.

DISQUIETUDES AND INSUFFICIENCIES

That is the positive side. Offsetting those plus factors—more than offsetting them in some areas, in fact—are certain nagging disquietudes and insufficiencies. What follows is a brief discussion of some of the more important factors, both negative and positive, affecting the Coast Guard today—contributing to but at the same time delimiting in certain respects its war and peace capabilities.

Personnel

At the moment the Coast Guard finds itself in an excellent position with regard to people. There are no major difficulties with enlistment and retention remains high. However, Coast Guard leaders have no illusions about the future. They know that, with a declining pool of potential recruits, competition for new enlistments will become keener and that the need for skilled personnel in the civilian labor market will provide lucrative opportunities for those who have learned their trades while in uniform. The Coast Guard has managed to meet its enlistment needs despite cutbacks of recruiting personnel during last year's tight-money crisis and despite higher enlistment standards—the depressed civilian job market helped to counter the negative results of those two factors. However, it is doubtful that the Coast Guard—or any of the armed services—will continue to be so fortunate in the immediate future.

In time, the problems of acquiring authorization for additional personnel and of recruiting those personnel must be faced. As Adm. James S. Gracey, the Coast Guard's Commandant, observes: "There is nothing more difficult today than adding people to the federal payroll." Certainly the Navy found that out earlier this year, when Congress balked at authorizing and funding the personnel needed to man the many new ships now joining or soon to join the fleet. The same kind of problem, albeit on a lesser scale, faces the Coast Guard. Additional ships and aircraft are on the way and they must be manned. But a higher USCG personnel ceiling has not yet been set.

And then there are the reserves—or, in the Coast Guard's case, a lack of reserves. Surprisingly, at a time when Congress has moved or is moving to beef up reserve strength across-the-board in the other services, the Coast Guard has just 12,000 reserves, only 55% of its mobilization requirements. Does it need more? Obviously. And Gracey, the only Commandant in recent memory to serve tours as both Atlantic-area commander and Pacific-area commander, has had far more opportunity than most to see firsthand how much reserve forces contribute to overall Coast Guard readiness and capability. Gracey describes reserves as "full members of the family"—a family that is involved 365 days of the year, whether the nation is at war or at peace, in carrying out its mission.

Gracey would like to have more regular personnel and more reserves, but the dollars to pay for both are hard to come by.

Meanwhile, to maximize the efficiency and productivity of its most valuable asset, the Coast Guard men and women now on active duty, the Coast Guard has begun a personnel evaluation program radically different from those traditionally used by the services. Rather than looking only at an individual's performance while aboard ship (or on duty at a shore station), the new program concentrates on the individual"s day-in, day-out, year-round worth to the service—the term "worth" specifically including his or her off-duty behavior. Is a petty officer an inspiring leader while on duty but a boozer once he doffs his uniform? The Coast Guard wants to know, so that it will have an understanding of how well he can be counted upon in event of emergency. In contrast, is a quiet, reliable, but perhaps uninspiring individual a solid contributor to his community and to the reputation of his service? The Coast Guard wants to know that, too. In short, the Coast Guard is striving to learn what the whole person is like, not just the on-duty person, and what his potential is for a long-term, constructive contribution to the Coast Guard as a vital, dynamic, and constantly evolving organization.

The Coast Guard is more justified, perhaps, in embarking upon this kind of personnel appraisal than the other services would be. Coast Guard personnel usually have more contact, both routinely and in emergencies, with the general public than do the members of any of the other services. A senior Coast Guard petty officer may be responsible, for example, for repairing an inoperative aid to navigation relied upon heavily by boaters; he may head a force cleaning up an oil spill threatening a local beach; he may be assigned to monitor the rise of a rain-swollen river and work side by side with his neighbors to fill sandbags to keep the floodwaters away; and he might be in charge of a crew fighting its way through pounding surf to save the occupants of an overturned sailboat. And those are just a few of the ways a Coast Guardsman can come into direct contact with the local citizenry.

The new evaluation program is a bold step forward, yet one that may be long overdue. It also might well be one that could precipitate a hue and cry from those who would contend that an individual's privacy is being intruded upon. But there is no arguing with the fact that if this system results in putting the right man or woman in the right place where he or she can respond at the right time, everybody wins.

Coast Guard officials say feedback from those with whom Coast Guard personnel come in contact in their many endeavors "would be most welcome." Not only would such feedback provide yet another means of ascertaining whether the right personnel have been correctly assigned, but when the feedback is positive in nature it also would be a tremendous morale booster.

Operating resources

Here the Coast Guard is undergoing a facelift. Four new 270-foot cutters built by Tacoma (Wash.) Boatbuilding Co., soon will be joining the fleet, and the first of a group of nine being constructed in Rhode Island by Robert E. Derecktor Corp., will be launched shortly. Thanks to the impetus given to the Coast Guard's drug-interdiction mission by President Reagan and Vice President Bush, acquisition of three surface effect ships was expedited dramatically. Two have been in full operation for several months already; they are the only surface effect ships now used by any of the U.S. maritime services.

The Coast Guard also will acquire six to eight new patrol boats of a type not yet determined. Funds for their acquisition were included among $300 million appropriated by Congress last year for the Defense Department but earmarked for the Coast Guard. One of the conditions attached to the patrol boat acquisition is that the craft must have a hull form already proven by use in a military or police role. Proposals from industry for construction of the craft arrived at Coast Guard headquarters last month and are currently being evaluated. (The process will be time-consuming; the average *weight* of the proposals is said to be 50 pounds.)

A SWATH (small-waterplane-area twin-hull) craft also is being designed by the Coast Guard. Gracey is particularly enthusiastic about the SWATH because of its stability at sea and the resulting decrease in crew fatigue.

In the air, because of the lack of modernization over the last couple of decades, what the Coast Guard is receiving now in the form of brand-new assets is particularly note-worthy. Last October the first of 41 HU-25 Guardian aircraft was flown operationally; it was the first new USCG aircraft since the 1960s. Later, in March, the last HU-16 Albatross, an ancient seaplane the first model of which was built in 1949, was flown for the last time. Eighty-eight of these reliable old birds served the Coast Guard with distinction during the past three decades plus.

The Guardian is an unusually sophisticated patrol aircraft, highly automated and capable of use in a variety of missions. Enthuses one of its supporters: "Comparing the Guardian with its predecessors is like drawing a comparison between a Z-car and a Model-T Ford!"

A newer version of another magnificent old workhorse, the C-130 Hercules, will join the Coast Guard ranks later this year. These new patrol aircraft will have an electronics capability vastly superior to that of their predecessors, as well as greater fuel capacity, speed, and range.

In October, still another new aircraft will arrive on the scene—the HH-65A Dolphin helicopter, the Coast Guard's new short-range recovery aircraft. The HH-65A replaces another veteran of more than two decades of service, the HH-52A Sea Guardian. The Dolphin, like the other two newcomers to Coast Guard air, has a state-of-the-art avionics system that will contribute tremendously to its much-improved capabilities. It, too, will be faster than its predecessor, with greater range and fuel capacity.

Maintenance

Even as the Coast Guard acquires new hardware assets, it still must struggle to find ways and means of keeping its older assets afloat and in the air. For that reason,

the USCG soon will embark on a FRAM (fleet rehabilitation and modernization) program to standardize equipment aboard its 378-foot cutters. The FRAM program is reminiscent of similar Navy programs during and after the Korean War to prolong the lives of WWII destroyers in the absence of funds to build new ones. New ships obviously would be better, but the FRAM program will add years—if not complete modernity—to the lives of the large cutters.

A lack of adequate spares still plagues the Coast Guard. Gracey aptly describes the USCG's collection of ships and aircraft as a "potpourri." Finding parts for some of the more ancient craft often can be likened to finding a needle in a haystack; some spares, in fact, must be custom-manufactured to fill particular needs, and that problem can only worsen as long as the older ships and aircraft stay in service.

There are additional maintenance frustrations in still another area—ship overhauls. The Coast Guard had hoped, to minimize the separation of crews from their families, to undertake the majority of its overhauls in the homeport areas of the ships being overhauled. That laudable goal already has proven to be for the most part unattainable, since it has not been possible to find enough shipyards in homeport areas either able or willing to do the work. Part of the problem lies in the low volume of work available, part in its irregularity, and still another part, believes Gracey, in the unwillingness of many yards—because of paperwork requirements, slow payment, and other frustrations—to undertake small government projects.

Research and development (R&D)

The Coast Guard is on the way up in this vital area after having sustained sharp budget cuts in the recent past that reduced the service's overall R&D effort and resulted in the loss of sizable numbers of talented civilian employees. Now not only does the budget contain more R&D dollars, but there is also a clear determination on the part of Coast Guard leadership to make R&D pay both long- and short-term dividends. Asserts Gracey: "We are bringing more civilians aboard, and also are making it clear that we are willing to take risks in R&D. And we're not going to sit back and wait for the ultimate solution."

What the "ultimate solution" is for the law enforcement mission has yet to be determined. There appears to be recognition, however, that, despite the upcoming influx of new equipment previously described, the Coast Guard still lacks enough resources, and enough of the right kind of resources, for certain key missions, notably drug interdiction. The NACOA study recommends that, "in the long term" and assuming "a continuing high priority for anti-drug efforts," the Coast Guard be given "sufficient resources to handle this effort without adverse effect on its other missions."

The Coast Guard was fortunate in being able to acquire the three surface effect ships—two of which were available almost immediately—in a matter of just months. But how often will that type of miracle occur? What prototypes are being developed and tested now that could be the first of a class tomorrow? With the possible exception of a single modified 200-ton surface effect ship (the only one in existence) being tested by both the Navy and Coast Guard, the answer is, "None." That is a worrisome situation.

Third World involvement

The Coast Guard has long been involved in international activity of various kinds, not only as a wartime partner of the U.S. Navy but also on missions in the Antarctic and associated with the international ice patrol, to cite but a few examples. Its unique abilities have in fact been recognized and emulated throughout the maritime world. Of late there has been a new development: requests from African nations for assistance in establishing and improving their own fledgling coast guards.

The door to such involvement, already opened by such duties as the operation of a LORAN (long-range [electronic] aid to navigation) station in Liberia, was opened even wider by a USCG training team that worked in Sierra Leone. The team, headed by Lt. Robert C. Eccles, impressed those with whom it worked directly, as well as the officer who commands all of Sierra Leone's forces and U.S. State Department officials assigned to Sierra Leone. From that beginning came invitations for Gracey to extend an already-scheduled trip to Liberia to include visits to Sierra Leone and other African countries. The upshot has been the establishment of closer relations with all of the nations involved, a development which in the long run could be of immeasurable benefit in improving and standardizing maritime practices, regulations, and cooperation worldwide.

OF RESOURCES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

During the terms of office of the last three Commandants, Adms. Owen Siler, John Hayes, and Gracey, the Coast Guard has gone from a service that loyally and almost automatically responded "Aye, aye, sir" when called upon to fulfill ever-increasing responsibilities with resources lessening in capability to one that, although just as loyal, has made it clear that—for the country's sake, if not its own—it will make itself heard if and when it finds its responsibilities are near to overtaxing its resources.

Hayes did much to awaken the executive branch, the Congress, and the public to Coast Guard problems when he warned that threatened budget cuts would result in sharp curtailment of search and rescue operations. And suddenly Congress—not wanting to contend with irate constituents who rely heavily upon the Coast Guard—managed to find funds to ensure that those SAR missions would continue. Gracey, although perhaps not as conspicuously combative as his immediate predecessors, also does not hesitate to make known what will happen if ill-considered budget cuts are made, if potentially damaging reductions by well-meaning study panels are implemented, and if the professionalism of his service is endangered by those who apparently don't understand what "multi-mission" means.

But no matter how able—and how forthright—the USCG's leadership might be, the Coast Guard is in a sense threatened by those seemingly endless studies that manage to pick it apart, but somehow just don't seem to know how to put in back together. In those studies two themes are dominant: (1) If certain Coast Guard responsibilities appear to be secondary, nonemergency-type missions, they should be turned over to civilian agencies on a contract basis. (2) The amount of time the Coast Guard devotes to various missions should be quantified, and if percentages of time spent on certain functions are below a desired norm, those functions should be eliminated or transferred to other agencies.

A case in point in NACOA's discussion of the use of buoy tenders in the national aids to navigation program. NACOA believes that "10 percent to 16 percent utilization of such major capital equipment is unusually low when compared to typical industry use of comparable equipment." Other comments of a similar nature were made by NACOA, with emphasis on similarly esoteric econometric data rather than on the relationship of sometimes ancillary duties to the overall Coast Guard mission.

"SHIPS MUST OPERATE"

The Coast Guard's responses to such contentions—and to the often accompanying recommendations for transfer of certain USCG functions to the private sector or to other government agencies—point to the serious problem it has in bringing about an understanding that the "whole" Coast Guard mission is somewhat more than the sum of its component parts and that there is, accordingly, a continuing need for involvement of Coast Guard people in tasks which in private industry might be "farmed out" to subcontractors.

Asserts the Coast Guard: "There is an important training factor in buoy tender operations. But it cannot be met by having just a few tenders in operation. Furthermore, gaining professional experience—and keeping it sharp—are different matters. Buoy tenders provide superb command-at-sea experience for mid-level officers. Because of the work they do, they also provide unparalleled professional experience for junior officers and crew alike. To get that experience, ships must operate; they cannot be in mothballs, or sit idly while others do routine work. . . . Tenders and their military crews also perform other USCG missions and meet regional emergency needs—like floods—as required. The effect of losing that resource and the flexibility of military personnel to respond quickly and effectively whenever and wherever needed should not be taken lightly. It is doubtful economic benefit can be shown for NACOA's proposal, all things being considered, but even if it were shown, the decision should not rest on economics alone. The national interest transcends economics."

A superb example of what the Coast Guard is seeking to impart—the importance of honing an individual's skills across a wide spectrum—is the previously mentioned Lt. Eccles, whose leadership, sound basic knowledge, and diplomatic presence led to such a warm response in Sierra Leone. Eccles, 1983 winner of the Navy League's Capt. David H. Jarvis Award for Inspirational Leadership and Professional Competence, also was cited for his operational competence in time of crisis when a civilian airliner slid off an icy runway at Boston's Logan Airport into the sea. The SAR procedures he initiated while serving as operations duty officer translated directly into the saving of lives.

At this juncture, if indeed the Coast Guard is alive and well, it would appear prudent for those outside the Coast Guard who are charged with the responsibility for its well-being to expend more effort in ascertaining what resources the Coast Guard needs to keep it that way, rather than in dissecting it once again without really determining why it continues to function as well as it does.

At the same time, it would behoove the Coast Guard itself to speak out more loudly and more persuasively, across-the-board and at levels other than the top, to what it believes it needs, so that the public it serves

every day of the year can better support those requirements.

Gracey himself is obviously doing his utmost to make public the Coast Guard's deficiencies, and certainly is pulling no punches, whether on Capitol Hill or in executive branch circles, in articulating the Coast Guard's needs. But no matter how persuasive he is in Washington, even more effective is the Coast Guardsman at water's edge, perhaps repeating Gracey's words verbatim as he uses Coast Guard assets which no longer can do the job.

It can be argued ad infinitum whether $100 billion, $250 billion, or $500 billion a year need be spent for national defense purposes, but there simply is no argument at all with regard to Coast Guard responsibilities. They may not change in definition, but it is inevitable that, with some very minor exceptions, they will continue to increase in volume. Therefore, if it is presumed that, as all evidence indicates, the Coast Guard is well led and well managed, then the leaders of the legislative and executive branches of the government have a responsibility to the citizenry at large to give the Coast Guard enough assets, and enough modern assets, to permit it to respond to the degree that it not only wants to but has to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of leader time on this side.

Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, does he wish part of the leadership time this morning?

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire is not here now. He and I have requested that we be yielded a part of the leadership time.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, let me yield to my good friend from West Virginia and reserve the time for the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the acting leader.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILSON). The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield my time to the distinguished acting leader, if he wishes to have it.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senators from New Hampshire and Connecticut the remainder of the time of both leaders to be used as they see fit.

Mr. RUDMAN. I thank the acting majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

SECRETARY WATT'S "UNFORTUNATE CHOICE OF WORDS"

Mr. RUDMAN. Mr. President, I rise in this Chamber this morning more out of sadness than anger to address the unfortunate remarks made by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. James Watt, yesterday here in the city of Washington. I say more in sadness than in anger because it seems to me that we in the Congress should allow the President and his administration to operate in a generally unfettered way and surely should not interpose our wishes as to who is fit to serve and who is not fit to serve in the Cabinet.

For those unfamiliar with the Secretary's remarks, he said yesterday in a speech here in Washington, describing a commission he had appointed, as follows:

> We have every kind of mix you can have. I have a black, I have a woman, two Jews, and a cripple. And we have talent.

That last part of it would almost indicate that somehow those characteristics of the people and talent were somehow mutually exclusive.

Very polite and nervous applause greeted that statement. He then went on to say that he was only saying that as some sort of a joke.

This morning, one of the members of that commission said:

> I am disturbed that he decided to describe our race, religion, and other characteristics. The point should be that we are intelligent, experienced, well-informed people, undertaking a serious, conscientious study.

Mr. President, I could not help but wonder last night as I watched the evening news and watched the Secretary make those remarks and then, suddenly after the very polite and nervous applause, have what I can only describe as an embarrassed sneer on his countenance. I could only think of the thousands of Americans in veterans hospitals, disabled in the service of this country, who must have had something to think about as they were characterized as cripples.

I could only think of two of the most distinguished Members of this body who hardly think of themselves as being handicapped, one on each side of the aisle, who received their disabilities, if they would call them those, while in extraordinary service to this country. I wondered how they felt as they heard that remark about cripples.

I wondered about all the young children, children of friends of mine, who, through no fault of their own, through birth defects, through accidents and injury, have disabilities as they found themselves being described by a representative of the President of the United States as cripples.

It seems to me that this is the last straw. I will not recount Secretary Watt's past indiscretions. They have been laughable, and they have been pathetic. But this remark shows an insensitivity that is an egregious insult not only to handicapped Americans but to all Americans.

Mr. President, Secretary Watt was not elected. He was appointed by the President of the United States, our President, who has not an ounce of prejudice or poor taste in his entire being. And yet when this man speaks, the American people look at him as a representative of our President.

I am going to suggest this morning that the Secretary think long and hard as to whether his usefulness to his country and to his President has now passed its time.

He is an embarrassment to the President who appointed him, he is an embarrassment to the party to which I am proud to belong, and, most of all, he is an embarrassment to the country.

I call this morning on Secretary Watt to do the sensible thing and sumbit his resignation to the President.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. GORTON. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. RUDMAN. Yes.

Mr. GORTON. Would the Senator from New Hampshire be willing to add me to his thoughtful statement and to the views which he expressed?

Mr. RUDMAN. I would be delighted to have my longtime friend and colleague, the senior Senator from the State of Washington, be associated with these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I first want to associate myself with all those thoughts so clearly articulated by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

I do not doubt that if anyone in this Nation saw a cross being burned on their neighbor's lawn, or some such overt activity reflective of prejudice, they would assist their neighbor in the most immediate and effective way. But then the question is, how many would stand up in the barroom down by the corner on behalf of their neighbor if someone made an offensive remark relative to their neighbor's color, race, or physical condition?

Maybe we do not associate words with extreme action, but that is where the problem always starts. It is when we fail to speak out at the offensive comment that the violent deed will eventually take place.

I have seen various descriptions of yesterday's comments by the Secretary—unwise, unfortunate. However, I

suggest that they probably are an accurate reflection of how Secretary Watt views his fellow man. Therefore, it is the integrity of his views on humanity that I find incompatible with his position as one of the leaders of the Government of the United States of America.

His past indiscretions relative to persons of the Jewish faith, the Jewish state, his past indiscretions relative to minority Americans, Indians among them, his past indiscretions relative to those of a differing philosophical point of view are a part of a panorama not of error but of bigotry and hate.

There is nothing wrong with blunt talk. There is a great deal amiss with the convictions of a Cabinet Secretary whose talk flies in the face of our constitutional ideals and commitments.

One of the great privileges that I have is to serve as the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Handicapped. I am not doing any favors in the sense of the duties I perform. Rather, I have never seen a tougher, more idealistic, more committed group than those who in some way or another are deemed to need our special care. The crippled and handicapped are the patriots and the purpose of America. My concerns, then, go beyond just one Cabinet Secretary's speech.

It remains to be seen whether Watt is a loose cannon or whether he is a part of a battery.

Either way he well articulates the trash of American thought rather than its commitment to individual dignity. And what one does with trash is what I suggest the President of the United States do with James Watt.

Parenthetically, what one does to further human dignity is what I suggest the President do in concert with the Congress of the United States.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BAUCUS

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

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my speech this morning, along with the introduction of a bill, be done as if in morning business.

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

Mr. BAUCUS. I thank the Chair.

TARIFF BARRIERS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, today I am submitting a sense of the Senate resolution insisting that Japan dismantle its nontariff barriers to beef imports.

GENERAL BACKGROUND

Last year, America's trade deficit with Japan was $16 billion. There were many reasons for this deficit; clearly, one of the main ones was protectionist Japanese barriers against imports of American products. As the U.S. Trade Representative's Office recently reported:

> A widespread perception persists among Japan's trading partners * * * and not incorrectly, that the Japanese market remains relatively less open to foreign suppliers when compared to access for Japanese goods and services in their markets.

BARRIERS AGAINST BEEF IMPORTS

Some of the most significant barriers restrict imports of American beef. There are two main barriers.

The first barrier is the beef quota system. As a recent Japanese Government report says: "All beef imports into Japan are subject to a quota system." This system, designed to protect Japanese cattlemen against competition, now permits imports of only 30,800 tons of high-quality beef a year. That comes to only 10 ounces—about one good steak—a year for every Japanese consumer.

The second barrier is a system of tariff and nontariff restrictions, including things like a complex licensing system and an artificial pricing system. These restrictions more than double the price at which American beef is sold in Tokyo.

As a result, American ranchers are locked out of a large part of the Japanese market.

THE BILATERAL AGREEMENT

During the Tokyo round of multilateral trade negotiations concluding in 1979, the United States and Japan entered into a 5-year bilateral agreement. The United States essentially agreed not to invoke remedies under United States and international trade laws. Japan agreed to gradually increase the quota for high-quality beef from about 16,000 tons to about 30,000 tons. And Japan pledged to negotiate "on ways to further expand the importation of high-quality beef in 1984 and thereafter to the mutual benefit of both countries."

On March 31, 1984, this agreement expires. Negotiations for a new agreement are underway. But so far they have been unsuccessful. In fact, the Japanese seem to have become more and more intransigent.

But there are some positive signs, too. Some influential Japanese are beginning to recognize how much Japanese agricultural protectionism threatens United States-Japan relations. For example, the Japanese Economic Institute recently reported that the Japanese business community has grown "increasingly critical of the protection of the agricultural sector, on the grounds that it would not lead to more efficient and productive farming in the long run, and that it jeopardizes Japan's access to foreign markets * * *."

THE NAKASONE LETTER

But even such positive signs are not enough.

Therefore, I and 51 colleagues recently sent a letter to Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone. This letter said that Japan's barriers to imports of U.S. beef remain one of our most important bilateral issues. It concluded by asking the Japanese to join us, in the spirit of free trade, "in reaching a new agreement liberalizing the treatment of American beef."

THE JAPANESE RESPONSE

At about the same time, Japan's Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Okawara, gave Japan's side of the story. In an address to the National Governors Conference, he defended Japan's agricultural trade policy, making four main arguments. I shall respond to each.

First, the Japanese Ambassador argues that, because "[t]he fear of a food shortage persists * * * [s]ome level of domestic agricultural production is a necessary assurance."

Self-sufficiency indeed is an important consideration. But it is overridden by two other considerations. First, if self-sufficiency justifies protection, that justification cannot necessarily be limited to agricultural products. It might just as easily extend to many other products—including products Japan exports. And that might undermine the entire GATT system.

In addition, self-sufficiency is not necessarily inconsistent with increased beef imports. As Mike Mansfield recently wrote me: "[w]e are not out to destroy Japan's agriculture * * *. We want and need a viable Japanese agriculture. Academic studies seem to indicate that Japan could open its market without great harm to cattle growers."

That is a letter from our Ambassador to Japan, Mike Mansfield.

Second, the Japanese Ambassador to the United States argues that "the effect of this import quotas on the enormous volume of Japan-United States trade is marginal."

This argument misses the point. We do not contend that barriers against beef imports are the sole cause of our trade deficit. What we do contend is that they undermine the principles of free trade, reduce the income of U.S. cattlemen, and obstruct the development of better United States-Japan trade relations. That is harm enough.

Third, the Japanese Ambassador to the United States argues that Japan has "made substantial accommodations that have benefited U.S. farm interests."

This argument, too, misses the point. True, as Japan's economy has grown, so have its agricultural imports. And, true, Japan now buys about 60 percent of U.S. beef exports. But Japan buys much less U.S. beef than it would in an open market. For

example, if the beef quotas were eliminated—just as, I might parenthetically add, we do not have any legal quotas against the importation of Japanese cars in the United States—U.S. sales of high-quality beef could increase as much as fivefold.

Fourth, the Ambassador argues that "[t]he United States* * * maintains import restrictions similar to those of Japan. * * *" As examples, he refers to import restrictions under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and under the Meat Import Act of 1979.

Granted, the United States does not always observe pristine free trade principles. But even so, the Ambassador's two examples are much less disruptive than Japan's barriers against beef imports. The section 22 restrictions are expressly permitted under a 1955 GATT waiver; the United States participates in a continuing review of the waiver and has been willing to discuss any special problems it creates. And, the Meat Import Act quotas are triggered only at extremely high import levels. What is more, they would not be necessary if countries like Japan did not impose such barriers against U.S. beef exports.

RECENT NEGOTIATIONS

The debate goes on. And so do the negotiations to renew the bilateral agreement.

The most recent negotiations took place last week in Tokyo. U.S. negotiators raised the beef issue and asked the Japanese negotiators to make reasonable concessions. The Japanese refused. They offered simply to extend the current quota system. Eventually, the talks broke down and no progress was made.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, a double standard exists. The Japanese sell Americans billions of dollars worth of cars, electronic devices, and other products. But they refuse to give us a fair chance to sell them American beef. They deny U.S. cattlemen the same treatment America routinely accords Japanese businessmen.

Given this situation, we in the Senate must convince the Japanese that we will not tolerate this double standard. Trade must be a two-way street.

That is why 51 colleagues and I in a letter that I circulated among my colleagues in the Senate expressed to the Japanese Prime Minister our very deep-rooted dissatisfaction. That is why I am today introducing a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that "the United States negotiators should insist that Japan dismantle all nontariff barriers to imports of beef" and that "if negotiations do not result in satisfactory progress toward the dismantling of all nontariff barriers the United States trade representatives should seek appropriate relief under United States and international trade law."

Mr. President, this resolution is similar to last year's Bentsen-Danforth resolution, Senate Resolution 462, which passed the Senate on September 30, 1982. It reemphasizes the Senate's deep concern about the beef issue. That way, I hope it will encourage fruitful negotiations.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the resolution. And, I urge the Senate leadership to process the resolution quickly so we can get a recorded vote in the Finance Committee on the floor as soon as possible.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be held at the desk until the end of the day for the addition of original cosponsors.

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

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. RES. 225

Whereas, the United States and Japan are signatories to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (hereinafter referred to as "GATT");

Whereas, in keeping with the provisions of GATT and the general principles of free trade, the United States has given Japan broad access to many United States markets;

Whereas, Japan has benefited from this broad access by becoming a major United States supplier and now has a $16 billion annual trade surplus with the United States;

Whereas, Japan uses a system of quotas and other nontariff barriers to limit imports of beef;

Whereas, the Japanese system forces Japanese consumers to pay unreasonably high prices for beef and denies American cattlemen an opportunity to compete fairly in the Japanese market;

Whereas, the Japanese system is in violation of GATT;

Whereas, in 1979 the United States and Japan negotiated a bilateral agreement by which Japan would gradually increase its beef quota;

Whereas, the bilateral agreement expires on March 31, 1984, at which time Japan will no longer be under any agreement to increase the quota and the United States will no longer be under any agreement to forego trade law remedies against Japan;

Whereas, negotiations are underway to establish a new bilateral agreement; and

Whereas, Japan's barriers to beef imports undermine the principles of free trade, reduce the income of United States cattlemen, and obstruct the development of better trade relations between the United States and Japan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that, in negotiations with Japan, United States negotiators should insist that Japan dismantle all nontariff barriers to imports of beef.

SEC. 2. It further is the sense of the Senate that if negotiations do not result in satisfactory progress toward the dismantling of Japanese barriers to imports of beef by the time the current bilateral agreement expires, the United States Trade Respresentative should seek appropriate relief under United States and international trade law.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. BOSCHWITZ) has a brief statement he would like to make, and I ask unanimous consent that he may proceed as if in morning business for 3 minutes at this time.

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

The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

A CALL FOR SECRETARY WATT'S RESIGNATION

Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Mr. President, I speak more in sadness than in anger this morning as I speak about James Watt, and I call for his resignation in these remarks. Really, I did not find the remarks he made yesterday any more or less offensive than others he has made, but I believe that his effectiveness has been undermined—perhaps even before this time—certainly at this time, and it is on that basis that I call for his resignation and ask the President to appoint somebody who can move forward in the field of environment.

There is hardly a subject that comes before us on which there is greater polarization then environmental issues. There is hardly a subject that comes before us that is more sensitive if we are really going to strike a balance between environmental concerns and the concerns of the economy.

I have sought in my voting record to strike that kind of a balance, and when I have been in doubt, I have sided with the environment, as it must be preserved and it cannot always be retrieved.

James Watt increases the polarization that surrounds the issue of the environment. Every action that we consider with respect to environmental affairs becomes one of pro or con, often not on the issue itself, but pro or con James Watt. Every issue becomes a cause. At times we are asked to relax certain environmental measures because of the economy. At other times we find it necessary to tighten up laws and regulations because of the environment. A balance simply must be struck.

I do not think that that balance can be struck as long as James Watt is the Seretary of the Interior. These last remarks have pushed me over the edge, though certainly many of his remarks

and actions have brought me close to the edge before. I think that the President can find somebody who will better serve the country, better serve the environment, and better serve the Government than the present incumbent, and therefore I call for his resignation.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Minnesota. I wholeheartedly concur in his statement, and I commend him for calling for the resignation. It is one thing for a Democrat to do that, it is far more difficult and more significant I think when a Republican Senator does.

PENTAGON MAY BE INFLATING ESTIMATES OF SOVIET DEFENSE COSTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, rightly or wrongly, no single estimate has had more of an influence on U.S. defense and budgetary policy than the annual measures of Soviet defense costs.

Because of reported differences between the CIA and DIA over their estimates of Soviet defense, I asked the Joint Economic Committee staff to prepare a report explaining the latest conclusions of the intelligence community about the trends and to put them in perspective.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CIA AND DIA ESTIMATES

The study shows where the two agencies agree and differ and examines the possible causes of the slower growth rates of Soviet defense estimated by the CIA.

The highlights of the study are as follows:

According to the CIA, Soviet defense costs grew at an annual rate of 2 percent during 1978-81, compared to a growth rate of 4 to 5 percent during the previous 10 years.

The CIA also found that the portion of GNP devoted to defense—the military burden—did not increase during the 1970's.

Most of the slowdown in the defense growth rate took place in procurement which has been level since 1976.

The slowdown in the growth rate was probably the result of problems in the economy, such as transportation bottlenecks, which affected the defense industries, but a policy decision by the Kremlin to slow the growth rate cannot be ruled out.

THE DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

While the DIA agrees with the CIA's dollar cost estimates, the Defense Intelligence Agency's own current ruble price methodology unlike the CIA indicates there was no slowdown in total Soviet defense spending.

According to the DIA, Soviet defense costs increased by 6 to 7 percent in nominal terms during the 1970's, and the military burden increased from 13 to 14 percent in 1970 to 14 to 16 percent in 1981.

So who is right, the DIA or the CIA?

The DIA's estimates are not adjusted for inflation, are based on a definition of Soviet defense that differs from the U.S. definition, and contain wide margins of error.

The DIA considers its methodology classified, making it difficult for outsiders to evaluate it.

For many years, attention has focused on the CIA's estimates of Soviet defense costs. Its estimates are made in ruble terms and dollar equivalents, both adjusted for inflation.

The CIA's estimates should be given serious consideration by all those who assess Soviet behavior and especially by those who believe our policies should in part respond to theirs.

QUESTIONS ABOUT DIA METHODS

The DIA is in effect challenging the validity of the CIA's estimates but it is doing so in a way that raises more questions than it answers.

The fact that the DIA's estimates are not adjusted for inflation reduces their usefulness for policymakers to practically zero. Such estimates are meaningless unless you know what the inflation rate is. That is why U.S. defense spending is usually given in constant dollars, that is, adjusted for inflation. This questionable practice could result in inflating the costs of Soviet defense.

At the very least, the DIA's methodology should be subjected to careful scrutiny by an outside group of experts so that Congress understands what weight to give it.

I might add that the CIA's methodology for estimating Soviet defense costs has been subjected to outside scrutiny. In addition, the CIA on several occasions has explained in some detail its own methodology.

DIA METHODS SHOULD BE REVIEWED BY OUTSIDE EXPERTS

I urge the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency to take the necessary steps so that an outside group of reputable specialists in the field can examine the DIA's methodology for estimating Soviet defense spending in current rubles. Unless this is done, the analytical approach used by the Pentagon will be considered questionable and charges that it is inflating their estimates of Soviet defense spending will be hard to refute.

The study mentioned above, "Soviet Defense Costs," was prepared by Richard F. Kaufman, assistant director of the Joint Economic Committee. Copies of the study can be obtained from the Joint Economic Committee.

CHILDREN OF THE HOLOCAUST

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the reality of Hitler's Holocaust against the Jewish people of Europe has, indeed, been documented and condemned. The horror of his means has long been made evident to all who care to know—the crematoria, the mass graves, the experimental torture. It is hard enough for Americans, so accustomed to democracy and an open society, to grasp the level of terror perpetuated against an innocent group of people. Yet even more horrible is the crime against a group so often overlooked when we think of the Holocaust: the mass destruction of children.

There is a certain innocence about children, an innocence that exists merely by a lack of knowledge about the bad things in the world. We Americans, like so much of the world, treasure our children. They are not only the future of our society, but they also inspire their parents to work toward a better society. Could we have tolerated the destruction of our own children? Obviously, the answer is no. To moral and civilized men, the destruction of others' fragile children is no less tragic.

Hitler's reign of terror against the Jewish people included their children. Not only did these children witness the tragic and inhumane destruction of their elders, but they, too, faced death by similar means. Their lives were destroyed, their youthful innocence shattered.

There is perhaps nothing as painful to see as the faces of the children of a genocidal war, children in the midst of death. Yet even in the wake of their horror, we find those who managed to maintain their youthful air, their sense of innocence. In a collection of poems by children who were caught up in the Holocaust, entitled "I Never Saw Another Butterfly," we are made aware of this fragile yet enduring characteristic of childhood. They expressed their fears, they showed their tears, but they never lost that final glimmer of hope.

Mr. President, if the adult victims of a genocide cannot stir us into action, perhaps the children can. Our ratification of the Genocide Convention, which has been pending in this body since 1949, 34 years—President after President has called on us to act, and we should act at long last—can only help us bring future perpetrators of genocidal destruction of people to clearcut and thoroughly legal justice.

THE NUCLEAR FREEZE—NOT "BUILD-DOWN"—IS THE ANSWER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, MARK HATFIELD, has written an article that appeared in the New York Times this morning entitled "This Is Arms Control?" That article constitutes a masterful indictment of the so-called build-down which some Senators are now pushing as a substi-

tute for the comprehensive, mutual, verifiable nuclear freeze. As we all know, Senators HATFIELD and KENNEDY are the authors of the nuclear freeze resolution. That resolution was reported adversely—that is, with a recommendation that it not pass—from the Foreign Relations Committee this week.

In opposing the so-called build-down approach to arms control, Senator HATFIELD contends that, far from reducing our nuclear arsenal, build-down would, in the name of modernization, enhance our nuclear arsenal. The build-down would really become a nuclear buildup. Is HATFIELD right? Why would not an agreement with the Soviet Union that required the destruction of two old nuclear weapons for every new one added to the arsenal not result in a reduction in the nuclear arsenal? HATFIELD in his article says why. He argues that the sponsors of the build-down would measure build-down by the number of strategic warheads and the destructive capability of each warhead.

Destructive capability is measured by megatonnage and throw weight. And what is wrong with that? As HATFIELD points out—plenty. This formula overlooks the prime ingredient in the effectiveness of a nuclear weapon—its accuracy. In HATFIELD's words, when the accuracy of a missile is improved by a factor of 2, its capacity to destroy a particular target is increased by a factor of 8. So the build-down would become a buildup.

Why am I so certain that it would inevitably become a buildup? Simple. Let me ask: Why would the Soviet Union or this country bring a new nuclear weapon into its arsenal if it had to destroy two old ones? Think about the answer to that question.

Ponder it for a minute. Why would the Russians or our military bring a new weapon into their nuclear arsenal with the full knowledge that they would have to destroy two old ones? It is a critical question. The answer is that they would only bring a new weapon into the arsenal on one condition. They would have to be sure that the one new weapon would be more deadly, more potent, more effectively destructive than the two weapons they would take out of the arsenal. Can anyone seriously doubt that? Can there be any other reason for a Russian or a NATO general to recommend or accept a new nuclear weapon for his arsenal? Of course not.

In the course of Senator HATFIELD's argument, he hits the crux of our problem in seeking an effective way to end the arms race when he observes that the nuclear freeze "treats technological advancements in weaponry as the greatest danger of the arms race and the first priority of an arms control agreement leading to reductions." This is exactly why this country should make the nuclear freeze the heart of our negotiations with the Soviet Union to stop the arms race. Some Senators may regard this as a kind of "mission impossible."

How can we stop technological progress in nuclear weaponry or in any other area? Has not technological progress again and again established itself as an irresistible force? Well, there is an answer and a good one. The answer is that we can stop technological progress in a particular area and especially in the area of nuclear weaponry. How do we stop it? We stop it by stopping testing. No new nuclear weapon can develop to a level of reliability and accuracy without continuous testing. And testing we can—we are sure—detect. The freeze would stop testing, as it would stop the building or the deployment of nuclear weapons. The build-down, of course, would not stop testing.

Indeed, it would have a seriously perverse effect. It would actually stimulate the arms race. How? It would enhance the competition on both sides to test intensively to develop more advanced and effective weapons. And that technology advance by the superpowers would continue to stimulate the proliferation of nuclear weapons as cheaper, lighter, more readily available weapons became increasingly easier for more and more countries to acquire.

Mr. President, the build-down or intermediate regional nuclear arms limitation such as we are now conducting with the Soviets in Geneva, or quantitative limitations on the number of warheads or megatonnage or throw weight or on MIRV'ing may or may not serve a specific, limited purpose, but at best they constitute band-aids. None of these can serve the purpose of a comprehensive freeze on all nuclear weapons. Sure, I admit that such a strategy requires monumental efforts to secure reliable verification. But Senator HATFIELD is right: This course does indeed constitute the most promising path toward survival, exactly because it confronts and begins to master the heart of the problem, which is the technological arms race.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from today's New York Times by MARK HATFIELD, entitled "This Is Arms Control," be printed in the RECORD.

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

THIS IS ARMS CONTROL?

(By Mark O. Hatfield)

WASHINGTON.—The attitudes that threaten to prevail in Congress today are similar to those that gripped European and American leaders at the turn of the 20th century. The peace movement was strong during that period, just as it is today. The political elite sang of disarmament. Yet these leaders had no intention of denying themselves the freedon to build all the arms they desired.

So it is with the vast majority of those in Congress who support the MX missile on the grounds that it will encourage progress at the arms control talks in Geneva. This defies logic. The type of "arms control" they want in exchange for voting for the MX is even more mind-boggling—a "guaranteed build-down" that would remove two or three old nuclear weapons from the arsenals of the superpowers for each new one built.

Arms escalation would thus become what some Congressmen have called "the engine to fuel arms control." George Orwell would have had fun with this one. Build-down is simply a new way to insure continuation of the old rules, allowing the Administration to determine what it "needs" (whatever the weapons laboratories offer) and attach a quantitative ceiling. This is then called arms control—and we move on to the next round in the arms race. Build-down is a general's dream. It is analogous to trading old Volkswagens for new Rolls-Royces and sleek, agile Ferraris.

In contrast, the term "nuclear freeze" accurately reflects the intent and substance of the proposal it represents. It treats technological advancements in weaponry as the greatest danger of the arms race and the first priority of an arms control agreement leading to reductions.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted Tuesday to reject the freeze and build-down but sent them to the Senate floor for a vote. There is talk of reconciling the two measures. Only magic could make this possible. Weapons might be built on both sides while a freeze is being negotiated—and certainly it would seem more desirable to be removing some weapons than to fail to impose any constraints. But there is a catch: New weapons systems desired by build-down advocates will take many years to reach partial or full deployment, while a nuclear freeze could be negotiated within a year.

While some proponents of build-down are fervently committed to its implementation, others are probably quite prepared to settle for much less. They are merely seeking an imaginative justification for the MX. I suspect that all the President would need to do to placate them is announce that our negotiators at the arms talks in Geneva have been instructed to mention build-down to the Russians. Having done this, they could then return to their original agenda. Congressmen and Senators could hold press conferences touting their influence, and that would be that.

Last week, three members of Congress suggested modifications to make build-down more acceptable to freeze advocates. These include ceilings on strategic warheads and destructive capability. They are flawed in two crucial respects.

Surprisingly, the sponsors acknowledged that rough strategic parity now exists. If this is so, nothing useful can be accomplished through spending for new weapons that couldn't be accomplished without spending a dime through a freeze and subsequent reductions tailored to preserve the balance in a purely downward motion.

The second flaw lies with the build-down proposal's formula for measuring destructive capability. The formula takes into account throw weight, the number of warheads and bomber-carrying capacity. But one glaring omission—missile accuracy—renders it virtually useless. When the accuracy of a missile is improved by a factor of two, its capacity to destroy a specific target increases as though its explosive power were

increased by a factor of eight. Accuracy is not verifiable, but missile flight testing, which is necessary to improve accuracy and maintain confidence in existing weapons systems, is easily verified. Unlike the freeze, build-down conspicuously overlooks the single most important factor contributing to destructive capability.

The historian Barbara Tuchman described the mentality that spurred the second international conference on arms limitation at the Hague in 1907 by saying, "political leaders told the public only what sounded virtuous . . . disarmament must be discussed, if only to prove to the public its impracticability and their own honest intentions." In 25 minutes, they agreed to call for "further serious study" of disarmament. Agreement on the acceptable instruments of war consumed six weeks. They agreed to meet again in eight years. Seven years later, World War I had begun. Fortunately, they weren't able to conclude the war in less than an hour—as we are today.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. KASSEBAUM). Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to exceed 12 noon, with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

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

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

REVIVAL OF 1960's DRUGS

Mrs. HAWKINS. Madam President, 1983 marks the 18th anniversary of a very important event—the launching of the major drug-abuse movement in the United States. The time was 1965. The place: the University of California at Berkeley. January 1965 marked the first time the Berkeley campus—or any college campus—was used to protest and to advocate illegal activities, including the use of illicit drugs, particularly marihuana and LSD. Tables were set up to disseminate information and press for the legalization of marihuana. Marihuana itself was a symbol of protest, as opposed to alcohol, which was used by the establishment. Timothy Leary preached to that generation, "Tune in, turn on, drop out."

The time is now 1983. The place: the entire country—every State, every city, every community, and almost every home. The sons and daughters of the 1960's generation are starting a 1960's renaissance that includes the abuse of LSD, once out of fashion. Today almost 1.2 million Americans use hallucinogenic drugs, including mescaline, peyote, and LSD. LSD traffic runs about $20 million and is steadily growing.

The 1980's generation was born too late to witness the horrors of this particular mind-exploding drug, which can cause irreversible physical and mental damage. They are learning though. In 1982 hospitals in 26 metropolitan areas admitted 4,378 people who overdosed on acid. And that does not include mental hospitals. The Drug Enforcement Administration estimates that there are 10 times more LSD overdoses today than in the 1970's. Three deaths from LSD overdoses have been reported in the last 3 years. It seems that the 1980's generation is tuning in, turning on, and dropping dead from drug abuse.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD two articles on the revival of 1960's drugs in the 1980's.

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

[From the Washington Times, July 6, 1983]

EXPERTS NOTE REVIVAL IN USE OF 1960'S DRUGS

LOS ANGELES (UPI).—Hallucinogenic drugs, popular among a generation that "tuned in, turned on, and dropped out" in the 1960's, are regaining favor among users cynical of the horror stories surrounding psychedelics, drug experts said yesterday.

Greater sophistication among drug users, refinement of hallucinogenics and fewer "bad trips" are encouraging a West Coast trend toward LSD, PCP and other mind-altering substances that one expert predicts "will spread gradually throughout the United States by the end of the decade."

Already, UCLA psychopharmacologist Dr. Ron Siegal said in an interview, "We are getting reports of a renaissance of LSD use in major cities such as New York and Chicago."

Police said the greatest abuse seems to be among high-school students, attracted by the ease with which hallucinogenics can be obtained and their convenience. The most popular is apparently a single drop of LSD on a postage-stamp size piece of blotter paper that a user just pops into his mouth.

Among the horror stories that scared drug users away from psychedelics were tales of people who, under the influence of hallucinogenic drugs, exhibited bizarre public behavior, killed themselves or murdered others.

"Some of the (current) users are aware of the history of LSD, and they're aware of a lot of the horror stories where just that, horror stories with little scientific validity," Siegal said.

Drugs such as LSD are more refined today than in the 1960s, which users feel make them safer, Siegal said.

He said use of potent forms of marihuana, resulting in mild hallucinogenic experiences without ill effect, has "tempered the fear and anxiety many people have about experimenting with a hallucinogenic drug.

"Their own experience has convinced them these drugs could be used safely when handled properly," Siegal said.

Don Bays, an administrative assistant with the Los Angeles Police Department, said there has been an enormous increase recently in the confiscation of LSD. So far this year, police have seized 112,222 units of LSD—a 3,000 percent increase over the 3,462 units seized in the first six months of last year.

LSD USE RISING DRAMATICALLY IN INDIANA

(By Bill Lammers)

LSD's popularity in Indiana has risen dramatically in the last two years, says a top state police investigator. And Fort Wayne isn't immune from the trend.

Users apparently discount horror stories of suicides resulting from "bad trips" in the '60s, officials say, adding the '80s version of the hallucinogen is purer, lessening the danger.

In 1982, 74 persons in Indiana were arrested for selling LSD, while only three cases were reported in 1981, said Lt. Charles P. Williams, head of the special investigations section of the state police.

LSD ranked fourth in arrests in 1982 behind marihuana (388), methaqualone (128) and cocaine (88).

"This year, it's running neck and neck with methaqualone," Williams said. "I expect before the year is out it'll be one of the most popular drugs."

Most of the LSD coming into Indiana is in tablets, he said. But recently some forms of blotter LSD—a drop of the drug on a postage-stamp-size piece of paper—have been seized, especially a type known as "Black Star" in the Fort Wayne area.

State police have pinpointed two routes for the hallucinogen into the state from the Berkeley and Westminster areas of California: direct from California to Indianapolis and from California to Florida to Bloomington.

"The one thing we've seen is the large amount—5,000- and 8,000-dosage units," Williams said. The drug often sells for $1.50 to $2 a dose; the manufacturing cost is 10 to 15 cents a dose.

Fort Wayne health and rehabilitation officials said they also had seen interest in LSD perking up in recent years.

"From what we hear there does seem to be a little bit of a trend, an increase," said Ruth Anne Sprunger, executive director of the Mental Health Center. "It had sort of died down for a while, and then it was all pot, coke (cocaine) and booze."

LSD appeared in quantity in Fort Wayne during last year's Three Rivers Festival, said Joyce Bussard, evening supervisor at Washington House Inc., 2720 Culbertson St., which helps people break their dependence on drugs or alcohol.

"The reefer (marihuana) died out, but the acid stayed on all summer," said Bussard. "The one (LSD) is really kind of hit and miss," with fewer young people reporting its use lately.

The '80s version of LSD is purer, with dosages more uniform, officials say, "The quality is more consistent," Williams said.

"I don't want to say it's safe. The drug itself is very dangerous because it acts on your mind. But for the street people, it's cleaned up a lot since the '60s," he said.

GUERRILLA DRUG WAR

Mrs. HAWKINS. Madam President, I ask you and all the other Members here today to "ride shotgun" with me on the issue of youthful drug abuse in America. We are fighting a full-scale war here—against drugs, against drug growers, against drug smugglers

against drug dealers. But a conventional fight will not defeat this enemy.

Madam President, the drug war we are fighting has all the marks of true guerrilla warfare. We are not exactly sure who the enemy is. It could be a wealthy landowner in Colombia or the guy down the block who takes weekend trips in his small private plane. He could be the neighbor next door—as an entire Florida community discovered recently. Enemies are everywhere, yet no one can pinpoint them. What is worse, the enemy keeps moving around and changing his position. For instance, Florida's crackdown on drug smuggling has had the unfortunate effect of increasing drug trafficking in other border States, particularly California. The enemy simply shifted position and dug in once again.

The drug smugglers and dealers fight a dirty war. In true guerrilla style, they demoralize the population slowly, bit by bit. Because their forces are small and scattered, they prey on the innocent and the helpless—the youth of our country. Their tactic is to undermine the coherence of the community by targeting its weakest members, by destroying their minds and bodies with drugs and ruining any chance of a future.

Madam President, it seems to me that we have to fight the drug war on the enemy's terms. We must be harsh and ruthless with these criminals who are attacking our Nation's very foundation. We are too lenient, too "fair." We cannot allow the guerrillas to win a waiting game. The best way to win the drug war is to act now and knock out the central source of supply: illegal drug imports from abroad. The time has come for a diplomatic initiative against drugs. Eradication of illegal drug crops is the best possible means of attack. And we must link such eradication with one of the most powerful weapons that the United States can wield: foreign aid.

As long as foreign countries are willing to soak up American taxpayers' money, they must make a good-faith effort to destroy once and for all their illegal drug trade.

It cannot be done overnight; I realize that. But a systematic reduction of crops should clearly be linked to U.S. foreign aid and U.S. votes at multilateral banks. Sure and steady pressure over a long period of time will convince drug-producing countries that we mean business. The battle against drugs is not a weekend war.

VERMONT TOWN ENERGY PROJECT

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent article published in the Energy Conservation Bulletin on the Vermont town energy project. This excellent article describes the outstanding work of this project. I believe this project is an excellent example of local initiative. I commend it to my colleagues.

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

COMMUNITY ENERGY PLANNING UNDERWAY IN VERMONT

In line with their strong history of direct democracy and citizen involvement, 18 towns in Vermont have begun developing town energy plans, undertaking local energy projects, and participating in regional energy task forces. The impetus for this activity is a program called the Vermont Town Energy Project, funded by an ACTION Community Energy Grant and operating out of the Center for Rural Studies at the University of Vermont. The VTEP works with Town Energy Coordinators, volunteers appointed by the Selectmen in each town, to help them become more effective in promoting energy conservation and the use of local renewable sources, and to bring together all of the energy-related services available to the community from various agencies.

According to Paul Markowitz, Project Coordinator, "The aim of the Vermont Town Energy Project is to establish a working framework in each region and in each town to help move the State of Vermont toward a more affordable, sustainable, and secure energy future."

The Project, which was initiated in November 1982, has been operating in two regions of the state—the Central Vermont area and in Bennington County. In August, expansion of the Project to a third region in the Brattleboro area brought the number of target communities to 25.

The Project combines components of many existing efforts that have been conducted in Vermont and throughout the nation to assist local energy programs: distributing energy planning and action documents, creating regional energy task forces, sponsoring workshops, coordinating the technical and planning assistance offered by various agencies, and providing money to each town for project expenses.

The Project coordinates the energy-related services of the Community Action Agencies, Regional Planning Commissions, Cooperative Extension Service, and the State Energy Office, to provide direct planning and technical assistance to towns. It emphasizes improving the effectiveness of Town Energy Coordinators while bringing together other people in the community who are interested in working on local energy projects. For instance, in Central Vermont, the initial target region, each of the nine towns participating have formed town energy committees invovling a broad spectrum of community residents.

The regional energy task forces organized by the Project are comprised of Town Energy Coordinators, agency representatives, and representatives from energy-related businesses. The task forces were designed to help overcome the isolation of Town Energy Coordinators and to pool the knowledge and experience of coordinators within a region. They have also brought agencies with energy-related services into direct contact with individuals at the local level who can apply those services to their town and community's needs.

Another valuable contribution has been a series of special workshop sessions conducted in five locations throughout the state, held in conjunction with the Extension Service's annual training sessions for town officials. The workshops topics included: (1) developing a town energy plan, (2) financing energy conservation in town and school buildings, and (3) bulk purchasing of insulation. While the first session on energy planning was more analytical in scope—assessing energy needs, resources, and consumption patterns—the financing and insulation workshops session used local individuals with strong backgrounds in the field, and the insulation workshops called upon local energy outreach advisors from the Home Energy Audit Team, Vermont's energy audit program.

The principal reference for the Project is a guidebook entitled Town Energy Planning: A Framework for Action, prepared by Markowitz in cooperation with the Center for Rural Studies and the Agency of Development and Community Affairs, Montpelier, Vermont. The guidebook described the range of issues that can be pursued at the local level and discusses in detail specific projects that communities can undertake. These projects include fuel oil and fuelwood cooperatives, volunteer weatherization efforts, town forest management, and implementing energy-conscious land-use bylaws.

Markowitz is enthusiastic about the progress of community energy planning in Vermont. He told the Bulletin: "While the Vermont town Energy Project is a fledgling program, it has already demonstrated that individuals at the local level are eager to work together to address their energy needs and problems if they can be provided with a reasonable level of assistance and funding."

CLINCH RIVER BREEDER REACTOR

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD today the speech I made on the Clinch River Breeder Reactor in 1981.

As we face this issue again in the near future, this speech provides a historical perspective on this issue that I believe will be helpful to my colleagues.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR PATRICK LEAHY ON THE CLINCH RIVER BREEDER REACTOR

For a number of years, I have been opposed to the building of the Clinch River Breeder Reactor because I believe this program presents an unreasonable risk to the public health and safety, and because this facility is a waste of the taxpayers' money.

The point I will make today is simple. The Clinch River Breeder Reactor is the latest in a long series of nuclear white elephants which have cost the taxpayers of this nation billions of dollars but have never provided any measurable benefits to our citizens.

During this year we have spent more effort on reducing waste in the federal budget than ever before. We have cut programs to fund basic human needs. We have cut scientific development. The President has asked us to slash the funding for alternative energy sources such as solar energy and energy conservation which are so important to the people of my state. Yet, while the President has been asking every-

one to tighten his belt, he has increased federal spending for nuclear power by 30%.

The nuclear power industry is obviously in trouble. But the nuclear industry's difficulties, no more than any other industry's, cannot and should not be solved by throwing the taxpayers' money at the problem.

Over the past three decades, the Federal Government has given the development of nuclear technology the most aggressive support of any new technology ever supported by the Federal Government. Unfortunately, in its enthusiasm to develop every aspect of nuclear technology, the Federal Government has not tempered its enthusiasm with equal fiscal vigilance. In fact, for many years, billions of dollars have been wasted by projects which appeared technologically attractive and intellectually exciting but which, again and again, have turned out to be expensive white elephants. The Clinch River Breeder Reactor is the latest in the long series of such projects.

To put its development in perspective, I would like to review a few of the projects which the Federal Government has funded in past years in this area.

The first of these was the nuclear-powered airplane. The concept behind this program was that the heat from a nuclear reactor could be used to provide jet propulsion. Year after year, the Congress was warned that the Russians were ahead in this vital area, and, year after year, the Congress authorized millions to support the project.

It was soon recognized that the nuclear jet plane suffered from an insurmountable problem. If enough lead shielding were placed on the plane to protect the passengers from the radiation produced by the engine, the plane would be too heavy to get off the ground.

At one point, the Atomic Energy Commission proposed using old pilots in the planes. Since they had a shorter time to live, a little extra radiation would do less harm.

In what would have been the most star-crossed technological combination imaginable, it was even proposed that nuclear jet engines be placed on the C-5A cargo plane.

The C-5A had the unfortunate habit of dropping engines in flight. The core of a nuclear jet engine—in a single year—would be more radioactive than a Hiroshima bomb. Imagine if the C-5A had dropped a nuclear jet engine!

This program has now been abandoned by us and the Russians, yet the American taxpayers spent over $1.5 billion supporting this project over 11 years.

Then there was the nuclear-powered buzz bomb. It was designed to use a nuclear-powered rocket to send atomic bombs on our enemies. Unfortunately, the nuclear rocket engine spewed millions of curies of radioactivity over friendly territory on its way to its target.

It, too, was abandoned—but not until after hundreds of millions were wasted.

If not a jet, if not a rocket—perhaps then a nuclear-powered space ship. It was an intriguing idea—the ship could fly forever. It was even proposed that it could "intercept potentially hostile space vehicles." The principal problem in space flight, unfortunately, is not flying forever but getting off the ground in the first place.

Never mind that NASA thought the program was a waste of money. Over $1.5 billion in taxpayers' money was wasted on this project as well.

By the way, that engine was tested at a site called Jackass Flats, Nevada.

If not in the air—perhaps on the sea. The idea—build a nuclear-powered merchant ship which could steam forever. Never mind that merchant ships want to call at port regularly to unload their cargo.

Over $100 million was spent on this program before it was abandoned.

And then there was the proposal to use radiation to preserve food. It was abandoned after scores of millions were spent.

And then there was Project Plowshare. Nuclear bombs would be used to excavate canals and release natural gas. Over $150 million was spent on this project before it also was abandoned.

But my favorite is plutonium-powered long-johns developed to keep deep-sea divers warm. Let me quote from the Atomic Energy Commission's press release:

"The device . . . warms a garment of the 'long john' type worn under the diver's suit . . . The water is warmed in a bottle-shaped heat exchanger . . . which contains four capsules of plutonium 238 fuel."

I do not know how much was wasted on plutonium-powered long-johns, but there is no record they were ever popular with divers.

When all the other arguments have fallen by the wayside, it is argued that we must continue spending these huge amounts of money on breeder reactors because the French are doing it. Why our program is more expensive than the combined French, British, German, and Japanese programs is never explained.

Nevertheless, it is argued, we cannot lose out to the French.

I did not understand the French attitude to the breeder program—which will obviously be an economic failure—until I studied the French decision to build the Panama Canal in the course of our debate on that matter.

Because Ferdinand de Lessups had built a sea-level canal at the Suez, he decided that the glory of France demanded a sea-level canal be built at Panama. Of course, there was a mountain in the way in Panama. You have all seen the pictures of the hulks of the rusting French heavy equipment which they left when they abandoned the project.

And we all know the story of how the United States—using a more practical plan—succeeded and, with this project, established its place in the world as a major economic power.

The breeder decision is really the same type of decision. We can spend our very tight research dollars to build better, more efficient uranium-powered reactors and coal plants or gamble billions on a whole new type of reactor which will be twice as expensive as our present power plants.

The French made that gamble with their sea-level canal and lost to the United States.

The French gambled on the SST and again lost to the United States jumbo jets.

Let them gamble again on a white-elephant breeder while we concentrate on building more efficient coal and uranium plants. They will surely lose again.

The only purpose of a breeder reactor is to create electricity. The United States has 400 years of coal and 100 years of uranium supplies—all of which can be used to generate electricity. It makes no energy or economic sense to spend billions more to develop a substitute for coal and uranium—our most abundant domestic fuels.

In summary, from Jackass Flats, to the nuclear-powered C-5A, to the plutonium-powered long-johns, the nuclear research program has been a parade of nuclear white elephants. I think it is time to stop making the taxpayers finance the parade. I support the cancellation of the Clinch River Breeder Reactor.

EQUALITY OF RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

Mr. CRANSTON. Madam President, I would like to take a few moments to speak upon a matter of continuing urgency for our Nation—the attainment of equal rights for all Americans regardless of sex.

INTRODUCTION

Our Nation was founded upon the concept of equality of rights and equality of opportunity. Yet, more than half of all Americans are still denied equal rights and opportunities because of their sex.

Despite advances over the past two decades, many American women each day face discrimination, limited opportunities, and economic hardships. It is essential that we begin to recognize the fact that attainment of equality by American women is of paramount importance to each one of us. The practices and policies that exclude women from full social, political, and economic participation in our society rob our Nation of the benefits of their contributions, their productivity, and their creativity. Our Nation simply cannot achieve full productivity and prosperity as long as we continue to deny more than half our population full opportunities to utilize their talents and energies.

The American dream of equal opportunity must become a reality for all women in this Nation.

LIMITED PROGRESS

In the sixties and seventies, significant progress was made toward breaking down many of the barriers, stereotypes, and prejudices that for nearly 200 years relegated women to second-class citizenship. The enactment of numerous civil rights laws—particularly in education and employment—led to the elimination of many archaic laws and policies that had effectively barred women from numerous occupations and professions or denied them the right to own or use property, to obtain credit, and otherwise enjoy economic rights. As a consequence of the struggles of the past two decades, increasing numbers of women have made inroads into facets of American life from which they were previously excluded.

But beneath the surface and despite this demonstrable progress, denial of opportunities and rights on the basis of gender persists. Women still bear the burden and stigma of a kind of second-class citizenship. Measured by any standard, sex discrimination is still with us. It continues to strangle the hopes and aspirations of young women, condemn older women to lives of poverty and fear, and hold millions

in stagnant, dead end jobs with bleak economic futures.

It has been some 20 years since the passage of the Equal Pay Act and title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—the two laws intended to eliminate employment discrimination against women. Yet the earnings gap between men and women has not declined but, in fact, has widened. In the 1950's, full time female workers earned 64 percent of what similarly situated male employees earned; today they are down to 59 cents on the average.

Despite State and Federal equal pay laws prohibiting unequal treatment, wage discrimination against female workers exists today in every profession, occupation, or field of employment and at every level of experience. It persists in male-dominated fields. It persists in female-dominated fields. It persists in the new occupational fields that have not yet become sexually stereotyped. For example, female engineers earn only 86 percent of the salary of male engineers; female college professors and lawyers receive only 71 percent of what their male counterparts earn. Although 60 percent of the retail sales clerks are female, they earn only 67 percent of what male clerks earn. Average starting salaries for female Harvard MBA's are reported to be $2,000 less than those paid to male MBA's. Entry level male college lecturers average $13,577; females, $11,870. Sex-bias in wages has even appeared in the computer field. In 1981, the median weekly pay for female computer operators was $355; for males, $488.

Moreover, for every woman who has moved into a higher paying, male-dominated occupational field, thousands have remained behind, locked in female job ghettos where the services performed are undervalued, wages kept low, and the opportunities are limited. The salaries paid in occupations and professional fields dominated by female workers are universally lower than their education, skills, responsibilities—and working conditions—warrant. This lack of comparable pay for work of comparable worth is a major factor depressing the wages of women generally.

ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES

The combined effects of unequal pay for equal work, unequal pay for work of comparable worth, and occupational segregation have been devastating for women.

Our Nation has been increasingly experiencing what is graphically described as the feminization of poverty. Two of every three poor adults today are women. The number of poor families headed by women increased by one-third between 1969 and 1978, rising from 1.8 to 2.7 million; the number of male-headed families in poverty dropped from 3.2 million to 2.6 million during that same time.

For many men, poverty comes as a consequence of joblessness and the way out of poverty is through employment. But many of the women living in poverty already have jobs and are working full time—their jobs just do not pay a living wage. Almost 40 percent of the fully employed women earn less than $10,000. The 1982 poverty level for a four-person family was $9,860. The poverty rate for families headed by a full-time working woman is more than double that for households headed by full time working men.

Poverty endures for many of these women long after their families have grown. A lifetime of lower earnings and limited career opportunities results in substantially lower benefits from social security and other pension programs. Presently, 72 percent of older persons living in poverty are women.

Minority women face the double burden of race as well as sex discrimination. While the average ratio of male-to-female wages is 59 percent, that ratio is 54 percent for black women and 49 percent for Hispanic women. More than half of the black and Hispanic families headed by a female live in poverty. Older minority women constitute the poorest of the poor; 82 percent of older black women live at or near poverty. And the unemployment rates among young black women are the highest of any category of workers.

Wage discrimination against women has serious consequences for the welfare of America's children. It is estimated that one-third to one-half of the children born during the 1970's will live for some significant period of time in a female-headed household—more than one-third of which now live in poverty. Unless we find ways to break down the barriers which continue to deny women workers access to jobs with adequate salaries and advancement potential, many children will also face a high risk of poverty and its consequences.

DISPELLING THE SECONDARY WAGE-EARNER MYTH

A major task in achieving the goal of providing women equity in the work force is that of overcoming once and for all the myth that continues to linger that women are merely secondary wage earners and, hence, their participation and attachment to the work force is of lesser importance. President Reagan himself contributed to the perpetuation of this false perception when he suggested that the increase in working women, rather than the recession, was itself the cause of high unemployment. He was implying that perhaps these new women entrants really did not have to work.

The fact is women work for precisely the same reasons that men work. They work to provide for themselves and their families. Economic necessity is the primary and overriding factor. Seventy-four percent of the women now working are either sole providers or are married to men with incomes of less than $15,000; their earnings are necessary to keep their families out of poverty.

Dispelling the myths that surround the role of women in the work force is particularly important with respect to young women. Today, 56 percent of adult women are working outside the home. During this decade, it is expected that two-thirds of all women between the ages of 20 and 64 will be in the labor force at any one time. But relatively few teenage girls seem aware of this. Our educational systems do too little to prepare young women for the world of work. Department of Education statistics show that over 40 percent of the girls enrolled in vocational education programs are learning only homemaking skills. The rest for the most part are training for a narrow range of female-stereotyped, low-paying occupations. Young women should be learning about the jobs that will be emerging out of the new technologies. They should be preparing themselves for work that will provide decent salaries and advancement opportunities. They should be encouraged to develop all of their talents and capabilities to the fullest. Their horizons should not be limited by sexist stereotypes or false perceptions about the work force.

PROMOTING THE NATIONAL INTEREST

For those directly affected, the cost of allowing discrimination against women to continue is serious; the cost to our Nation is also certain to be great; especially in the labor-scarce years ahead. A second major task in achieving the goal of providing equal opportunities to women is gaining recognition of the fact that it is our national interest—as well as a matter of moral principle—to overcome the obstacles that continue to deny women those opportunities.

Demographic trends indicate that we will soon have a shrinking pool of young entrants into the work force and most of the new workers our Nation will need will come from groups that have been denied full participation in our work force—women, minorities, older Americans, and disabled individuals. The new growth industries—computers, telecommunications, robotics, and biotechnology—are creating ever more sophisticated jobs to be filled. Already we face critical shortages of engineers and certain highly skilled workers. We will need to draw upon the best minds and energies of all our people—female as well as male—to be able to meet the new demands. Today it is clear we are not using in the work force the full capacities of American women. While the

number of women entering the labor force has grown enormously over the past few years, they continue to be segregated into a handful of occupations and fields.

If we are to meet the challenges that lie ahead for our Nation, we cannot afford to continue to squander our talented and creative human capital. We cannot allow women workers to continue to be devalued and excluded from full participation in the economic life and growth of our Nation.

NEED FOR ACTION

There are a number of specific steps that can and should be taken to promote both economic and social justice for women.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The most critical and urgent area that must be addressed is in the area of promoting true equality of opportunity in the work force. The continuing inequities suffered by women workers have dire economic consequences for these women, for their children and families, and for their security in old age.

First, we must have full and vigorous enforcement of existing equal employment opportunity laws. Under the Reagan administration, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's enforcement of title VII of the Civil Rights Act has been curtailed. According to a report prepared by the Coalition on Women and the Budget, staffing levels at EEOC are down 13.2 percent as a result of the fiscal year 1983 budget, the length of time for EEOC processing of individual charges is now an average of 5.5 to 9 months, nearly double the amount of time a case took in fiscal year 1980, and in fiscal year 1982 only 72 cases were filed in Federal court by EEOC, 73.9 percent fewer than in fiscal year 1981. Similarly, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs—OFCCP—of the Department of Labor has suffered major staff losses. The Reagan administration has also proposed changes in affirmative action regulations that would substantially weaken the OFCCP's ability to enforce equal employment opportunity requirements with respect to Federal contractors.

Moreover, despite promising efforts at EEOC and OFCCP under the Carter administration to develop an approach to deal with the problem of unequal pay for work of comparable worth and the decision of the Supreme Court in 1981 in the Gunther case which opened the door to further efforts in this area, activity on comparable worth issues by both agencies appears to be at a virtual standstill. It is clear that some direction in this area, either from Congress or the administration, is necessary. I will soon introduce legislation to provide needed guidance and direction to EEOC and OFCCP for action in this area. The problems of pay equity and the discrimination against female workers cannot be resolved until these issues are adequately addressed by the Federal agencies charged with the responsibility for enforcement of equal employment opportunity laws.

Second, the Federal Government ought to be providing a model for equal opportunity through the management of the Federal work force in a fair and progressive fashion. That has not occurred. As the author of the 1972 amendment to title VII that extended its protections to Federal employees, I have been deeply disappointed with the lack of progress that has been made in extending equal employment opportunities and career advancement opportunities to women and minorities in the Federal work force. Women in particular continue to be concentrated in the lower Federal pay grades. Eighty-five percent of all Federal white collar female workers are employed in grades 1 to 9. Moreover, although women constitute roughly 30 percent of the Federal work force, they have been vastly over represented among the victims of the recent reduction in force—RIF—actions. During the first 6 months of fiscal year 1982—the period when major RIF's occurred—62.9 percent of the Federal workers laid off were women.

Moreover, although the 1978 Civil Service Reform Act clearly directed the Federal Government to eliminate pay inequities based upon comparable worth problems, virtually nothing has been done by OPM to address this problem within the Federal work force.

Finally, women continue to be under represented in the highest level policymaking positions and in the Federal judiciary. The present administration continues to fall far short in its appointment of women to top positions, notwithstanding the recent visible cabinet-level appointments. This tokenism approach to the appointment of women was underscored in President Reagan's candid explanation as to why no women had been appointed to this Central American Commission.

Third, federally supported employment and job training programs must be designed to afford opportunities for groups, such as women, who have been underserved by these programs. The Federal Government's efforts to make these opportunities available to women, as well as men, have been few and ineffective. We must do better. I am proud to be the sponsor of legislation, S. 266, the Hawkins-Cranston Community Renewal Employment Act, which is specifically designed to take into account those needs.

Fourth, we will never adequately address the employment-related needs of women until we deal effectively with the child care needs of our Nation. Lack of accessibility to adequate child care services is a major barrier to employment and the attainment of economic security for millions of women and their families. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has noted that studies have suggested that one of every five or six unemployed women is unemployed because she is unable to make satisfactory child care arrangements. Lack of adequate child care restricts employment opportunities for women in a number of other ways, including limiting advancement opportunities and adversely affecting job performance. Adequate child care services must be a cornerstone of any effort to provide women with equal opportunities in the work force. Without such assistance, economic equity will remain an elusive goal for millions of women.

The problem also cannot be adequately addressed simply by tinkering with tax credits and business deductions. Improving the existing child care tax credit is an important step which should be taken and has broad bipartisan support. But ultimately we must recognize that tax incentives, even with refundability provisions, are not going to provide meaningful assistance for the vast numbers of women working in jobs paying less than $10,000 a year. Families living from paycheck to paycheck, facing weekly child care bills, need direct assistance. When programs like title XX and the child care food program, which provide direct assistance in meeting child care costs, are drastically cut—as they have been under the Reagan administration—countless families are pushed out of child care programs. Many are forced to either quit their jobs and go on welfare or leave their children alone or in undesirable situations. Any serious effort to deal with the child care needs of these families must go beyond a Tax Code approach or we run the risk of developing a system of Federal support for child care costs that ignores those in the greatest need.

The time is long overdue for this Nation to recognize that adequate child care services are essential to the economic well-being of our Nation's children and families. Until we have adopted a comprehensive policy and format for addressing the child care needs of all those who need assistance along the lines set forth in my bill S. 4, the proposed Child Care Assistance Act, we will continue to deny many women the support they need to work and provide for themselves and their families. Such a comprehensive format must include—as does S. 4—such things as support for child care information and referral programs, which play a key role in helping parents find the kind of care they need, decent minimum standards to help assure the health and safety of the children in

child care programs, and a diversity of programs so that parents can choose the child care option that work best for their family.

EDUCATION

Another critical area where additional efforts must be made is in the continuing struggle to insure that equal educational opportunities are made available to women. Education has always been a key to advancement and economic security in our society. The lack of equal educational opportunities for young women in the past has been a tremendous obstacle to the attainment of equal opportunity.

The enactment over a decade ago of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 which prohibits sex discrimination in federally assisted educational institutions provided a tremendous tool for eliminating discriminatory practices in education. Prior to passage of title IX, overt, blatant sex discrimination was practiced in public and private schools throughout the Nation. Young girls were routinely and openly denied access to certain vocational programs, admission to certain schools or fields of study, or the right to participate in a wide variety of extracurricular school activities solely because of their sex. Guidance counselors uniformly steered young women away from male-dominated career patterns into traditional female roles. These policies and practices—some almost inconceivable today—were once deeply ingrained parts of our educational institutions. Title IX has led to revolutionary changes in ways that our schools and institutions of higher education look at and treat young women. These have been positive changes which have opened up the doors to education and training to enable these young women, as well as older women returning to the classroom, to develop and utilize the skills and capabilities they possess and to fulfill their individual potentials.

Yet, today title IX has fallen under a serious threat. The Reagan administration has not only curtailed its enforcement mechanisms for resolving title IX complaints, but it has formally taken a position in the pending title IX case before the Supreme Court—Grove City College against Bell—which would severely limit and effectively emasculate title IX. The Reagan administration would restrict title IX's scope to only those aspects of the school directly involved in receipt of Federal assistance. Thus, an educational institution would be free to reinstitute any of the old sex-biased policies so long as the specific program touched by Federal assistance was not involved. Federal funds could thus be freely expended to support totally biased and inequitable institutions so long as the funding was carefully funnelled into programs where such discrimination was not overtly practiced.

I feel so strongly that this position is wrong that I have taken the unusual step of joining two of my colleagues, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) as well as almost 50 Members of the House of Representatives in a bipartisan amicus curiae brief filed with the Supreme Court opposing the Reagan Justice Department's position in this case. I have also cosponsored the Senate Resolution 149, reaffirming congressional support for title IX.

Any retreat in our efforts to extend equal educational opportunities to women would be tragic—a result which would not only hinder the advancement of millions of women, but would deprive our Nation of their enormous potential contributions.

HUMAN SERVICES PROGRAMS

At the same time that efforts are being made to open up the avenues to self-sufficiency and economic security through employment and educational opportunities, support must be continued for those women and their children who need assistance for their very survival. Just as women and children have been the major victims of poverty, they have been the primary victims of the Reagan administration's drastic cutbacks in the basic programs of assistance for needy Americans. Cuts in health programs, housing assistance, child nutrition, food stamps, legal services, and the AFDC program have caused great suffering by millions of women and children dependent upon these programs for basic subsistence. Women and children constitute almost 70 percent of all food stamp recipients, 66 percent of the residents of subsidized housing, 61 percent of medicaid recipients, 67 percent of all legal services clients, and 93 percent of those dependent on the AFDC program. Some of the heaviest blows have fallen upon those women trying to work their way off welfare. Shortsighted cutbacks in areas like child care and work-related expense deductions have only served to drive these families deeper into economic despair and dependency.

Special attention must also be paid to issues affecting older women. First and foremost must be a reevaluation and revision of the social security system to assure that the needs of older women are adequately met. Earnings sharing, which recognizes the economic partnership of marriage, has been repeatedly identified as the most promising and fair approach to dealing with these problems. I have introduced an earnings sharing bill in the Senate, and I authored an amendment to the 1983 social security reform legislation which requires the Department of Health and Human Services to submit to Congress a report on how such a program might be implemented. That report should provide a basis for action in this area.

Similar efforts to promote greater equity for women in private pension programs and the civil service retirement system are also underway. A major proposal is contained in the Economic Equity Act, S. 888, which I have cosponsored. These actions with respect to social security, private pensions, and the civil service retirement system are essential if we are to deal effectively with the impoverished condition of millions of older women.

The stability and adequacy of the medicare program is also of utmost importance to older women, and we must assure that medicare is protected and strengthened so that the health care needs of our older citizens can be met.

Finally, the persistent attacks by this administration and its allies in Congress on programs like family planning must be stopped. On the one hand, the Reagan administration has sought enactment of measures in the area of abortion—measures I have strongly opposed—which would increase governmental interference and control in the most personal, private decisions of individuals. At the same time, it has sought to eliminate programs such as the title X family planning program which can contribute to a reduction in the number of abortions and unintended pregnancies. Greater efforts should be made in developing realistic alternatives to abortion, such as family planning services, safer and more effective methods of contraception, adequate medicaid assistance for all pregnant, low-income women, and support for adoption assistance programs. I have authored major legislation in all of these areas. Promotion of individual choice and alternatives ought to be our goal in this sensitive and difficult area, rather than Government intervention and the curtailment of individual decisionmaking.

MILITARY SPENDING AND THE ARMS RACE

Bringing a halt to the mindless and incredibly costly arms race we are engaged in is also of immeasurable importance to women—as it is to all Americans.

We need a strong national defense that is second to none.

But we also need a sound economy, a prosperous and secure America, and opportunity for all our people. We simply cannot achieve these goals if we continue to pour trillions of dollars into a bloated military budget. The arms race is forcing us to undermine our economy, to divert precious resources from pressing domestic problems, and to mortgage our Nation's future through enormous deficits. Further, it helps to foster an ever more macho society in which it is increasingly difficult for women to participate and compete. The struggle for equal justice is hindered when our na-

11-059 O-87-32 (Pt. 18)

tional resources and priorities are focused upon the development of more and more awesome weapons of destruction rather than investing in and promoting our human capital.

We must negotiate an arms control agreement with the Soviet Union that is balanced and verifiable and fair so that we can put an end to this shamefully expensive and dangerous arms race. We must do this to bring our world out from under the dark shadow of nuclear destruction. Attainment of all our other goals and aspirations as a people is endangered if we fail in our efforts in this area.

RATIFICATION OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENTS

Finally, we must ratify the equal rights amendment. Full and equal status for women will not become a reality in this Nation until the Constitution is amended to include ERA. Only a constitutional amendment can provide a secure guarantee of equal status and dignity. That truth has unfortunately been amply demonstrated as the current administration has worked to undermine the statutory protections for women which now exist. Ratification of ERA is necessary to establish the legal foundation needed to assure equality of rights under the laws of our land as well as to signify our national consensus on the underlying issue of equality.

However, while we continue to struggle to achieve ratification of ERA, there are pending legislative issues that must be addressed. Passage of the fair insurance bill, S. 372, and the fair housing amendments, S. 1220, which will for the first time provide protections against housing discrimination for families with children, are key steps forward that must be taken. Other important measures include action on domestic violence prevention legislation, strengthening of child support enforcement laws and various other key elements of the Economic Equity Act, S. 888. As a cosponsor of all of these measures, I am committed to pressing forward in these and other areas as we continue to work for social and economic justice in every aspect of our society.

CONCLUSION

The task that lies before us is awesome, but not insurmountable. To achieve these goals, however, we need national leadership that will help dispel the stereotypes about women and the lingering ambivalence about their status. We need national leadership that will help to articulate the fact that it is in our national interest to promote full equality for women and to help communicate the message that women's issues are not special interests, but part of the national agenda that is of critical importance to all Americans. Equal justice and equal opportunity for women is not a luxury; it is an economic and moral necessity.

BARNEY WEEKS—A GREAT MAN

Mr. HEFLIN. Madam President, as I traveled across Alabama during the Senate's August recess I saw stories in several newspapers telling of the upcoming retirement of a fixture in the State's public life, Barney Weeks, President of the Alabama Labor Council.

Weeks has notified union officials across the State that he will not run for another 2-year term when his current one expires in October. He has held that post continuously since 1957. During those 26 years, he has worked tirelessly for union goals, always a dedicated supporter of the rights of working men and women in Alabama.

Barney Weeks first began his union career in 1936, with Montgomery's International Typographical Union. He had been a printer with a Montgomery newspaper for only 6 months when he was chosen president of the union local. He then held various labor posts for about 20 years, until he was first elected to the full-time position of president of the State labor council.

As president of the council, Weeks has done what is almost universally recognized as a fine job in advocating the cause of his group. Even as recently as this last session of the Alabama Legislature, Weeks helped his group achieve some successes, such as an increase of more than 30 percent in unemployment compensation.

Barney Weeks is a great American. He is well known in labor circles and among progressive groups throughout the Nation. His wise counsel has been sought by Americans from all walks of life. He is a superb Alabamian. His interest in the betterment and growth of Alabama is recognized by business leaders as well as political leaders. He has earned the respect of all Alabamians. He is a true and honorable professional. His integrity is unassailable. He is a wonderful human being and a warm friend.

His years of vigorous dedication to the labor movement in Alabama have certainly earned Barney Weeks the right to a peaceful retirement with his wife, Ruth. While his wisdom and integrity are definitely going to be missed, I wish him all the best in the future.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Birmingham Post-Herald be printed in the RECORD.

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

LABOR COUNCIL PRESIDENT SEES STRUGGLE AHEAD—STATE'S TOP UNIONIST SEES CHANGES FORCED BY TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES

(By Bill Koenig)

This is Barney Weeks' last Labor Day as the state's top organized labor official.

Weeks can look back with a sense of accomplishment on 26 years as president of the Alabama Labor Council.

About 21 percent of Alabama's work force is organized. That's lower than the national average (22.9 percent), but higher than other Southern states such as Georgia (17 percent) or Florida (14.8 percent).

Under Weeks, The council has been active. In 1973, for example, Weeks' group—which is part of the AFL-CIO and acts as an umbrella organization for unions affiliated with the federation—won a case in the U.S. Supreme Court.

But Weeks also knows his successor, to be elected next month, will face a wealth of problems. Chief among them: a labor force shifting away from heavy industry—organized labor's traditional base—as well as technological change.

Weeks doesn't oppose technology by itself. "I think you've got to have automation. You can't pay high salaries unless productivity increases.

"But there has to be, I think, a more concentrated effort to prepare people for this." Without such preparation "we will be a country of shopowners and service industries, such as England is becoming. We've got more people employed in service now than we do in manufacturing. And I never thought I'd live to see the day that would happen.

The 70-year-old Weeks is, in one sense, a vanishing breed. Weeks started in organized labor in 1936 as an official of the International Typographical Union in Montgomery. He worked in a variety of jobs involving printing. He was a skilled, blue-collar craftsman—traditionally one of the pillars of organized labor's leadership.

"That's an endangered species," says Higdon Roberts, director of University of Alabama in Birmingham's labor studies center.

Those kinds of jobs are threatened on several fronts. Automation has eliminated many of those types of positions. Further, employers in the steel, auto, rubber industries among others seek to consolidate job classifications. Instead of having highly specialized craftsmen, such as Weeks, they want broader classifications.

Organized labor has made some adjustments to the shift to service emplyment. Since World War II, the largest union growth has been among government workers.

But it's generally agreed unions must make inroads, organizing privately employed white-collar employees if they are to remain influential institutions.

Weeks, for one, thinks unions can accomplish that.

Says the labor council president, "Labor has always had to adapt to existing conditions."

The career of Weeks is an example. The South in general has been less inviting to unions than other regions, yet, the Alabama group has recorded some successes.

For example, on June 11, 1973, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld an Alabama law originally sought by the labor council. That law required employers to pay their workers

regular wages while on juries, minus any jury pay they receive.

That law was challenged in the case of Dean vs. Gadsden Times Publishing Corp. Weeks' organization was involved through the appeal process up to the nation's highest court.

But some Weeks associates say a greater accomplishment may have been to hold the state's unions together in the early 1960s.

"I think without question the No. 1 problem Barney had to face was integration," said A.G. Trammell, the council's secretary-treasurer and the only announced candidate to succeed Weeks.

The National AFL-CIO supported equal pay regardless of race and other goals of the civil rights movement. "He was preaching that far before the politicians dared to say that in Alabama," Trammell said of Weeks. The two have known each other since 1957, when Weeks was first elected council president.

Weeks, for the record, doesn't like to comment on that era. "I don't want to inflame this issue all over again."

During the civil rights movement, Weeks sometimes had to check out early from hotels while on union business for fear of violence.

Today's union problems are more economic. Besides the changing nature of the work force, unions now confront huge, broad-based conglomerates.

"They can be real tough, because they can afford a work stoppage," Weeks says. "That makes it very, very hard. And it makes it very hard sometimes to find out who owns the company."

Moreover, Weeks says, organizing is more complex.

"When I first joined, you had to keep your membership totally secret or you were fired the minute they found out about it. They were a lot of strong-arm tactics."

Now, the labor council president says, organizing disputes take place in the courts. Those battles can take years to resolve. Weeks says that lowers the chance for successful labor organizing, even if courts decide in favor of unions.

Yet Weeks remains an optimist. He sees opportunities for union organizing in various fields traditionally considered professional. For example, he says the development of hospital chains could lead to unionized medical personnel. "The doctors and nurses find out they can't deal with them any more than we could deal with U.S. Steel without a union."

THE SQUARE DANCE

Mr. HEFLIN. Madam President, I rise today in support of legislation sponsored by the distinguished Senate minority leader, Senator BYRD of West Virginia. This legislation, Senate bill 1448, would make permanent the designation of the square dance as the national folk dance of the United States.

It was a little more than a year ago, in June of 1982, that President Reagan signed into law a resolution adopted by Congress recognizing the square dance as our national folk dance for a 2-year period. We are now asking that this designation be made permanent.

My home State of Alabama is one of five States that recognize the square dance as the official State dance. Just for the information of my colleagues, the other four States that do so are New Jersey, Oregon, Tennessee, and Washington.

Despite the fact that square dancing has been around for quite sometime, it is still enjoying quite an increase in popularity. Membership in the many square dance organizations which have formed across the country is growing, and new organizations are continually coming into being.

In fact, Madam President, twice recently, on my travels around Alabama I have run into representatives of square dance groups. From them, I have learned that June of 1985 will find Birmingham, Ala., hosting square dancers from all over the world for the 34th National Square Dance Convention. It is estimated that over 35,000 dancers will converge on Birmingham for that convention, sponsored by the more than 6,000 dancers across Alabama. It is believed that this will be the largest convention ever held in the State.

The fun, fellowship, and interaction between the square dancers themselves in only a part of the story of the convention. The gathering will also provide those Alabamians who are familiar with square dancing an opportunity to view the activity at its finest, and it will give those Alabamians unfamiliar with square dancing an opportunity to learn about a great American tradition.

Square dancing is an important part of our national heritage. Although not an American invention, but a combination of many dances drawn from a variety of national origins, the square dance has been an integral part of our culture since before the American Revolution.

Our recognition a year ago of the important role square dancing has played in development of true American culture has been a boon to square dancing. Since then, spectator attendance at square dance festivals and civic functions has increased. Square dance organizations have increased in number by 25 percent. Media coverage of events has also increased.

Madam President, I believe that the tremendous enthusiasm and excitement with which the country has accepted the square dance as the national folk dance justifies a permanent designation.

BUDGET ACT WAIVER

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate Calendar Order No. 241, Senate Resolution 152, the budget waiver for the consideration of S. 1342.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 152) waiving section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to the consideration of S. 1342.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BYRD. We have no objection, Madam President.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 152) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 152

Resolved, That pursuant to section 402(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the provisions of section 402(a) of such Act are waived with respect to the consideration of S. 1342, a bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, and the Board for International Broadcasting, and for other purposes. Such waiver is necessary to allow the authorization of $13,283,000 to enable Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Incorporated (RFE/RL), to enhance programing, improve audio quality, and renovate broadcast facilities, in accordance with the President's announcement of July 19, 1982, "to move forward . . . with a program to modernize our primary means of international communication, our international radio system.".

Compliance with section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 was not possible by the May 28, 1982, deadline because the administration failed to submit this request until November 23, 1982. This request was resubmitted to the Congress in March of 1983.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate S. 1342, the Department of State authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1342) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, and the Board for International Broadcasting, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, there is no objection. That has been cleared on this side.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PERCY. Madam President, today the Senate will consider S. 1342, a bill authorizing appropriations for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency and the Board for International Broadcasting for fiscal years 1984 and 1985.

The total amounts authorized by this legislation for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 are $3,203,518,000 and $3,234,249,000 respectively. This represents a cut of $65,427,000 from the administration's fiscal year 1984 request, and $330,442,000 from the administration's fiscal year 1985 request. Despite these substantial reductions, I believe that this bill will provide the U.S. foreign policy agencies with adequate resources to carry out their various mandates and to promote U.S. interests abroad.

I ask unanimous consent that the following table which compares the administration's requests with the committee's recommendations be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1984 AND 1985

[By fiscal year; in thousands of dollars]

	1982 appropriations actual	1983 authorization Public Law 97-241	1983 supplemental authorization requests	1983 appropriations Public Law 97-377	1983 supplemental appropriations request	1984 authorization request	1985 authorization request	1984 increase/decrease over 1983 appropriations request	1985 increase/decrease over 1984 request	Committee mark 1984	Committee mark 1985
STATE DEPARTMENT											
Administration of Foreign Affairs	1,259,151	1,248,059		1,310,232	26,411	1,473,713	1,574,520	137,070	100,807	1,473,713	1,473,713
International organizations and conferences	466,462	514,436		518,804		602,343	645,978	83,839	43,635	602,343	645,978
International commissions	20,292	22,432		20,198	174	23,207	27,503	2,835	4,296	23,207	23,207
Migration and refugee assistance	423,000	460,000		395,000		344,500	386,400	−50,500	−18,100	144,500	326,400
U.S. bilateral science and technology agreements	3,700	3,700		1,700		1,700	1,700			1,700	1,700
The Asia Foundation	4,100	4,500		4,100				−4,100		10,000	10,000
Consulate protection						6,000	6,300	6,000	300	6,000	6,000
Subtotal	2,176,705	2,253,127		2,250,034	26,585	2,451,463	2,582,401	174,844	130,938	2,451,463	2,486,988
U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY											
Salaries and expenses	450,401	[1] 489,443		492,122	20,377	569,365	594,457	56,866	25,092	580,547	580,547
Center for culture and technical interchange between East and West (Hawaii)	16,880	18,280		18,000		18,547	19,345	547	798	18,547	18,547
Acquisition and construction of radio facilities	19,000	40,000		25,000	11,833	47,959	179,426	11,126	131,467	26,250	26,250
Special foreign currency program	9,800	11,327		10,327		10,556	12,412	229	1,856	10,556	10,556
Project Democracy			20,000		20,000	65,000	65,399	45,000	399		
Subtotal	496,081	[2] 559,050	20,000	545,449	52,210	711,427	871,039	113,768	159,612	636,000	636,000
BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING											
Administrative expenses	832	838		857		1,075	1,128	+218	+53	1,075	1,128
Transmitter purchase						1,395		+1,395	−1,395	1,395	
Grants to RFE/RL, Inc	82,375	97,479	13,283	89,443	21,300	103,585	110,123	−7,158	+6,538	103,585	110,123
Subtotal	83,207	98,317	13,283	90,300	21,300	106,055	111,251	−5,545	5,196	106,055	111,251
Grand totals	2,755,993	2,910,444	33,283	2,885,783	100,095	3,268,945	3,564,691	283,067	295,746	3,203,518	3,234,249

[1] Includes $4 million for Tsukuba Expo. [2] Public Law 97-241 rounded this figure off to the nearest million ($559 million).

Mr. PERCY. As the above chart illustrates, the committee took the following actions on the various administration funding requests: First, the committee rejected the U.S. Information Agency's fiscal year 1983 $20 million supplemental request to initiate its Project Democracy; second, the committee granted the fiscal year 1983 supplemental request of the Board for International Broadcasting for $13.2 million to enhance and upgrade the broadcasting capabilities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty; third, the committee approved $2.46 billion authorization of appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 1984 and a $2.48 authorization for fiscal year 1985; fourth, the committee approved an authorization of appropriations of $636 million for the operations of the U.S. Information Agency for fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985; and fifth, the committee approved $106 million in fiscal year 1984 and $111 million in fiscal year 1985 for the Board for International Broadcasting.

In addition to these funding levels, the committee adopted approximately 28 different policy amendments which cover a wide range of foreign policy issues.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of these items be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

POLICY AMENDMENTS

In addition to providing funds for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency and the Board for International Broadcasting, other sections of S. 1342: (1) remove the ceiling on the amount that the United States may contribute to the Paris Union for the Protection of Industrial Property of the World Intellectual Property Organization; (2) eliminate and modify ten reporting requirements of existing law; (3) authorize the appropriation of $6 million in fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985 to improve and expand consular protective services within the United States; (4) express the sense of the Congress that U.S. representatives to various international organizations should oppose the adoption of international marketing and distribution regulations which unnecessarily impede the export of U.S. agricultural and other products; (5) earmark $2 million to strengthen the Secretariat of the Coordinating Committee on Export Controls; (6) earmark $8.4 million to enhance the overseas political and economic reporting capabilities of the Department of State; (7) strengthen Congressional oversight authority with respect to the State Department's emergency expenditures account and its repatriation loan program; (8) earmark $3 million in fiscal year 1984 and $7 million in fiscal year 1985 for the establishment of an alternative communications system for the Department of State to secure uninterrupted transmission of communications related to U.S. foreign policy and national security interests; (9) permit foreign service officers to select their state of residency for purposes of voting in Federal elections; (10) direct the Secretary of State to establish regional wildlife resources attachés; (11) require the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Interior, to review the effectiveness of existing U.S. international activities relating to the conservation of international wildlife; (12) merge the Foreign Service Information Corps with the Foreign Service Corps; (13) earmark $225,000 for fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985 for continued support of the Secretariat of the U.S. National Commission to the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization; (14) earmark $248,000 for fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985 as the U.S. contribution to the World Heritage Trust Fund; (15) state the sense of

the Congress that the United States should move as expeditiously as possible toward a bilateral agreement with Canada on the acid rain problem; (16) express the sense of the Congress that the Department of State should take steps to eliminate the excessive delays in the publication of its historical series, "The Foreign Relations of the United States"; (17) make it the sense of the Congress that the U.S. Government should move immediately to promote lower prices and fair market conditions for imported natural gas; (18) earmark $1 million for fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985 for grants to nongovernmental organizations in South Africa promoting political, economic, social, juridical and humanitarian efforts to foster a just society and to help victims of apartheid; (19) require the proportionate reduction of the U.S. share of any programs of any international organizations for the Palestine Liberation Organization, the South West Africa Peoples Organization, Cuba or Iran; (20) authorize supplemental allowances for USIA personnel assigned to New York City; (21) increase the duration of transmitter leases for the Voice of America; (22) earmark increased funding for the traditional activities of the USIA in the field of educational and cultural exchanges; (23) require a 15-day notice for 1 year to the House and Senate committees involved with foreign relations concerning all USIA reprograming activities and program grants; (24) create within the USIA a new program of environmental exchanges; (25) authorize the Board for International Broadcasting to create a fund composed of foreign currency gains to enhance the pension of retirees that left the Radios prior to 1976; (26) create a non-profit corporation, the National Endowment for Democracy, to encourage free and democratic institutions throughout the world through private sector initiatives; (27) strengthen the enforcement authorities of the liability insurance requirements of the Diplomatic Relations Act; and (28) specifically authorize annual grants to the Asia Foundation.

Mr. PERCY. In conclusion, Madam President, I wish to commend the Foreign Relations Committee for taking the administration's funding requests, which had already been severely pared by the Office of Management and Budget, and finding other areas of savings to bring this bill to the floor below the President's budget. I hope my colleagues will keep this in mind in considering this legislation and support the bill as reported by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Madam President, This legislation, S. 1342, authorizes funding for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Board for International Broadcasting. Title IV of the bill creates a National Endowment for Democracy, an innovative joint effort on the part of the AFL-CIO, the Chamber of Commerce, and the two political parties to promote American democracy and ideas abroad. In addition S. 1342 gives statutory recognition to the important work of the Asia Foundation as well as making some technical improvements in the Foreign Missions Act approved last year.

The Foreign Relations Committee approved administration requests for fiscal year 1984 funding for the State Department and the Board for International Broadcasting. The BIB funding will allow a long overdue upgrading of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty studios and transmission facilities—some of which were captured from the Nazis at the end of World War II. At a time of escalating East-West tension it is critical that these beacons of truth and hope be heard.

Regrettably the State Department funding level will not correct a long-term neglect in the vital diplomatic aim of our national security apparatus. This bill will still leave the State Department with roughly the same number of Foreign Service officers as in 1960—in spite of an enormous increase in workload including a 36-percent jump in overseas posts, a 400-percent increase in Washington demand for reporting cables, and a 900-percent increase in consular work. I would note that the increase in the State Department international organization account—for assessed contributions due under treaty obligations—reflects completion of the administration's deferral program and does not imply any program growth or increase in U.S. share.

The Foreign Relations Committee did make a very deep cut in USIA's budget. While I agree that the President's request—a 30-percent increase in 1984 and a 30-percent increase in 1985—was a bit too generous, Senator PERCY and I favored a less severe cut than that enacted by the committee. I am pleased that USIA Director Wick has taken forceful steps to correct the abuses motivating the committee cuts and I am also pleased that the most damaging cuts—to the VOA modernization effort—have been restored as part of the compromise on Radio Marti. Because of that compromise I believe the $636,000,000 in this bill for USIA is sufficient.

The committee also took several important actions to enhance our exchange-of-persons programs and to improve our international environmental efforts. First, the committee followed through on its action of last year and earmarked funds necessary to meet the terms of the Pell amendment to double exchange-of-persons programs by fiscal year 1986. Second, the committee added important protections to those programs by adopting a charter, of which I am the author, to insure the integrity and nonpolitical character of our Fulbright-Hays activities.

In the international environmental area the committee adopted my amendment to set up an environmental education and exchange program, a Cranston amendment on acid rain, and a Chafee amendment on wildlife. The environmental exchange program was part of S. 1067, the international environment protection cosponsored by myself, Chairman PERCY, Senator CHAFEE, and Senator GLENN. At the appropriate time I intend to offer the entire bill as a new title on S. 1342.

Madam President, the Foreign Relations Committee bill, S. 1342, provides funding for our essential foreign affairs agencies as well as authority for several important and innovate new international programs. The committee's bill is a good one and I urge its passage.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2187

(Purpose: To authorize appropriations for United States-German teenage exchange)

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. HEINZ) for himself and Mr. LUGAR, proposes an amendment numbered 2187.

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 32, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following new section:

"FUNDS FOR UNITED STATES-GERMAN TEENAGE EXCHANGE

"SEC. 210. There are authorized to be appropriated for the United States Information Agency $2,500,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and $2,500,000 for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out a United States-German teenage exchange sponsored by the Members of the United States Congress and the West German Bundestag.".

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, as all of us know, one of our very most important relationships that we in the United States have today is our partnership with the Federal Republic of Germany. With passage of time our nations face the most obvious of problems. The Germans and Americans who share the memories of the close cooperation during the post-world war period, the Berlin airlift, which I remember vividly, the Marshall plan, which I studied as a student in school, the founding of the Federal Republic, which I think we all know the beginnings of and, of course, even the initi-

ation of the Fulbright exchanges, are not aging and these events are fading somewhat in our memories.

There is a new generation—some have called it the successor generation—moving toward leadership in both our country and in the society of the Federal Republic.

That generation, I say to my colleagues, does not necessarily share the knowledge, or the understanding, or the sensitivity, or the background that we all grew up with. They do not necessarily have as careful a knowledge of what has gone before.

That is why it is especially fortuitous that 1983 is the tricentennial of German immigration to America. Of course, we noted when Vice President BUSH went to Eifel, Germany, to commemorate the first group of Germans who left Germany from that small town to come to the United States, it is an honor and a privilege that the community in which they settled is in my home State of Pennsylvania. Indeed, a German town, it is a part of the city of Philadelphia, the City of Brotherly Love, and though that German immigration to America was, albeit, a handful of families, it became a small trickle, then a larger rivulet, then a substantial migration.

While there are many celebrations of the tricentennial that have already occurred and will continue to occur this year, most notably the upcoming visit of the President of the Federal Republic, Karl Carstens, and 30 members of the Bundestag, it is very important that the tricentennial have a legacy that endures beyond this year.

With that in mind, the Senate last year passed Senate Joint Resolution 260, which expressed the Senate's strong support of the concept of a teenage exchange sponsored by Members of the U.S. Congress on the one hand and the West German Bundestag on the other and emphasizing home stays with families. Our action was significant because it holds out the hope that 535 young Americans, 100 from the Senate, 435 from the House, and 520 young Germans can experience each other's life and values—520 because that is the number in the Bundestag.

The German Bundestag, however, I say to my colleagues, is a step ahead of us. They have already read our resolution and appropriated their half of the money to pay for this exchange program to begin in 1984.

What this amendment does, Mr. President, consistent with the resolution that we passed unanimously in the Senate last year, an amendment sponsored by myself and the distinguished Senator from Indiana who, with me, is proud to claim roots of descent from Germany, would provide for the American side of that commitment, specifically $2.5 million in fiscal year 1985. It would be particularly appropriate that we do this now, do it as soon as possible, indeed, do it so that we may announce prior to the Arrival in just a few days of the President of the German Federal Republic of Germany and the Bundestag delegation that is accompanying him to Washington, that we have met our responsibilities to further this very valuable youth exchange program and, more importantly, attack I think as directly and concretely as possible the widening gulf of knowledge of history that is tending to separate some of our younger people from the realities and, most of all, the shared values that have been so important not only to the understanding of our heritage and the heritage of the Federal Republic but, indeed, to that of the Atlantic alliance that we have put so much faith in for so long.

Mr. President, I note the arrival of my distinguished cosponsor, Senator LUGAR, who I might add has just returned from a visit to the Federal Republic of Germany, as he represented, as I understand it, the Vice President, who could not attend the ceremonies in the home province of the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany. I would be pleased to yield to Senator LUGAR, at this time if he desires me to do so.

Mr. LUGAR. I appreciate that.

Mr. LUGAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. LUGAR. I wish to join my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, in seeking the authorization for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 to fully fund the United States-West German student exchange program.

This program originates in an initiative to deepen the people-to-people contacts that are fundamental to the continuing mutual understanding and alliance between our two nations. The German-American relationship is unique. It is founded on the rubble of the Second World War, on the experience of occupation and reconstruction, on the reintegration of West Germany into Western Europe, and, since 1945, of two generations of burden-sharing in the common effort to counter the Soviet military threat in Europe. These experiences have forged an understanding between our two nations rare in its depth and quality. As this relationship has matured, however, observers on both sides of the Atlantic have long pondered the question of how the postwar generations, with different histories and perceptions, would sustain an understanding which has long been a principal foundation of the North Atlantic Alliance and of a stable peace in Europe.

This program is one small, but significant, contribution to this effort. Involved will be only some 535 American and 520 German students annually, at small cost—but that is over 1,000 a year, over 10,000 in a decade, multiplied by the families of the students, multiplied again by the host families, and multiplied again by friends and high school classmates. The potential cumulative importance of a program of this nature was repeatedly emphasized to me by German officials during my visit there earlier this month, and we should note that the Bundestag has already provided funding for the German half of the exchange. It is appropriate that we today—in this, the year in which we commemorate the tricentennial of German immigration to the United States—meet the Bundestag halfway. The exchange program will be a living legacy of the tricentennial year.

I hasten to remind my colleagues that among exchange programs this one is unique—it is a congressional initiative, proposed by Congress, whose participants will be chosen by Congress, and whose German guests will reside in each of the States and congressional districts. We passed the resolution urging creation of this program, it is our obligation to fund it—particularly when our German counterparts have invested so much in it.

I urge the support of all Senators for this amendment.

Mr. President, I would simply reiterate the importance that my distinguished colleague has placed upon this program. I have in fact just returned from the Federal Republic of Germany. As a part of the tricentennial celebration, the Bundestag is most hopeful that 500 German youth will come to the United States and that Germany, indeed, may be host for 535 of our youth representing each Member of the Senate and each Member of the House of Representatives. This is an extraordinary opportunity in the life of our relationship with the Federal Republic of Germany. It is one not to be missed.

Essentially, the Congress in its wisdom has affirmed the desirability of the program. In various ways the funding had been left out. This remedies that part, and I am hopeful our colleagues will unanimously affirm the strength of our friendship with Germany at this crucial point.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President. When Charles Wick, Director of the USIA, this morning put on a presentation before the Foreign Relations Committee, the centerpiece of it was videotapes showing the value of youth exchanges. I believe this amendment is very consistent with the objectives of the administration. The addition will not take the totals of the bill S. 1342 over the President's requested levels. Therefore, I accept the amendment on behalf of the majority. I turn to my

distinguished colleague to speak on behalf of the minority.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I am not only delighted to join my senior colleague from Illinois in accepting this amendment on behalf of the minority, but also I want to advise my distinguished friends, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. HEINZ) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), what while the name Dixon may be somewhat misleading, they should know that my mother was a Tebbenhoff and her mother before her was a Washausen. I would be honored to cosponsor the amendment with my distinguished colleagues.

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON), particularly in light of his distinguished ancestry which makes him an even more distinguished Member of this body than I had previously realized, be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I should like to point out that my grandmother was born in Stuttgart. Though my name is Percy, my mother married an Englishman. Does that qualify me for half distinction then or to be half cosponsor? I would be happy to cosponsor the amendment.

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, I make the same request on behalf of the even more distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and majority manager of the bill (Mr. PERCY).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, both distinguished Senators from Illinois will be added as cosponsors.

Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2187) was agreed to.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I believe that Senator LUGAR would like to be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana, who has the floor, yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. McCLURE. I have to chair a committee hearing starting at 2 o'clock. Is there any possibility I might offer an amendment that has been given to the Chair?

Mr. PERCY. Senator LUGAR as well would like to be next. If he would yield, I would be happy to have the Senator from Idaho bring up his amendment.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I need to bring the delegation of Europeans up to the floor as soon as I complete this action.

Mr. McCLURE. I understand. I am informed by committee staff that it is a noncontroversial amendment, and if it should prove to be otherwise I would be happy to take it down temporarily and yield back.

Mr. LUGAR. I would be happy to yield. I hope I might proceed immediately thereafter.

Mr. McCLURE. I thank the Senator from Indiana very sincerely and the Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 2188

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCLURE) proposes an amendment numbered 2188:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

The President shall prepare and transmit to the Congress a report on the record of Soviet compliance or non-compliance with the letter and spirit of all existing arms control agreements to which the Soviet Union is a party.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, there are at the rear of the Chamber some charts that indicate a kind of summary record of concerns that many of us have about Soviet violations of existing arms control treaties. This is a subject upon which I have spoken at length a number of times in the past. A similar amendment was proposed when we had the resolution in condemnation of the Soviet Union on the floor.

It was the desire of many Senators that that be reported clean, as was ultimately the case; it was reported without amendments. Even in the presence of that request, 45 Members of the Senate voted in favor of this subject at that time.

Mr. President, my amendment to require the President to report to Congress is the culmination of a long effort I have made to have the President inform the Senate about whether or not the Soviets are violating arms control agreements, including the SALT II Treaty, the SALT I ABM Treaty, the threshold Test Ban Treaty, and the Kennedy-Khrushchev agreement of 1962. I ask unanimous consent that the letter to the President of June 22, 1983, with 34 cosigners, be printed in the RECORD, together with the President's response of August 3, 1983. I also ask unanimous consent that my response to the President's letter of September 10 be printed in the RECORD, together with my letter of August 1, 1983, to the President and his response of August 10, 1983, as well as letters from Senator SYMMS to the President.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., June 22, 1983.

Hon. RONALD REAGAN,
The President,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We strongly support your efforts to thoroughly study the problem of Soviet compliance with arms control treaties in the National Security Council Verification Panel. Preserving the integrity of the arms control process is of great importance.

We sent you a letter on May 12, 1981 questioning Soviet compliance with the SALT I Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. Since then, there have been many reports of new Soviet violations or circumventions of SALT and other control treaties.

In testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on June 15, 1983, Secretary of State Shultz criticized "Moscow's continuing practice of stretching a series of treaties and agreements to the brink of violation and beyond." Schultz added that the United States is "becoming increasingly concerned about Soviet practices—including the recent testing of ICBMs—that raise questions about the validity of their claim of compliance with existing SALT agreements."

Mr. President, we respectfully request that you continue your NSC studies in order to answer our original letter and any other Congressional letters on Soviet arms control compliance. We are sure that you agree that the Congress and the American people have a right to know if the Soviets are violating or circumventing SALT treaties.

With warmest personal regards.

Sincerely,

James A. McClure, Jake Garn, Steve Symms, Gordon Humphrey, Chuck Grassley, Jesse Helms, Chic Hecht, Mark Andrews, Bill Cohen, Rudy Boschwitz, Jeremiah Denton, Don Nickles, Frank H. Murkowski, Ted Stevens, John P. East, Orrin G. Hatch, Paula Hawkins, Bob Dole, Mack Mattingly, Roger W. Jepsen, Dan Quayle, Pete V. Domenici, Bob Kasten, Bill Armstrong, Strom Thurmond, Malcolm Wallop, Jim Abdnor, Paul Laxalt, Paul Trible, Larry Pressler, Alfonse D'Amato, Warren B. Rudman, Dick Lugar, Pete Wilson, U.S. Senators.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1983.

Hon. JAMES A. McCLURE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: Thank you for your letter of June 22, 1983, and for your support of our efforts to deal with the problem of ensuring Soviet compliance with arms control treaties.

I firmly believe that our security requires that we do not agree to treaties that we cannot effectively verify. Hence, one of the key principles of arms control that I have set down is that we will seek only agreements that include effective means of verification. I will not submit unverifiable treaties to the Senate for ratification.

Similarly, it is critical that the Soviet Union comply in full measure with obligations undertaken in current treaties and agreements. Where questions of compliance exist, I will pursue each issue until it is resolved satisfactorily.

As you know, I have established the National Security Council Arms Control Verification Committee to address verification and compliance issues in a systematic way.

This group is currently conducting a comprehensive study of Soviet compliance with existing treaties and agreements. A priority task for the group is to study in depth those issues you and your colleagues have identified.

We will keep you apprised as the work progresses.

Again, thank you for your letter and for your continuing support on this crucial matter.

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C., September 10, 1983.

Hon. RONALD REAGAN,
The President,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you for your letter of August 3, 1983 replying to the letter of June 22 signed by 34 Republican Senators on Soviet SALT violations. I especially appreciate the statement you make in your letter that you "firmly believe that our security requires that we do not agree to treaties that we cannot effectively verify." Further, I strongly support your statement that you "will not submit unverifiable treaties to the Senate for ratification."

On September 16, 1982, the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency conceded in a letter to U.S. Senators that since 1979, U.S. SALT verification capabilities had been degraded. The ACDA letter went on to say that:

"The most recent analyses of the verifiability of SALT II . . . is a 1979 [Carter Administration] verification study. There are *no* current plans to carry out a systematic review and updating of these analyses." (Emphasis added.)

Mr. President, the Carter Administration only believed in "adequate" SALT verification. In view of your own expressed concern about "effective verification" of arms control treaties, and the acknowledged verification degradations, why has your Administration not completely redone the Carter Administration's SALT verification study?

Another notable admission was made in the same ACDA letter to Senators. ACDA stated:

"The Administration is currently engaged in an intensive study of the verification provisions which *will* be required for START and INF proposals *on the table* in Geneva." (Emphasis added.)

This statement suggests that the U.S. has already proposed START and INF positions to the Soviets, without having first made the determination of whether or not our START and INF proposals are verifiable.

Mr. President, I would respectfully like to ask two questions. First, especially in light of your own press conference statement on January 29, 1981, that "there is no verification—of the unratified SALT II Treaty—as to the number of warheads on [Soviet] missiles, no method for us to do this," why have you not ordered a re-evaluation of the verifiability of the SALT II Treaty? Second, why has the U.S. made START and INF proposals without having first determined their verifiability?

Thank you for your prompt attention to these questions.

With warmest personal regards.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. MCCLURE,
U.S. Senator.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1983.

Hon. RONALD REAGAN,
The President,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have just been informed that the US has requested a Special Session of the SALT Standing Consultative Commission (SCC) with the USSR. The purpose of this Special SCC Session, to begin in early August, 1983, is to discuss probable Soviet non-compliance with the SALT II Treaty, and also with the SALT I ABM Treaty. The two principal issues will reportedly be the new Soviet PL-5 ICBM, and the new Soviet ABM Battle-Management radar.

My position that the PL-5 is a Soviet SALT II violation is well known to you. I am enclosing my recent statement on the new Soviet ABM Battle-Management radar, together with a twenty-two year old article by Fred Ikle entitled "After Detection—What?" The new Soviet ABM radar is the most flagrant Soviet SALT violation yet. Indeed, it is not possible to envision any other Soviet action that would be as clear-cut a SALT violation as the new Soviet Radar, which violates 3 to 5 elements of the SALT I ABM Treaty.

Mr. President, in view of the seriousness of these Soviet actions, I urgently request that you arrange for the Vice President to conduct a special briefing of the entire Senate in closed session as soon as possible, so that the Senate can be aware of the evidence of Soviet SALT violations and your intended course of action in dealing with these grave threats to US national security. I am also making this request of Senator Howard Baker, Majority Leader.

With warmest personal regards.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. MCCLURE,
U.S. Senator.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1983.

Hon. JAMES A. MCCLURE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLURE: This is to acknowledge your August 1 letter urging the President to arrange for the Vice President to conduct a special briefing of the entire Senate in closed session, as soon as possible, on the matter of Soviet SALT violations.

Your letter has been brought to the President's direct attention, and we are now sharing your comments with the appropriate advisers for a prompt and careful review. I assure you that your request will be given priority consideration.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

KENNETH M. DUBERSTEIN,
Assistant to the President.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., August 12, 1983.

Hon. RONALD REAGAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Recent press reports describe a new Soviet Anti-Ballistic Missile radar allegedly being built in violation of the 1972 SALT I ABM Treaty. These reports suggest the existence of a clear-cut, overt violation of the ABM Treaty entailing as many as five key provisions.

Mr. President, I wrote to you on April 4, 1983 about a whole series of Soviet ABM Treaty violations. I have yet to receive any response. Meanwhile, my constituents have expressed concern about Soviet violations of the SALT I ABM Treaty. Several additional questions have arisen in my mind:

(1) When the second, five-year ABM Treaty review was conducted last fall with the Soviets in the SALT Standing Consultive Commission (SCC), did the Soviets admit to the U.S. that they had a sixth ABM battle-management radar then under construction? If not, does this silence constitute yet another serious case of Soviet deception?

(2) Are there any lessons for the present from Winston Churchill's alarums in the 1930s about Nazi rearmament in violation of several arms control agreements?

(3) Would you support Senate Armed Services Committee hearings on the military implications of current Soviet ABM activity?

(4) A letter to me by Ken Duberstein dated November 10, 1982, states that the U.S. can propose amendments to the Treaty at any time. Do you agree?

Mr. President, thank you for considering these urgent questions.

With warmest personal regards,

STEVE SYMMS,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1983.

Hon. RONALD REAGAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I strongly congratulate you on your recent public statements that the Soviets are violating five arms control treaties. You have exercised statesmanlike leadership in the highest tradition of the American Presidency.

You have made the following positive statements on Soviet arms control treaty violations:

(1) Soviet violation of the unratified SALT II Treaty.

President Reagan, press breakfast, February 23, 1983, on Soviet flight testing of a second new type ICBM in violation of SALT II: ". . . This last one comes the closest to indicating that it is a violation . . ."

President Reagan, speech, March 31, 1983: "And I am sorry to say, there have been increasingly serious grounds for questioning their (i.e., Soviet) compliance with the arms control agreements that have already been signed and that we have both pledged to uphold. I may have more to say on this in the near future . . ."

The Washington Post of April 1, 1983, added: "Administration officials said the President was referring to reported Soviet deployment of the *SS-16* missile and the testing of *two types of missiles,* instead of one, in *violation* of the SALT II Treaty." (Emphasis added.)

The Washington Post of April 3, 1983, noted: "An interagency study group is likely to report to President Reagan that the Soviet Union has *violated* the terms of the unratified SALT II Treaty limiting nuclear arms. Administration sources said last night, . . . in the panel's thinking, that test (i.e., on February 8 of a a second Soviet new type ICBM) is a *violation* . . ." (Emphasis added.)

(2) Soviet violation of the Kennedy-Khrushchev Agreement of October 28, 1962.

This agreement would "halt further introduction of such weapons systems (i.e., Soviet offensive weapons which Khrushchev defined as including Soviet troops) into Cuba as "firm undertakings" on the part of "both" the U.S. and the Soviet governments. President Reagan press conference,

May, 1982: ". . . You know, there's been other things we think are violations also of the 1962 Agreement."

(3) Soviet violation of the Threshold Test Ban Treaty of 1974.

President Reagan stated on March 28, 1983: ". . . We have reason to believe that there have been numerous violations . . ."

(4 and 5) Soviet violations of the Biological and Chemical Warfare Conventions of 1975 and 1925.

President Reagan, January 26, 1983: ". . . There is overwhelming evidence of Soviet violations of international treaties concerning chemical and biological weapons."

President Reagan, June 17, 1982: "The Soviet Union and their allies are violating the Geneva Protocol of 1925 . . . and the 1972 Biological Warfare Convention. There is conclusive evidence . . ."

Finally, President Reagan made the following statement on general Soviet compliance with arms control treaties, May 9, 1982: "So far, the Soviet Union has used arms control negotiations primarily as an instrument to restrict U.S. defense programs and in conjunction with their own arms buildup, as a means to enhance Soviet power and prestige. Unfortunately, for some time suspicions have grown that the Soviet Union has not been living up to its obligations under existing arms control treaties."

In view of your above positive statements, I am puzzled, however, by an article in The Washington Post of April 2, 1983. It was reported by White House spokesmen that you met privately with Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin sometime in February. The meeting was intended "to assure him (Dobrynin) of U.S. determination to improve East-West relations," according further to White House officials. Your above statements on Soviet arms control violations suggest that it is the Soviets who should be the diplomatic demandeurs for better relations, not the U.S. Indeed, it would be disappointing if you did not mention the pattern of Soviet arms control non-compliance at this meeting.

In March, 1983, Henry Kissinger, writing in Time, said in regard to the Soviet response to his own arms control proposals: ". . . One of three conclusions is inescapable: (a) Their (Soviet) arms program aims for strategic superiority if not by design, then by momentum; (b) they believe strategic edges can be translated into political advantages; (c) arms control to the Soviets is an aspect of political warfare whose aim is not reciprocal stability but unilateral advantage."

Kissinger's assessment of Soviet arms control behavior, especially as applied to the history of arms control, is sound.

Mr. President, on May 12, 1981, twenty-one Senators wrote to you inquiring about whether Soviet construction of five large Anti-Ballistic Missile Battle Management Radars violated the 1972 ABM Treaty. (letter attached.) In early January, 1981, the Joints Chiefs of Staff reported to Congress that:

"Soviet phased array radars, which may be designed to improve impact predictions and target handling *capabilities for ABM battle management,* are under construction at *various locations throughout the USSR. These radars could perform some battle management functions* as well as provide redundant ballistic missile early warning coverage. The first of these radars is expected to become operational in the early 1980s." (Emphasis added.)

Article I of the ABM Treaty states: ". . . Each Party undertakes not to deploy ABM systems for a *defense of the terrority of its country* and not to provide a *base for such a defense . . .*" (Emphasis added.)

The above JCS statement, made at the end of the Carter Administration, strongly implies that the Soviets are in violation of Article I of the ABM Treaty, by deploying ABM Battle Management Radars which are a base for a defense of its national territory.

For a year, no answer was received to the May 12, 1981 letter from 21 Senators. In early 1982, another letter was sent to you requesting that you answer the May 12, 1981 letter from the 21 Senators. Still, there is no answer to the May 12, 1981 letter—almost two years later.

On September 15, 1982 The Washington Times reported a John Lofton interview with the chief architect of the SALT I ABM Treaty, Dr. Henry Kissinger. Kissinger was asked if the Soviets had ever violated the ABM Treaty. Kissinger answered: "On actual violations, I'm familiar with one . . ." This Soviet ABM Treaty violation was, he explained, Soviet flight-testing of Surface to Air Missiles in the prohibited ABM mode. Thus, the Soviets have already violated the ABM Treaty, in the opinion of Kissinger, whose reference was to over 50 illegal SAM-5 ABM mode tests between 1973 and 1975.

On September 16, 1982, three Senators wrote to you requesting that you delay the second five-year review of the ABM Treaty scheduled for last November. (This letter is also enclosed.) We requested that the review be deferred until after the MX deployment decision was made, in order to keep open the option to deploy an ABM defense around MX. But the recommendation of our letter was ignored, and the ABM Treaty review proceeded as scheduled, reportedly between November 9 and December 15, 1982 in the SALT Standing Consultative Commission.

The March, 1983 issue of the Heritage Foundation's National Security Record reports on page 5 that the State Department stated: "The U.S. and the Soviet Union . . . announced the completion of their review of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty."

But this review was conducted totally in secret with the Russians. Your long standing failure to answer the letter to the 21 Senators questioning Soviet compliance with the ABM Treaty may help to explain why the review was conducted in secret. Is it possible that the U.S. has again acquiesced in Soviet SALT violations? But the Senate's Constitutional role in treaty-making and appropriations for the "Common Defense" suggests that a report to the Senate on Soviet compliance with the ABM Treaty would be warranted. Indeed, there are serious questions raised by the delay in such a report and the secret nature of the ABM Treaty review.

Another factor also suggests the advisability of a report to the Senate on Soviet ABM Treaty compliance. Soviet leader Yuri Andropov recently unjustifiably stated that your recently announced U.S. space-based ABM concept is a U.S. violation of the ABM Treaty. It would be ironic if it turned out that the Soviet Union was violating the ABM Treaty today in the present, while falsely accusing the U.S. of ABM Treaty violations which were still in the conceptual phase and 15 to 20 years away from development or deployment. Thus, a Presidential report to the Senate on Soviet compliance could affect the debate over a U.S. space-based ABM defense, and other defense and arms control proposals.

There is a further matter of concern. The Wall Street Journal of Friday, March 25, 1983, reported: "There is even a possibility that the Soviets themselves are in violation of the ABM Treaty, or nearly so, with a missile, the SA-12, soon to be in production, that may have the capability of intercepting ICBMs."

Mr. President, the above concerns require me to reiterate the questions raised in the May 12, 1981 letter from 21 Senators, and to add some new questions. I request that you answer these questions as soon as possible, so that the Senate can more fully deliberate on the requirements for the "Common Defense:"

(1) Do the five Soviet ABM Battle Management Radar by now almost completed provide a base for a Soviet nationwide ABM defense? Do they violate Article I of the ABM Treaty?

(2) Did the numerous ABM-mode tests of the Soviet SAM-5 between 1973 and 1975 violate the ABM Treaty, as even Dr. Kissinger has conceded?

(3) Do the Soviets have in series production and deployment around Moscow a mobile or a rapidly deployable new ABM system, the ABM-3? Are mobile ABMs banned by the ABM Treaty? Does this production of a rapidly deployable or mobile ABM also provide them with the base for a nationwide ABM defense, also in violation of Article I?

(4) Did the Soviets test the SAM-10 in a prohibited ABM mode?

(5) Has the SAM-12 been tested in an ABM mode, and is it capable of intercepting ballistic missile re-entry vehicles? Does the Intelligence Community believe that the SAM-12 can intercept Pershing re-entry vehicles? Are Pershing re-entry vehicles similar to Poseidon and Trident I SLBM re-entry vehicles? Is the SAM-12 therefore an ABM system, which is mobile and about to be deployed nationwide?

(6) Do the five ABM Battle Management Radars have the capability to contribute to the use of SAM-5s, SAM-10s, SAM-12s, and ABM-3s as ABM interceptors in a nationwide ABM defense? If the five ABM Battle Management Radars and the SAM and ABM interceptor systems are being mass produced and widely deployed, do the Soviets now have a nationwide ABM defense in violation of the ABM Treaty? Have they already broken out of the ABM Treaty?

(7) Have the Soviets violated the ABM Treaty with SAM upgrade tests (as Henry Kissinger has conceded), ABM Battle Management Radars, ABM camouflage and concealment, creation of a new ABM test range without prior agreement, and falsification of ABM deactivation?

(8) If the Soviets have violated the ABM Treaty, why have you never answered the letter from the 21 Senators? Has there been a cover-up of Soviet SALT violations?

(9) Did the last ABM Treaty review conclude that the Soviets have violated the ABM Treaty? If not, why not? If so, why was this not reported to the Senate and the American people?

Thank you, Mr. President, for your prompt answers to these important questions.

Very respectfully,

STEVE SYMMS,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., September 16, 1982.
President RONALD REAGAN,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We believe that it is strategically and politically unwise for the September 1982 ABM Treaty review with the Soviets to occur before the December 1, 1982 MX deployment decision. We request that you postpone the ABM Treaty review until after the MX deployment decision is made, so as to ensure that all options for defending America's number one defense program are protected.

It is now time to make a hard decison on compliance with the unratified SALT II Treaty versus MX deployment. In view of the Administration's decisions to redesign the B-1B bomber to comply with SALT II, to unilaterally deactivate 292 strategic delivery vehicles counted in SALT II, to limit the MX throw-weight and payload in accordance with SALT II, and to accept cancellation of deployment of 50 Minuteman III ICBMs in accordance with SALT II, we are concerned that SALT II may also constrain MX Densepack deployment. Are you willing to set aside SALT II and renegotiate the SALT I ABM Treaty, in order to deploy the MX in the densepack mode with an ABM defense?

With warmest personal regards,

STEVEN D. SYMMS.
JESSE HELMS.
JOHN P. EAST.

SOVIET SALT CHEATING: THE NEW EVIDENCE

At the very time proponents of arms control agreements with the Soviet Union are urging ratification of SALT II and progress at the START negotiations at the expense of rigorous verification standards, there is new evidence of Soviet violations of the 1972 SALT I Antiballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. Instead of protesting this Soviet cheating, the Reagan Administration has been strangely silent and the Congress has ignored the unambiguous signs of Soviet nuclear warfighting preparations.

Recent photographs taken by a U.S. surveillance satellite on a routine sweep of the eastern Soviet Union reveal the construction of an immense radar system deep inside the Soviet Union north of the Mongolian border. This new radar system is targeted toward Alaska and uses advanced "phase-array" technology which will enhance Soviet abilities to predict impact areas of incoming warheads and improve target handling capabilities for ABM battle-management. Construction of the new radar complex with a transmitter building almost 500 feet long and 300 feet wide violates the ABM Treaty. Article I prohibits any ABM system for territorial defense; Article II defines radars with an ABM role to apply to this type of system; Article VI proscribes deployment "in the future of radars for *early warning* of strategic missile attack except at locations *along the periphery* of . . . the national territory and oriented outward." (Emphasis added.)

This new radar system has clear ABM battle-management capabilities; it is almost identical with large missile tracking radars now being tested at Pechora in the Soviet Northwest, at Lyaki close to the Caspian Sea and two other locations. It closes the gap of coverage against incoming U.S. land- and sea-based missiles targeted against eastern Soviet territory and, together with already existing radar sites, will soon enable the Soviets to mount a formidable antiballistic missile defense against a retaliatory strike by the United States. When combined with growing Soviet first-strike capabilities against U.S. land-based ICBMs and vigorous Soviet preparations for civil defense, it becomes apparent that the Soviets are on the verge of acquiring all major elements for the potential to wage nuclear war against the United States at tolerable costs. An effective Soviet ABM capability will expose the United States to Soviet nuclear blackmail and jeopardize U.S. ability to counter Soviet threats to strategically vital regions of the world.

This new evidence reinforces longstanding concerns about systematic Soviet violations of the ABM Treaty. Battlefield management radars are the long leadtime component of any ABM defense system and the Soviets seem to have gained a great deal of experience in this field since 1975 when they installed an ABM-X-3 radar in the Kamchatka impact area for their ICBM tests. Over the years, the Soviets have also been upgrading their surface-to-air (SAM) bomber defense systems—now presumed to perform an ABM role. Since the Carter Administration, the Soviets repeatedly have tested various types of SAM missiles in a discernable ABM mode at altitudes above 100,000 feet and have deployed thousands of less capable SA-5 missiles around Soviet cities. These illegal ABM activities and the development of an anti-tactical ballistic missile system clearly point to a Soviet decision to subvert the ABM Treaty shortly after signing it.

Refusals to acknowledge these Soviet treaty violations point to the perennial dilemma of what to do after detecting cheating. The Administration is doing itself and the country no favor by refusing to acknowledge the mounting evidence that the Soviets are developing a capability which seriously erodes strategic stability and will soon permit the Soviet Union to break out of the ABM Treaty. The Administration should document and publicize Soviet ABM activities and Treaty violations. It should accelerate the U.S. ballistic missile defense (BDM) program. Unless Moscow can refute the evidence that its radar and weapons programs are not designed for an ABM role, the U.S. should abrogate the ABM Treaty.

MANFRED HAMM,
Policy Analyst.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, there are unclassified reports, some confirmed by the White House, that there are numerous Soviet SALT violations. I ask unanimous consent that the White House policy guidance on Soviet SALT violations dated August 3 be printed in the RECORD, together with several newspaper articles.

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

ARMS CONTROL POLICY, COMPLIANCE WITH EXISTING AGREEMENTS: SALT AND NUCLEAR TESTING

[From the White House, Aug. 3, 1983]

Serious concern raised about Soviet compliance with existing agreements. Senior-level Verification Committee reviewing broad range of issues.

Soviets tested a missile on February 8, May 5, and May 31 which is different from the new type ICBM tested in October, 1982. This missile appears different from ICBMs currently deployed.

We are still evaluating data on the ICBM tests, interagency group considering data. We are concerned about consistency with SALT II and of these tests and certain ABM activity with SALT I.

We have raised concerns with Soviets. As the President indicated, the information they have provided to date does not satisfy our concerns.

We also have concerns about nuclear testing issues and are seeking to strengthen verification provisions.

CHEMICAL AND TOXIN WEAPONS ("YELLOW RAIN")

We are convinced by detailed, independent and scientific analysis of evidence that the Soviets are using chemical and toxin weapons in Afghanistan and are involved in their use by Vietnamese and Lao forces in Southeast Asia in violation of human rights, international law and existing arms control agreements.

Use of chemical and toxin weapons in Laos dates from the mid-1970s, in Kampuchea from 1978 and in Afghanistan from 1979.

The 1925 Geneva Protocol prohibits use of these weapons and the 1972 Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BWC) prohibits possession, as well as use, of toxin weapons.

The United States, after unsuccessful diplomatic efforts with the governments involved to halt the use of these weapons, began reporting the evidence to the Congress, the United Nations and publicly.

Our objectives in continuing to draw world attention to this issue are to try to obtain a halt in these illegal activities; to strengthen and promote compliance with existing international agreements on these weapons; and to extend legal constraints further by achieving an effective, comprehensive ban on chemical weapons.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 16, 1983]

SOVIET ABM BREAKOUT

In developing and supplying "yellow rain" for use against primitive Hmong tribesmen and Afghan freedom fighters, the Soviet Union treated chemical and biological weapons treaties with brazen contempt. Now evidence is growing that it has taken the same attitude toward the anti-ballistic missile limitations in the first Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty.

The ABM limitation in SALT-I is the granddaddy of nuclear-arms control. Signed in 1972 by President Richard Nixon and Leonid Brezhnev, it has been cited as the most successful arms-control agreement and perhaps the one most central to strategic weapons balance between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. It provides sharp limitations on the deployment of anti-ballistic missile systems to shoot down incoming missile warheads. Each side is allowed only one ABM system with not more than 100 launchers. Since this means a system can always be saturated with 101 warheads, the U.S. has entirely forsaken its one system, while the Soviets have built an ABM around Moscow and have been energetically upgrading it these last few years.

Within the past few months, however, U.S. intelligence has detected a new ABM radar at Abalakovo, far away from Moscow but near fields of SS-19, SS-11 and SS-18 intercontinental missiles. The installation, larger than a football field, has apparently been under construction for two years, though detected only recently.

The Abalakovo radar is the most clear-cut violation of the ABM treaty to date. The treaty provides that large phased-array radars of this type can be deployed only along the national periphery and "oriented outward," so they can be used for early warning systems but not ABM battle management. The Abalakovo radar is located in the central U.S.S.R. about 500 miles north of Mongolia and 3,000 miles from the Pacific coast.

Even more significantly, the Abalakovo radar is not the first but the sixth large phased-array radar completed or under construction in the Soviet Union. The others have been known to the U.S. but were either arguably on the periphery or otherwise allowed under the treaty. Large phased-array radars are already in operation at Pechora near the Caspian Sea. Lyaki in the northwest and Misheleka in the far east. In addition, ABM radars, presumably permitted by the treaty, are Saryshagan at the Soviet's test range in central U.S.S.R. and the Pushkino system now being constructed near Moscow. The Abalakovo radar, which cannot be rationalized under the treaty, is aimed over the northeastern U.S.S.R. toward Alaska, and would fill in the final gap in an ABM radar network covering almost the entire Soviet Union.

All six radars are practically identical, housed in structures about 500 feet wide and more than 100 feet high resembling decapitated pyramids. They have tremendous range and can provide not only early warning of an attack but also can help direct the firing of anti-ballistic missiles to bring down the incoming missiles. Indeed, the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff said in January 1981 that the radars then under construction "may be designed to improve impact predictions and target handling capabilities for ABM battle management." This warning came even before discovery of the Abalakovo radar.

Besides the radars, the Soviets also have tested a variety of surface-to-air missiles in an ABM mode, in violation of the treaty, including the SAM-10 and SAM-12. These missiles are mobile, which is another treaty violation, and are now in mass production. Around Moscow, the Soviets are deploying the ABM-3 system of SHO-4 and SHO-8 missiles along with mobile radars; more than 100 silos have been sighted, which may be another violation of the limits on the number of silos allowed by the ABM treaty. The Soviets have also tested rapidly reloading these silos in two hours, yet another violation.

Last Friday Sen. Steve Symms wrote to President Reagan that the latest reports "suggest the existence of a clear-cut overt violation of the ABM treaty entailing as many as five key provisions." And the Abalakovo violation adds urgency to the warning Sen. James McClure issued on the Senate floor last month that the Soviets "are in fact already deploying a nationwide ABM defense."

Now, the ABM limits have never been our favorite arms-control idea. But it certainly changes the strategic balance if the Soviets build an ABM while we abide by a treaty outlawing it. In light of a Soviet ABM, we need to think about missile defense of our own, and about how to secure our retaliatory power—probably with flocks of small and highly accurate cruise missiles to fly under these defenses. But, more broadly, we need to spend less of our time and energy on negotiating treaties with people who break them, and more on securing our own defense and retaliatory power.

[From the Washington Times, Aug. 8, 1983]

RIGHT BEFORE OUR EYES

There is no longer much doubt that the Soviets are developing an ABM defense system. The latest indication comes from a routine satellite scan of part of Siberia, dutifully reported by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak in a column quickly entered into the Congressional Record at the request of Sen. James McClure, R-Idaho.

There, about 500 miles north of the Mongolian border, rises a tremendous new radar U.S. experts believe has the capability to act as an ABM battle management system. Article I of the SALT I ABM treaty states that "Each party undertakes not to deploy ABM systems for a defense of the terrritory of its country and not to provide a base for such a defense." But so what? This is, in Lenin's words, just one more pie crust broken.

For as McClure instructed his colleagues, Soviet ABM battle management radars reportedly now number five or six. Coupled with missiles already illegally tested in the ABM mode and deployed around the country, the Soviets have a pretty good jump on a project both they and the U.S. considered well worth banning. In other words, a project well worth developing if your adversary alone holds to the agreement. It's the old story of agreements we honor and they don't.

So isn't it time for the U.S. to raise some of the same complaints that attended Reagan's "Star Wars" speech—arguments that insisted that for one nation to develop a protective shield not employed by the other was to court disaster? The ABM system the Soviets are busy developing clearly gives them an advantage over the U.S. Why no denunciation?

It seems that the only player allowed to break the rules in this treaty-happy world is the Soviet Union, with whom we now negotiate, supposedly in good faith. There seems to be a sense that there is some odd virtue in seeing wrongdoing and not making waves. Or is it that we have assumed the characteristic of the child who sees a phantom in the night, and is too scared to cry out, much less to act?

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 17, 1983]

A "SMOKING GUN" IN SIBERIA?

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Disregarding risks to next year's election campaign, President Reagan has quietly signaled national security adviser William Clark to damn the torpedoes and go full speed ahead in challenging the Soviet Union to explain apparent violations of nuclear treaties with the United States.

Not surprisingly, Reagan's admonition was music to Clark, whose ears are finely tuned to the question of the Soviet Union's playing fast and loose with the SALT treaties. Intimates say Clark has reluctantly concluded that evidence of a massive new Soviet radar—this one in central Siberia—looks like "smoking gun" evidence of Soviet cheating on the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty.

What surprised hard-line Reaganauts was not Clark but the fact that Secretary of State George Shultz and Foggy Bottom's Soviet experts are also convinced that the long-suspected smoking gun may now be in hand. That ends more than three months of high-level vacillation on whether Reagan should risk going to the mat with the Russians on SALT violations. With Clark and Shultz—backed by the Pentagon and the CIA—now agreeing, only the politicians warn the president to go slow.

But warnings that taking the Kremlin to the woodshed could damage Reagan's political prospects by putting confrontation back in vogue cut little ice with the president. What the politicians have had in mind is continuation of the gradual—if meaningless—warming trend between Ronnie and Yuri to be followed by a Reagan-Andropov summit extravaganza sometime before mid-year 1984.

That would finally remove the Ghengis Khan cloak draped over Reagan's shoulders in the 1980 campaign and replace it with the olive branch of peace, Reagan campaign strategists have been trying to advance that political scenario for months, led by White House deputy chief of staff Michael K. Deaver.

The latest fact to intrude on Deaver's dream of running Reagan for reelection as the peace candidate was the discovery by U.S. spy satellites of a major Soviet radar installation that is a clear violation of the ABM Treaty. The White House was alerted July 15 with a cautiously worded statement from the intelligence community that the new radar base "appears to be inconsistent" with the treaty.

Far tougher language is used at high levels of the State Department to describe the new radar base, which resembles five others, including the battle-management radar covering Moscow. The Moscow radar is linked to a missile-defense system—the sole anti-missile system permitted by the ABM Treaty.

At State, officials make no pretense of underplaying the new radar. One top diplomat told us that the only question is whether the violation it represents is "pernicious" or something less. Except for the missile-defense system covering Moscow, the treaty permits only early-warning or tracking radars and requires them to be sited along the "periphery" of the Soviet Union.

The new Siberian radar station is aimed at the Pacific Coast facing Alaska, nearly 2,000 miles away, not at China, to the South. By itself, that is an airtight case of violating the ABM Treaty.

But the new radar also happens to be near several sites of intercontinental missiles. That suggests an intent to harness it to a missile defense system to protect those offensive missiles, a violation that would be clearly "pernicious."

As the new chairman of the President's top-level Arms Control Policy Group, the only interagency group he chairs, Clark will accept neither a "nyet" nor an undue delay from Moscow to the American request for an emergency U.S.-Soviet meeting. The United States wants to take up the radar question and other long-pending U.S. suspicions that the Russians are building new offensive missiles ruled out by SALT II.

Clark's impatience reflects the President's. Despite undercover planning for a pre-election summit, Reagan insists that the unresolved question of Soviet violations must be answered, whatever the impact on U.S.-Soviet cordiality. So long as Clark remains by his side, no one is likely to change his mind that the best 1984 politics is to tell the truth about Soviet deceit and let American voters make up their own minds.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 12, 1983]

UNITED STATES SEEKING SOVIET PARLEY ON ARMS VIOLATION ISSUES

(By Hedrick Smith)

WASHINGTON, Aug. 11.—The United States has taken the unusual step of asking the

Soviet Union for an urgent meeting of the joint arms control monitoring group to discuss possible Soviet violations of strategic nuclear arms treaties, but Moscow has not yet agreed, officials said today.

The officials said that Secretary of State George P. Shultz read a statement in late July to the Soviet chargé d'affaires, Oleg M. Sokolov, requesting that the monitoring group, which is known as the Special Consultative Committee, meet Aug. 11 to discuss three Soviet arms developments.

The committee, set up under the 1972 treaties on trategic arms limitation, normally meets in Geneva in the spring and fall. In addition to observing the 1972 pact, the two sides have informally agreed to carry out the provisions of a second treaty, signed in 1979, even though it has not been ratified.

LAST SPECIAL SESSION IN 1975

The United States sought a special session to underscore concern over Soviet weapons developments. The last special session was requested in 1975.

American officials said these were the three issues they wanted to raise:

Three tests of a new three-stage, solid-fuel intercontinental missile, the PL-5, that many American officials believe may violate the 1979 arms treaty.

The discovery this summer of a battle-management radar system in the interior of Siberia in possible violation of the 1972 anti-ballistic missile treaty, which firbids building such systems except on a country's periphery.

The possible deployment of the SS-16 missile system around Plesetsk, a move banned by the 1979 treaty.

The White House, in a memorandum given to members of the Senate on Aug. 3, said that the United States had "raised concerns with the Soviets" on these issues but that "the information they have provided to date does not satisfy our concerns."

The issue of possible Soviet violations of strategic arms limitation treaties has led to the setting up of a verification panel under William P. Clark, the President's national security adviser, and has become a point of contention among Senate conservatives.

In a letter to President Reagan on Aug. 3, Senator James A. McClure, Republican of Idaho, said the conservatives intended to ask Vice President Bush in the fall to "conduct a special briefing of the entire Senate in closed session as soon as possible."

Senator McClure, who has spoken out several times on these issues, said "the new Soviet ABM radar is the most flagrant Soviet SALT violation yet."

Under Article VI of the 1972 antibalistic missile treaty, each side agreed not to deploy future early-warning radars "except at locations along the periphery of its national territory." Each side has several such systems.

SPOTTED IN CENTRAL SIBERIA

Last month, American reconnaissance satellites spotted a radar system in central Siberia, 500 miles north of Mongolia and 1,900 miles from the Pacific, officials said. Senators were told the transmitter building was 500 feet long and 300 feet wide, indicating a large system.

The significance, officials said, is that peripheral radar systems can give early warning, but an inland system could be used to operate the single field of antiballistic missile defenses permitted each side and placed by the Russians around Moscow. This would upgrade the system beyond levels permitted by the 1972 pact.

Senate conservative sources said the new radar was 125 miles from a field of offensive missiles, close enough to become part of a second ABM system, if Moscow chose. Government officials said the evidence was insufficient to draw such a conclusion.

Lack of what President Reagan last spring called "hard and fast evidence" has kept the United States from publicly charging Soviet violations, although the President was sufficiently concerned March 31 to say there were "increasingly serious grounds for questioning" Soviet compliance.

DISPUTE OVER A NEW MISSILE

The key concern then was a Soviet test on Feb. 8 of the PL-5 missile. Previously, the Russians had begun tests of a larger, multiwarhead missile known as the SSX-24, identifying that as the one new intercontinental missile permitted under the 1979 treaty.

In early March, an American interagency panel concluded that the PL-5 was a second new missile and thus a violation of the 1979 agreement. After more high-level study, President Reagan decided in late April to pursue the issue through diplomatic channels.

According to American officials, the Russians contend that the PL-5 is a modernized version of the existing SS-13 missile, permitted under the 1979 agreement. More tests were run on May 5 and May 31.

The United States says the PL-5 exceeds provisions of the 1979 accord because it is much larger than the permitted modifications of the SS-13.

Dissatisfied with Soviet explanations and concerned about the new radar system, the United States sought the special meeting of the monitoring committee today.

[From UPI, Aug. 1, 1983]

WASHINGTON.—The State Department said Friday the existence of a new Soviet radar system raises serious questions about Soviet compliance with the treaty limiting anti-ballistic missile systems.

Sen. James McClure, R-Idaho, wrote President Reagan that the discovery by U.S. intelligence of a new, large radar installation in central Siberia appears to be "the most flagrant Soviet violation yet."

Under the 1972 anti-ballistic missile treaty, each side is limited to a system of radar and anti-missle weapons that guards the national command center. The United States has chosen not to build such a system, but the Soviets have.

A State Department spokesman said: "The existence of the radar does raise serious questions with respect to its consistency with the ABM treaty and the United States is studying this question in detail. It is the subject of diplomatic exchanges which of necessity remain confidential."

The new system, according to reports, is in central Siberia, too far from Moscow to be effective in guarding the city, but near enough to principal Soviet missile fields to protect them. That would be a violation of the 1972 agreement, in which both sides agreed to save themselves billions of dollars by outlawing such systems.

The State Department spokesman refused to confirm the details of the discovery because of the policy of not discussing intelligence matters.

[From the Washington Times, Aug. 17, 1983]

UNITED STATES, U.S.S.R. SEEK WAY OUT OF OBSOLETE 1972 ABM TREATY

(By Thomas D. Brandt)

There are signs in Washington and Moscow that both superpowers are considering ways to slip out of the ABM (anti-ballistic missile) treaty of 1972 as time, technology and new strategic thinking push the 13-year-old agreement to the edge of obsolescence.

The most obvious Soviet signal is the construction of a mammoth "battle management radar" which, because of its location 500 miles north of the Mongolian border, is thought by some U.S. analysts to have military value only as an ABM coordinator, and thus to be a treaty violation.

The radar complex, with a transmitter building nearly 500 feet long by 300 feet wide, could serve as part of the existing early warning system, but its location in the center of the nation argues for its use as an ABM radar.

The ABM treaty requires early warning radars to be near a country's borders, with their beams directed outward.

On the U.S. side, President Reagan in his "Star Wars" speech of March 23 called for new research on a high-technology ABM system. Research does not violate the treaty, but deployment of a system would.

The 1972 ABM treaty permits the United States and the Soviet Union to deploy one ABM system each. The U.S. system at Grand Forks, N.D., was retired in 1975. The Soviets have a system near Moscow.

The administration is clearly looking beyond the era of limits on ABM. This fits into the thinking of many conservative theorists, who for some time have been making the case for abrogation on strategy grounds, bolstered by the argument that technology now makes a wide-ranging ABM system feasible and affordable.

Either side can "break out" of the treaty with six months' notice, though neither is likely to act that directly and risk the appearance of being against arms control. It is more likely that one country will find sufficient treaty "violations" by the other side to justify moving on its own toward an ABM system.

That process is already in full swing in the United States, where Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., in 1982 and Sen. James McClure, R-Idaho, this year accused the Soviets of ABM violatins, specifically citing the new radar site that has been under construction for two years and under U.S. satellite surveillance.

The Heritage Foundation, a conservative think tank in Washington with ties to the administration, said this month that "the U.S. should abrogate the ABM treaty" unless the Soviets can "refute the evidence that its radar and weapons programs are not designed for an ABM role."

Besides the new radar, the Heritage Foundatin cited Soviet testing of surface-to-air missiles "in a discernible ABM mode at altitudes above 100,000 feet. . . ."

The point is that an incoming ICBM would be virtually the only target for a SAM capable of striking at that altitude.

Sen. Joseph Biden, D-Del., like Helms a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, recently predicted that the Reagan administration would unilaterally withdraw from the ABM treaty within the next several years because of charges of Soviet violations.

"That will be the rationale," he said during an August hearing on the nuclear-weapons freeze. "Joe Biden thinks that's what this administration has in mind."

Sen. Paul Tsongas, D-Mass., a liberal critic of the administration, followed Biden by saying that Reagan's call for new "defensive technologies," as the president called them, was leading the nation down the road to ABM violations.

Reagan hinted in his March speech at other reasons besides violations for breaking out of the treaty. Among the most persuasive is that it would move the superpowers away from a strategy of deterrence based on massive nuclear retaliation, and more toward a defensive policy of destroying incoming warheads.

"I call upon the scientific community in our country, those who gave us nuclear weapons, to turn their great talents now to the cause of mankind and world peace, to give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete," Reagan said in that televised address to the nation.

"This could pave the way for arms control measures to eliminate the weapons themselves," he added.

Despite the claims by the Heritage Foundation, McClure and others of Soviet ABM violations, the Reagan administration has not openly accused Moscow of breaking the treaty, though last Friday a State Department spokesman said the radar raises serious concerns.

"The existence of this radar does raise serious questions with respect to its consistency with the ABM treaty and the United States is discussing this question in detail," said department spokesman John Hughes.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 22, 1983]

SNARLING DÉTENTE

(By William Safire)

WASHINGTON, Sept. 21.—As Joan Rivers might say to Henry Kissinger: "Can we talk global strategy?"

Toward the end of the Brezhnev years, the Soviet Union was on a strategic roll. As U.S. armed forces atrophied, the Soviet arms buildup continued, and what had been rough parity was tipping toward Soviet superiority. In this period, Moscow made four far-reaching decisions:

(1) To take advantage of the post-Shah power vacuum in the Persian Gulf, the Kremlin launched its first overt invasion of a neighbor outside the Iron Curtain. The conquest of Afghanistan was answered by a U.S. grain embargo that was promptly undercut by France, Canada and Argentina; at seemingly low cost, the Russians threatened Pakistan and came within striking distance of the world's oil lifelines.

(2) To achieve military superiority over NATO, the Russians installed SS-20 missiles capable of leveling Europe's cities in a stroke. That effectively upset what had been the balance of power for a generation.

(3) To guarantee its superiority in intercontinental missiles, Moscow decided then to cheat on the 1972 antiballistic missile treaty, which limited missile defenses to a single national command center. Our intelligence recently spotted a major radar installation near ICBM sites in Siberia, aimed at Alaska and the U.S. coast; by tying this and other anti-missile radars into the battle-management ABM system in Moscow, the Russians make themselves less vulnerable to retaliation from a first strike at the U.S. They refuse to meet to discuss our objections to the new radars.

(4) To further the Communist penetration of Central America, Brezhnev ordered guerrilla cadres in El Salvador, supplied through Nicaragua and Cuba, to commence their offensive.

As Andropov took charge, Moscow's strategic roll ran out of luck. The record of power balances since 1982 looks like this:

(1) For the first time, the Kremlin is faced with five—count 'em, five anti-Communist insurgencies. Guerrilla forces supplied by the West or China are overthrowing or severely harassing Soviet puppet regimes in Angola, Cambodia, Mozambique, Nicaragua and Afghanistan. The Afghanistans alone have tied down 110,000 Soviet troops in a bloody occupation that drains Soviet resources.

(2) The thrust into El Salvador has been blunted by the U.S. readiness to arm and train local government forces and to put internal pressure on Nicaragua. As a result, "dialogue toward power-sharing" is now seen by more Americans as a grab for power without elections, and is resisted.

(3) In Europe, the imbalance of power caused by the SS-20's is being rectified; by year's end, our Pershing and cruise missiles will be in place.

In sum, Mr. Andropov in most of his first year could claim only the pacification of Poland without U.S. sanctions and the successful stonewalling of the stolen ABM advantage.

In recent months, the new Soviet leader has acted boldly to reestablish Soviet strategic momentum:

(1) He supplied Libya's invasion of neighboring Chad, thereby threatening the Sudan and all of Central Africa. Egypt shrugged; the U.S. did an Alphonse-Gaston routine with France, which finally did its duty in its "sphere." The outcome is uncertain, but Mr. Andropov has more patience than Mr. Mitterrand.

(2) He ordered his client, Syria, to activate P.L.O. and Druse fighters to overthrow the Government of Lebanon. (In the Mideast, even the surrogates have surrogates.) Twice removed, he can now order the launching of Soviet-supplied missiles against the U.S.S. New Jersey, and pose as a moralist condemning the U.S. for causing civilian casualties near guerrilla batteries.

(3) He and his military shot down the civilian airliner that came near the testing of his new PL-5 missile, the SALT violator. This loses popularity contests but strikes fear abroad and stirs xenophobic fervor at home.

President Reagan's reaction to the Andropov challenge has been to lay down the doctrine of snarling détente: "no vengence" means "no linkage." To the amazed delight of doves, and at the top of his moral lungs, Mr. Reagan has foolishly decoupled Soviet behavior from arms talks of economic retaliation.

Wearing a serious expression is not an expression of seriousness. Mr. Reagan's snarling détente will probably encourage Mr. Andropov to continue his pressure. Berlin is always a good place to test Western will; Jamaica is again vulnerable; an "analogous" response to the placement of our missiles in Europe would be the landing of Soviet Bear bombers in Cuba with nuclear missiles.

We can hope that Mr. Reagan would meet such tests with resolve. The tragedy of his strategy, however, is this: His stentorian restraint invites dangerous tests that could be averted now by the quiet, measured application of strength.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD material in connection with Soviet arms control violations.

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

SOVIET VIOLATIONS OF SALT II

SS-18 Rapid reload and refire; covert deployment of 100 to 200 SS-16s at Plesetsk test range; AS-3 kangaroo long range ASM on 100 TU-95 Bear bombers; new long range ASM on Bears; deployment of long range ASMs on Backfire bombers; almost total (95-100%) encryption of telemetry; ICBM—SS-18 Mod X; PL-4 (SS-X-24); PL-5 (SS-X-25); SLCM— SS-NX-19; SLBM—SS-NX-20; IRBM/ICBM—SS-20; 2 new ICBMs in development tests (SS-X-24, SS-X-25); increased and large scale strategic camouflage, concealment, deception.

SOVIET SALT I ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE (ABM) TREATY VIOLATIONS AND CIRCUMVENTIONS

Soviet SAM testing in ABM Mode—SAM-5, SAM-10, SAM-12; deployment of 6 ABM battle management radars; deployment of one ABM battle-management radar in interior USSR not facing outward. ABM camouflage and concealment; falsification of ABM deactivation; use of new test range without prior notification; development of a rapidly deployable, mobile ABM; testing of rapid refire ABM; deployment of a nationwide ABM defense; deployment of more than 100 ABM launchers around Moscow.

SOVIET SALT I VIOLATIONS AND CIRCUMVENTIONS

Interim agreement:

Deployment of the heavy SS-19 ICBM as the replacement of the light SS-11; failure to deactivate old ICBMs on time, and continuous falsification of official deactivation reports; bringing back ICBM equipment to deactivated ICBM complexes; keeping 18 SS-9 ICBMs at an ICBM test range illegally operational; Soviet deployment of "IIIX" silos with a configuration too similar to a missile-launch silo; increased use of deliberate camouflage, concealment, and deception; encryption of missile telemetry; camouflage of ICBM testing, production, deployment; concealment of SLBM submarine construction, berthing, dummy subs, construction of berthing tunnels; constructing over 68 strategic submarines, when only 62 were allowed; violation of Brezhnev's pledge not to build mobile ICBMs; deploying SS-11 ICBMs at SS-4 medium range ballistic missile (MRBM) sites; keeping about 1,300 to several thousand old ICBMs stockpiled for both covert soft launch and rapid reload of silos for refire.

SOVIET VIOLATIONS

THRESHOLD TEST BAN TREATY (1974)

Over 15 Soviet tests above 150 kilotons (2 with lowest possible yield above 150 and one with reported yield of 600 kilotons).

LIMITED TEST BAN TREATY (1963)

Over 30 unambiguous Soviet ventings of radioactive debris.

SOVIET VIOLATIONS OF KENNEDY-KHRUSHCHEV CUBA AGREEMENT

Soviet offensive capabilities deployed to Cuba—combat brigade; Golf and Echo class nuclear submarines; Cienfuegos strategic

submarine base with nuclear warhead storage facility; nuclear delivery capable aircraft, Mig-23/27, Bear—TU-95 D,F (TU-142, with operable bombays); military communications center.

Use of Cuba as revolutionary base—training terrorists and revolutionary forces; equipment supply to revolutionary forces; DGI 4th largest intelligence organization. Probable BW/CW facility.

SOVIET VIOLATIONS OF GENEVA PROTOCOL AND BIOLOGICAL AND TOXIN WEAPONS CONVENTION

BW manufacture and storage at Sverdlovsk and Zagorsk; 8 other suspect production and storage facilities; expansion of BW facilities after 1972 and 1975, continuing today; CW and toxin weapons employment and assistance to satellites, Kampuchea, Laos, Afghanistan. Toxin assassination weapons.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, on September 14, 1983, President Reagan made a very important statement. President Reagan was asked publicly if the Soviet Union was violating the 1962 Kennedy-Khrushchev agreement which ended the Cuban missile crisis. President Reagan answered:

* * * That agreement has been abrogated many times by the Soviet Union and Cuba in the bringing of what can only be considered offensive weapons, not defensive, there * * *

Mr. President, this is the second time that President Reagan has accused the Soviets of violating the Kennedy-Khrushchev agreement. President Reagan previously accused the Soviets of violating the Kennedy-Khrushchev agreement on national television in June 1982. In addition, CIA Director Casey, Under Secretary of Defense Iklé, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have all also accused the Soviets of violating the Kennedy-Khrushchev agreement ending the 1962 Cuban missile crisis.

The significance of these authoritative, official U.S. accusations is very great. They reinforce the importance of a report to the Congress on Soviet noncompliance with SALT and other arms control agreements.

Moreover, if the Soviets actually are violating the very agreement that brought the world peace after the most serious nuclear war crisis ever in world history, then this fact has enormous implications for our defense budget and arms control proposals. It also suggests the need for sanctions against the Soviets for their recent massacre of the Korean Air Lines 747 passenger airplane.

Mr. President, the Soviet actions which violate the Kennedy-Khrushchev agreement are illustrated on the explanation displayed.

Mr. President, I finally ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an analysis of evidence of Soviet violation of the Threshold Test Ban Treaty signed in 1974, and put into effect by the United States and the U.S.S.R. in 1976.

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

SOVIET VIOLATIONS OF THE THRESHOLD TEST BAN TREATY

Defense Department analysis clearly indicates that the Soviet Union is flagrantly violating the Threshold Test Ban Treaty (TTBT) limit of 150 kilotons put into effect in March of 1976. Both the chart and analysis are unclassified, according to the Defense Department and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

There have been 14 Soviet underground nuclear weapons tests since 1978 which are estimated to be above the 150-kiloton limit. There is 95 percent confidence that several tests have been 250 kilotons or above.

In addition, Secretary of State Shultz has testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that during the week of June 16, the Soviet Union tested another nuclear weapon about "double" the 150-kiloton limit—approximately 300 kilotons. This is a 15th Soviet test violation.

The Defense Department chart which I released in June 1983 indicates that since 1978, the Soviet Union has conducted at least five tests at the 300-kiloton level or higher—a factor of twice that allowed by TTBT.

The U.S. has given the Soviet Union the benefit of every doubt in TTBT compliance, even going so far to change our methodology more than two times in the Soviets' favor. Nevertheless, the Soviets continue to violate TTBT.

The vertical axis of the chart is labeled "The Sliding Rulers," showing how the U.S. has changed it methodology twice. The horizontal bars represent the 150-kiloton thresholds, expressed in terms of the Richter Scale.

The lowest bar represents the 150-kiloton threshold for U.S. underground nuclear tests at the Nevada test site. The upper two bars represent Soviet 150-kiloton thresholds, as revised upwards by the U.S. to the benefit of the Soviets.

Each dot on the chart represents a Soviet test of a nuclear weapon at the Shagan River Test Area. For instance, the chart indicates the results for four nuclear tests at the site in 1976.

Senator Helms showed this Defense Department chart and analysis to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during its arms control resolution markup on September 20, 1983. This chart and analysis strongly support the statements made by President Reagan, Defense Secretary Weinberger, and other White House and Arms Control Agency spokesmen that the Soviets have violated the Threshold Test Ban Treaty.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I do not know of any objection to the amendment at this time. I am advised that the committee might accept the amendment at this time.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, there is no objection by the majority. We are checking now with the minority to see whether there is objection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that Senator PELL might have some reservations about it, and we are trying to get in touch with him. For the moment, it would be satisfactory with us to set this amendment aside temporarily, if that is agreeable.

Mr. McCLURE. I am happy to do that. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be temporarily set aside.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interview on this subject by Mr. John Rees, in The Review of the News, with my distinguished senior colleague from Idaho, Senator JIM McCLURE, be published in the RECORD. This interview, revealing Soviet cheating in arms control pacts, was conducted by John Rees and was published in the Review of the News on August 17, 1983. I strongly agree with all of the points Senator McCLURE makes regarding the dangers to our national security of Soviet violations of SALT and other arms control treaties. I, myself, have taken a lead in the Senate in pointing out some of the Soviets arms control treaty violations, and I strongly support an amendment to an appropriate bill requiring the President to report to the Congress on Soviet SALT violations.

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

[From the Review of The News, Aug. 17, 1983]

CONSERVATIVE U.S. SENATOR JAMES A. McCLURE: AN EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW ON SOVIET CHEATING IN ARMS PACTS REVEALS WHY WE DARE NOT AGREE TO ANY FREEZE

(By John Rees)

The central problem in arms-control negotiations with the Soviets, says Republican Senator Jim McClure of Idaho, "is not the weapons . . . but Marxism-Leninism, their ideology," which commits the Soviet leaders to aggressive expansionism and a quest for power. A staunch Conservative serving on the Appropriations and Rules Committees, and Chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, Senator McClure recently initiated a letter from 34 Republican Senators to the President cautioning him not to be stampeded by domestic political considerations into a "quick" and potentially dangerous arms-control treaty with the Soviets.

Q. Senator, how do the Soviets view treaties they sign with us?

A. There is a famous quotation from Lenin: "Promises, like pie crusts, are leaven to be broken." Since 1917, the Soviets have violated nearly all the treaties they have signed, in addition to violating all the arms-control agreements to which they have agreed.

Many of the treaties the Soviets have violated since 1917 have been non-aggression pacts—pledges by the Soviet Government not to invade neighbors such as Finland, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and even Afghanistan. All those countries have had non-aggression pacts with the Soviet Union at one time or another, and all have been violated.

Q. These were weak, non-threatening, neighboring states. Wouldn't treaties with another great power over arms control and national security be more strictly followed as being in Soviet interest?

A. You would think so, but that has not been the case.

Q. What about the famous "joint statement" produced in the Carter Administration by the Departments of Defense and State, the C.I.A., and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which termed the Soviet treaty record regarding arms control as "good"?

A. There was a "white paper" submitted to the Congress in February 1978 that characterized the Soviet record on arms-control compliance as generally good. The definitive answer to this was provided by now-Ambassador Paul Nitze, who testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in July of 1979 on the SALT II treaty. He was asked this very same question and replied that "whenever we questioned them about any of their behavior, we always acquiesced to their position." That is, we allow the Soviets to violate the arms-control treaties, and then we call it "compliance."

Q. Will you review some of the key violations?

A. There are seven militarily significant classes of Soviet violations of arms-control agreements. These are:

The deployment of the SS-19 heavy I.C.B.M. which violated the SALT I Interim Agreement.

The Soviet stockpiling of I.C.B.M.s, which violates all of the SALT II treaty's ceilings, and the development of the rapid-refire capability of Soviet missile launchers which is part of that.

The underground nuclear weapons tests of high yield which violate the Threshold Test Ban Treaty.

The A.B.M. treaty violations which encompass A.B.M. mode tests and mobile A.B.M. components as well as illegal battle-management radars.

The biological-warfare violations and the chemical-warfare treaty violations.

The violations of the Kennedy-Khrushchev agreement of 1962.

The recent Soviet violations of the SALT II treaty, especially their testing of a second new type I.C.B.M. when only one new type is allowed.

Q. And of course SALT II couldn't even be ratified in a Democratic-controlled Senate under a Democratic President. Candidate Reagan denounced SALT II, but then as President said the U.S. would abide by it anyway. What rationale has been offered for this, and what effect is it having on modernization of U.S. defenses?

A. The Reagan Administration policy is characterized as a "no undercut interim adherence policy." This means that the U.S. will not undercut SALT II so long as the Soviets show equal restraint. But my colleague from Idaho, Senator Steven Symms, has been able to pinpoint nine ways in which the SALT II treaty has impinged upon U.S. strategic weapons deployments and plans.

In the opinion of some Senators, our acceptance of the terms of an unratified SALT II is inconsistent with both Section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act and with the Constitution of the United States, which provides that the Senate must advise and consent before the ratification of any treaty. Section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act says there are only two ways to oblige the United States to comply with an arms-control agreement: one, through the treaty-making power of the Constitution; and two, through further affirmative legislation.

In the case of the SALT II treaty's "interim adherence, no undercut" policy, we have become in effect "obliged" to adhere. In fact, we have precisely adhered to all of the provisions of SALT II without either the constitutional treaty-making powers of the Senate or further affirmative legislation. And so a strong case can be made that the Administration's policy, with respect to compliance with SALT II, is non-constitutional, unconstitutional, and illegal.

Q. What can you tell us about Soviet missile tests during 1982-1983 and their relation to existing formal or informal arms agreements?

A. According to unclassified sources, all of the Soviet missile tests since 1974 have had a high degree of encryption in their electronic telemetry signals. These are signals broadcast back to earth which provide information on the performance of the missile during a test.

But the SALT II treaty says there cannot be deliberate interference in the "national technical means of verification." The SALT II treaty says that the United States must be able to tell eight different characteristics of Soviet missiles, all of which require telemetry to determine. So, with high levels of encryption, such as we've seen in all Soviet missile testing since 1974, it's possible to say that the Soviets are violating the Article 15 provisions on encryption and non-interference with "N.T.M."—the National Technical Means.

Q. Roughly how much of the Soviet missile telemetry data is encrypted?

A. According to press reports, the percentages have been increasing from 80 percent to 90 percent to 98 percent . . . and now to 100 percent in some of the recent tests of new Soviet I.C.B.M.s.

Q. What about Soviet deceptions and circumventions?

A. The Soviets often engage in deception in their negotiations of arms-control treaties. They seek ambiguous provisions that don't constrain any of their strategic-weapons development programs. They then go to the limit of those provisions and test our reaction. If the United States does not react, they they go beyond those limits. They also exploit all the loopholes that are not covered by specific provisions.

In sum, the Soviets engage in negotiating deception; operational camouflage, concealment, and deception; and, outright violations if they can get away with it—and they have!

Q. Give us some specific examples.

A. In the case of the Backfire bomber, they engaged in both negotiating deception and operational concealment. In the case of the SS-20 mobile missile, there is a massive program of camouflage, concealment, and deception. The Soviets presented the SS-20 as an "intermediate-range" missile and negotiated deceptively to exclude it from SALT II.

Q. Senator, without getting into classified specifics, how good are America's technical-surveillance methods at discovering Soviet military developments?

A. The best answer to that question is the fact that during the 1960s the United States intelligence community grossly underestimated the number of Soviet I.C.B.M.s being deployed, the number of Soviet submarine-launched ballistic missiles (S.L.B.M.s) being deployed, and the number of Soviet strategic bombers. At the same time, we underestimated Soviet military spending by a factor of 100 percent.

These tendencies of U.S. intelligence to underestimate continued into the 1970s and the era of détente and SALT. They were accentuated as errors by another tendency that was also contradictory—the tendency to over-estimate the constraints that SALT I and SALT II would put upon Moscow.

So during the 1970s we had the juxtaposition of underestimates of Soviet military spending and of the nature and quanity of their strategic hardware, with overestimates of the constraining power of the SALT I and SALT II arms-control agreements and détente. I feel that this country has a very bad record in the business of detecting and estimating Soviet military programs.

Q. From what you've said, I get the feeling that no Administration, including this one, has been willing officially to tell the American people about the extent of Soviet armstreaty violations. Is there a valid reason for this, such as protection of strategic intelligence methods and information?

A. In my view, the reasons why the United States has been inhibited in challenging Soviet arms-control treaty violations are threefold:

First, the strategic balance has shifted against the United States since the early 1970s. This has been used to make it seem dangerous, even crisis provoking, actually to confront the Soviets with a major violation of the arms-control treaties.

Second, we have a dominant school of strategic doctrine in our country based upon the concept of "Mutural Assured Destruction," appropriately called M.A.D. This concept involves what is called minimum deterrence. Any advantages the Soviets may derive from violating an arms-control treaty are considered irrelevant. They have no strategic significance, according to the predominant view in the American national-security community.

Third, and perhaps the most significant reason why we've had inhibitions, is that current negotiations for future treaties are held hostage to enforcement of past and existing treaties.

Q. Will you expand on that last concept?

A. It means that if the United States were ever to accuse the Soviets of violating an existing or past treaty at the highest level in the nuclear area, this might jeopardize the continuation of negotiations for a future treaty.

Q. But hasn't the President said that the Soviets have violated some of those treaties; for example with regard to the "yellow rain" chemical and biological issue?

A. President Reagan and his Administration have directly accused the Soviets of violating the Biological Warfare Convention of 1972, the Chemical Warfare Protocol of 1925, and the Kennedy-Khrushchev Agreement of 1962. He has indirectly accused the Soviets of violating two additional treaties—the Threshold Test Ban Treaty of 1974 and the SALT II treaty.

Q. Fairly recently a campaign was launched against U.S. development of space-based defenses on the line that we would be violating some treaty on the peaceful uses of outer space. If, as has been reported, the Soviets already are the only country with an operational Anti-Satellite weapon, should we stick to a treaty which has already been broken by the other side?

A. The Outer Space Treaty, signed in 1967, prohibits nuclear weapons in space. The Soviets have not directly violated this ban. What they have done is to circumvent the treaty by developing a fractional orbital bombardment missile which gives them the ability to put a nuclear weapon into space and achieve a partial orbit at any time. Therefore, a non-nuclear anti-satellite weapon in space, such as the Soviets have

had operational since 1971, doesn't violate that treaty; it goes around the treaty.

Q. Didn't the previous Administration try for a treaty to ban any anti-satellite weapons?

A. Yes. The United States negotiated with the Soviets in 1977 and 1978 for an anti-satellite weapons treaty. These negotiations were suspended in 1979, however, because of Soviet contempt for American attempts to get them to dismantle their existing operational non-nuclear anti-satellite weapon in exchange for a promise by the United States not to develop and deploy one of its own.

It's clear from past negotiations that we have no leverage with the Soviets in that kind of weapons constraint unless we develop, test, and deploy our own anti-satellite weapon. We are doing so today despite the urgings of "Liberals" that we suspend unilaterally our weapons program and continue negotiations with the Soviets after they have already laughed us out of the negotiating room.

Q. How do the Soviet military chiefs view the arms-control and treaty process? Do they see it as a way of achieving equality and maintaining that as a status quo, or have they something else in mind,

A. We have direct evidence about the views of Soviet military leaders on the arms-control process. Some of that information unfortunately is still highly classified. But there is sufficient unclassified information, which I have reviewed, for me to conclude that they view the arms-control process as an instrument of political and military competition between Communism and Capitalism. They do not believe that they have equality with the United States; far from it. They believe that through arms-control negotiations they have achieved important strategic advantages and superiority.

Q. Will you give us some of the unclassified evidence?

A. First of all, the Soviet General Staff considers the arms-control process, and the whole range of diplomacy, part of the tactics of war. In the Soviet General Staff journal, Military Thought, they said in 1971, before the signing of the SALT I treaty, that "a nation's diplomatic activity becomes a part of those nonmilitary means of policy implementation which . . . are contained within the concept of the content of war."

Furthermore, we have evidence that in 1972 Brezhnev and his military leaders were consciously negotiating to protect the Soviet SS-19 heavy I.C.B.M. from constraint in the SALT I Interim Agreement, Article II, knowing full well that the United States was signing this article believing that heavy missiles such as the SS-19 were prohibited. But Brezhnev and his military staff knew that the SS-19 would go forward and that, because of their successful concealment, the United States did not even know the SS-19 missile program existed, let alone how far advanced or how heavy it was. Brezhnev, the Politburo, and the Soviet military knew the United States was signing Article II in ignorance of the fact that within a very short period Moscow would reveal it had this new missile which violated that provision of the treaty.

Q. The deception decision obviously came from the top levels of the Soviet leadership?

A. Yes. It shows the pattern of the Soviets' deliberate negotiating deception, and the deliberate intent of the U.S.S.R.'s top-level political and military leadership both to violate arms treaties and to use the arms-control process as a means of achieving strategic and military advantages.

Q. SALT II negotiator Paul Warnke and former C.I.A. Director William Colby maintain that it is irrelevant whether the Soviets have adhered to past treaties, on the grounds that all that matters is whether we can monitor their compliance with current treaties. Will you comment?

A. First, that's a good example of the "minimum deterrence" philosophy I mentioned earlier. When we have former high officials like Colby and Warnke telling the public that any advantages the Soviets achieve from violations are irrelevant and strategically insignificant, it inhibits any challenging of Soviet violations.

Second, it exploits the popular misconception of what is entailed in verification. The technical aspects, such as the collection of intelligence evidence, are what most people talk about when they discuss verification. But there is a much more difficult and neglected aspect to verification that very few pay much attention to. That is, what to do after a potential violation is detected?

Q. Isn't that the decision of our political leaders?

A. Exactly. It's a political decision whether to challenge and enforce an arms-control treaty. And that's a much more difficult and complex aspect of verification that is usually ignored.

Some 22 years ago Fred Iklé, who is now Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, published a major article in Foreign Affairs entitled "After Detection What?" I put that article into the Congressional Record recently as a policy document with immediate relevance because this question has not been grappled with in the intervening years.

Q. What are the keys to enforcement?

A. The two essential reasons for challenging breaches and enforcing arms-control treaties are the effect that has on commitment for an increased defense budget, and on the recognition that we may need to be prepared for an arms race at any time and on any level of armaments.

Q. What about the ongoing U.S. Soviet strategic and theater nuclear-weapons negotiations?

A. I've had information from the Reagan Administration that concedes that there are already Soviet compliance and U.S. verification problems of enormous significance with SALT II. I have been told that in Geneva today the results of the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (S.T.A.R.T.) and the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces talks (I.N.F.), both aimed toward treaties, will not have any significant advantages over SALT II in the area of verification. If that turns out to be the case, then these two potential agreements, S.T.A.R.T. and I.N.F., will be just as vulnerable as SALT II to questions of verifiability and compliance.

With the strategic balance continuing to shift against the United States and towards the Soviet Union, the enforceability of these agreements will be even worse than with S.A.L.T. II, which we are already finding impossible to enforce.

Q. Will political pressure be applied to push the President into making concessions for the sake of a pre-election arms treaty?

A. Yes, there is enormous political pressure on the President to come up with something to pull the rug out from under all of his Democratic opponents who are, to a man, posturing on a more accommodationist arms-constrol platform than the President. There will be an enormous political temptation to parry the Democratic "peace" candidates by consummating an arms-control agreement with the Soviets sometime before the 1984 election.

Q. What counter-pressure is there against such political action?

A. Thirty-four United States Senators, all of them Republicans and including five of the seven Republican leaders and the party leader, Paul Laxalt, have sent a letter to the President, which I originated. In this letter we cautioned the President that until current Soviet violations of SALT I, SALT II, and the other arms-control treaties are dealt with successfully, and either Soviet compliance is enforced or the U.S. abrogates, this group of 34 will continue to have significant reservations about whether a new S.T.A.R.T. or I.N.F. treaty can receive the advice and consent of the Senate needed for ratification.

Q. The "freeze" and disarmament groups in America and Western Europe want to stop deployment of the U.S. Pershing II and Tomahawk ground-launched cruise missiles. These were developed only after the Soviets started deploying the SS-20. Will you give us some specifics about the threat posed by those SS-20s?

A. According to press reports, last spring the United States discovered a whole new SS-20 missile complex that had been operational for years. The complex reportedly was massively camouflaged and had thus successfully evaded detection. This wasn't completely unexpected because we did know that the Soviets have been camouflaging and concealing their SS-20s since the start of their deployment program some six years ago.

Q. Can we draw any lessons regarding Soviet negotiating intentions from the long-term successful concealment of an SS-20 complex?

A. Many people may not know that in arms-control negotiations the Soviet side does not supply data on its missiles. They have instead decided to accept U.S. documentation since their concealment, deception, and camouflage programs have been successful in hiding some portion of their arms from us.

The concealment of SS-20s shows a lack of good faith on the part of the Soviet Union. Moreover, there have been recent press reports that there is solid information there are three SS-20 regiments—with eight launchers each—for which the United States cannot account on the ground. Where have they been concealed? These are mobile missiles transported with relative ease.

We also have reports that there is a very significant refire problem since there are up to five missiles associated with each SS-20 launcher. When you multiply that by the three warheads that are on each missile, the result is upwards of 5,000 warheads that the Soviets are deploying with their SS-20 program. The success with which the SS-20s are massively camouflaged and concealed, shown by the facts that we seem not to be able to find three SS-20 regiments, and that we just recently found one that had been operational for years, means that our intelligence leaves very much to be desired.

Q. What is its significance in an I.N.F. arms-control context?

A. It suggests that the order of battle arithmetic being used by America in both the I.N.F. and the S.T.A.R.T. negotiations—all of which is derived from the U.S. and none of which is furnished by the Soviets—is grossly in error.

Q. So what should we do about arms negotiations and treaties with the Soviet Union?

A. We should also be prepared to negotiate with the Soviets on every element of

military power. But if there is to be any hope of meaningful negotiations we must avoid the pitfalls of the past. These are deceptive negotiating by the Soviets, ambiguous language and loopholes in the provisions, and poor means of verification. We must be able to enhance the verification methods by such means as on-site inspection, confidence-building measures, cooperative means, and data exchange. Otherwise, to repeat, there is no hope of meaningful diplomatic exchanges.

Q. What about the question of covert political warfare, that is, "active measures"?

A. I'm concerned about dealing with a regime which violates its own Constitution, and which violates the very basis of U.S.-Soviet relations—the Litvinov Agreement of 1933. In that agreement the Soviets pledged not to interfere in the U.S. body politic with "active measures" aimed at the overthrow of the U.S. Government. We know, however, that the Soviets are engaged in "active measures" inside the United States and around the world.

Given the problems we have in dealing with this revolutionary state, it's fair to conclude that Marxism-Leninism is the main obstacle to equitable, verifiable, stabilizing arms-control agreements. I repeat: Their ideology is the essential obstacle. The problem is not the weapons themselves, not American ambitions, not American "intransigence," but Marxism-Leninism.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCLURE)? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Indiana and both Senators from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2189

(Purpose: To provide for the establishment of United States diplomatic relations with the Vatican)

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) for himself and Mr. DENTON proposes an amendment numbered 2189.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 24, line 20, immediately following sec. 121, insert the following new section:

"United States Diplomatic Relations With The Vatican

"SEC. 122. In order to provide for the establishment of United States diplomatic relations with the Vatican, the Act entitled "An Act making Appropriations for the Counsular and Diplomatic Expenses of the Government for the year ending thirtieth June, eighteen hundred and sixty-eight, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1867, is amended by repealing the following sentence (14 Stat. 413): "And no money hereby or otherwise appropriated shall be paid for the support of an American legation at Rome, from and after the thirtieth day of June, eighteen hundred and sixty-seven."

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, this amendment would repeal the prohibition, enacted in 1867 by the 39th Congress, against the expenditure of funds to support a diplomatic mission to the Vatican. This would permit, but would not require, the reestablishment of full and formal diplomatic relations with the Holy See, and I anticipate that the President, in all likelihood, would take this action once this impediment is removed.

The United States maintained consular relations with the Vatican States from 1797 until 1848 and official diplomatic relations from 1848 until 1867. The decision in that year to withhold funds from the American mission in Rome was rooted in controversies arising from the struggle for Italian unification. Its continuation today is an anachronism.

Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Nixon, Ford, Carter, and Reagan, recognizing the diplomatic importance of the Vatican, chose to appoint personal representatives to the Vatican, and this awkward charade continues today. President Truman in 1951 proposed to regularize relations by appointing Gen. Mark Clark as Ambassador to the Vatican, but this effort provoked public controversy and General Clark withdrew. In 1977, however, the Senate passed the Stone amendment which, like my amendment today, would have repealed the 1867 provision. This was deleted in conference.

In short, diplomatic relations with the Vatican are consistent with American tradition, have been carried on in substance if not in form by most administrations since the 1930's, and, in my judgment, should be regularized. Juridically, the Vatican is a sovereign state and is formally recognized as such by over 100 nations. That its status is historically unique, and that the status of the Papacy has, in past centuries, been the subject of varied controversies, should not bar us from recognition of the fact that the Vatican is a sensitive diplomatic forum and, with the courageous leadership of Pope John Paul II, is a significant political force for decency in the world. Over 100 other nations recognize these realities. The United States, in practice, does so as well. It is time to legitimate our current practice.

The language of this amendment is identical to paragraph (b) of S. 1757, a bill to permit the restoration of diplomatic relations with the Vatican which I introduced on August 3 of this year. I am proud to count as cosponsors of that measure Senators BIDEN, DODD, DOLE, DOMENICI, DURENBERGER, HATCH, HELMS, HUDDLESTON, JOHNSTON, KENNEDY, LAXALT, MOYNIHAN, MURKOWSKI, PELL, PRESSLER, QUAYLE, ZORINSKY, GLENN, DENTON, and NICKLES. A similar measure has been introduced in the House by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with the support of a wide majority of both majority and minority members of that committee. The time for this initiative is right; indeed, it is long overdue, and I urge all Senators to join in support of this amendment.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, this amendment was offered originally by Senator Stone in 1977. It was adopted by the Senate but was then dropped in conference.

I know of no objection to this amendment on this side of the aisle, and unless I hear such objection, we would accept the amendment from the standpoint of the majority and turn to the minority to determine if they have been able to clear it properly on their side.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I think it is an excellent amendment and hope it is approved.

Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. President, 116 years have passed since the United States last had formal diplomatic relations with the Vatican. The time has come to change this.

It is a pleasure to join my fellow colleague from Indiana who is seeking to make this change possible. The United States has been remiss in not taking action sooner and the Senate has the opportunity today to correct that wrong.

From 1848 to 1867 the United States maintained formal diplomatic relations with the Vatican. Then in 1867 the funding for the legation was stripped. Yet, since that time, various Presidents have appointed special representatives to the Vatican. We have continuously had a representative there since President Nixon was in office.

Last week Nepal was the 107th country to officially estabish diplomatic relations with the Holy See. In fact, the United States is one of the few countries not to recognize the Vatican as a sovereign state and the Pope as the chief of state.

On a practical level, such a recognition would be in the best interests of this country. It would improve the exchange of information and establish more formal and effective channels of communication.

But, there is a more important reason for our establishing formal diplomatic ties with the Vatican. Under the courageous leadership of Pope John Paul II, the Vatican State has assumed its rightful place in the world as an international voice. It is only right that this country show its respect for the Vatican by diplomatically recognizing it as world state.

Under the guidance of Pope John Paul II, the Vatican has come to have tremendous political and moral influence in this world of ours. This was most recently illustrated by the Pope's

successful intervention with Polish leaders on behalf of the people of his native land.

The United States should remove itself from the list of remaining nations yet to grant the Vatican full diplomatic recognition. There is no question but that this is the right thing to do.

And in conclusion, I want to commend my fellow Hoosier Senator for taking the lead on this important issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2189) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2188

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I should like to notify the Senate that the McClure amendment that has been offered and has been withdrawn has now been cleared by both sides.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I suggest that we move ahead with the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has not been withdrawn. It has been temporarily set aside.

Mr. PERCY. So that Senator McCLURE would have to be here to bring the matter forward again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment automatically comes before the Senate now.

Mr. PERCY. I suggest, then, that the Senate give consideration to the McClure amendment, inasmuch as it has been cleared on both sides.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, that amendment is pending before the Senate, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is; yes.

Mr. BYRD. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I think Senator McCLURE should be here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rollcall is in progress.

Mr. HELMS. There has been no response.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in his capacity as a Senator, responded.

The bill clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Maine (Mr. COHEN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBERGER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. SIMPSON), are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON), is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 263 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Abdnor	Garn	Moynihan
Andrews	Glenn	Murkowski
Armstrong	Gorton	Nickles
Baker	Grassley	Nunn
Baucus	Hart	Packwood
Bentsen	Hatch	Pell
Biden	Hawkins	Percy
Bingaman	Hecht	Pressler
Boren	Heflin	Proxmire
Boschwitz	Heinz	Pryor
Bradley	Helms	Quayle
Bumpers	Hollings	Randolph
Burdick	Humphrey	Riegle
Byrd	Inouye	Roth
Chafee	Jepsen	Rudman
Chiles	Johnston	Sarbanes
Cochran	Kassebaum	Sasser
Cranston	Kasten	Specter
D'Amato	Kennedy	Stafford
Danforth	Lautenberg	Stennis
DeConcini	Laxalt	Stevens
Denton	Leahy	Symms
Dixon	Levin	Thurmond
Dodd	Long	Tower
Dole	Lugar	Trible
Domenici	Matsunaga	Tsongas
Eagleton	Mattingly	Wallop
East	McClure	Warner
Evans	Melcher	Weicker
Exon	Metzenbaum	Wilson
Ford	Mitchell	Zorinsky

NOT VOTING—7

Cohen	Hatfield	Simpson
Durenberger	Huddleston	
Goldwater	Mathias	

So Mr. McCLURE's amendment (No. 2188) was agreed to.

Mr. McCLURE, Mr. President, I move to reconsider this vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

May we have order in the Senate, please?

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators SYMMS, D'AMATO, DENTON, DOMENICI, HELMS, ARMSTRONG, SIMPSON, and HUMPHREY be added as original cosponsors to the amendment just passed.

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

The distinguished majority leader.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF EUROPEAN PARLIAMENTS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, we have in the Chamber a group of distinguished parliamentarians. I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Indiana, the chairman of the subcommittee having jurisdiction over this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader.

We are indeed blessed today to have a most-distinguished delegation of members of the European parliaments. They come from each of their countries by direct popular election. They have constituents much as we do. We have already discussed today issues of war and peace, disarmament, and agriculture. It is a very great pleasure to introduce this delegation to you. Before asking you to greet them, I would like to yield to the ranking member of the European Affairs Subcommittee, Senator BIDEN, who has a resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 2190 TO S. 1342

Mr. BIDEN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, on two previous occasions the Senate has passed an amendment we initiated that would formalize the informal interparliamentary relationship between the Congress and our friends from the European parliaments, a relationship which has existed since 1972. Although in both previous instances this provision was lost in conference, I now fortunately have reason to believe that the same fate would not befall this provision were it to pass again in the Senate. Therefore, I take great pleasure, particularly in light of the fact that our colleagues are here in the Chamber, of sending an amendment to the desk which would formalize that relationship. I also hope it will encourage future involvement in the United States-European Community parliamentarians of the U.S. members in parliamentary meetings which occur once or twice a year.

Rather than ask for its consideration and passage at this moment—both managers, I understand, will accept it—I will yield back the floor.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, do I understand it is the wish of the Senator from Delaware that we adopt this resolution at this time?

Mr. BIDEN. That would be my wish.

Mr. BAKER. Is this an amendment to this bill?

Mr. BIDEN. This is an amendment to the bill, yes.

Mr. BAKER. There is no amendment pending, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. PELL. As a matter of information, the rules of the Senate are such under a rule that I proposed some years ago that members of the European parliaments have the same right of access to our Senate Chamber as do members of any other parliament.

They should be aware of that, that in their own right they have a right of access here, too.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I move passage of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) proposes an amendment numbered 2190.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following new section:

UNITED STATES-EUROPEAN COMMUNITY INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

SEC. 122. (a)(1) Congress hereby resolves that not to exceed twenty-four Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly and at least annually with representatives of the European Parliament to constitute a United States-European Community Interparliamentary Group for a discussion of common problems in the interest of sound relations between the United States and the nations of the European Community. Of the Members of the Congress to be appointed for this purpose (hereafter designated as the United States Group), half shall be appointed by the President of the Senate from Members of the Senate (not fewer than four of whom shall be from the Foreign Relations Committee), and half shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House (not fewer than four of whom shall be from the International Relations Committee).

(2) Such appointments shall be made for the period of each meeting of the United States-European Community Interparliamentary Group.

(3) The Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Senate delegation shall be a member from the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the House delegation shall be a member from the House International Relations Committee.

(b)(1) To provide for participation of the United States Group, not to exceed $50,000 shall be appropriated for each fiscal year (subject to the annual authorization and appropriation process), with $25,000 to be available for the Senate delegation and $25,000 for the House delegation, or so much thereof as may be necessary to assist in meeting the expenses of the United States Group. The Senate and House portions of such appropriation shall be disbursed on vouchers to be approved by the Chairman of the Senate delegation and Chairman of the House delegation, respectively.

(2) The United States Group of the United States-European Community Interparliamentary Group shall submit to the Congress a report for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made including its expenditures under such appropriation.

(3) The certificate of the Chairman of the respective delegation shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers in the auditing of all accounts of the Senate and House delegations to the United States-European Community Interparliamentary Group.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, speaking for the majority, I know of no objection on this side. Rather than any objection, I would detect a great deal of enthusiasm.

I have had the pleasure of visiting the chambers of the European Parliament, and I have met a great many of the members. We have the great distinction and honor of exchanging views.

No group of countries has ever stood more steadfastly together during more troubled times, and certainly in the last instance of this outrage against humanity, the shooting down of Korean Air Lines flight 007, we spoke as with one voice.

Many times in this country we do not speak with one voice. But certainly in this case the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the President spoke with one voice and the resolution was adopted within about 24 hours and signed by the President. Certainly our European colleagues responded rapidly. Canada took action against Aeroflot even before the request was made anticipating it.

We stand together on so many issues.

We have fought together, and we have worked together. When we disagreed we disagree in an agreeable fashion.

I am pleased to say that on the majority side of the Senate we are favorably inclined and support this amendment and commend Senator BIDEN and Senator LUGAR for the work that they have done in continuing to see that this body has direct and personal contact with the distinguished members of the European Parliament.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I move the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment (No. 2190) was agreed to.

RECESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess for 1 minute so that we may greet our colleagues from the European Parliaments.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:26 p.m., recessed until 2:32 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. EVANS).

AMENDMENT NO. 2191

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) proposes an amendment numbered 2191.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 26, strike lines 16 through 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"FUNDS FOR ENHANCEMENT OF TRANSMITTER FACILITIES

"SEC. 205. (a) Of the amounts appropriated for the United States Information Agency for fiscal year 1984, not less than $52,900,000 shall be available only for the engineering, site preparation, and enhancement of radio transmitter facilities.

"(b) Of the amounts appropriated for the United States Information Agency for fiscal year 1985, not less than $95,286,000 shall be available only for the engineering, site preparation, and enhancement of radio transmitter facilities."

On page 27, line 1, strike "$100,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$78,900,000".

On page 27, line 10, strike "$123,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$80,800,000".

On pages 33–43, strike entire title IV.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, with all due respect to my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Relations, I believe the committee was a bit remiss in its underfunding of its proposals to enhance the radio transmitters of the Voice of America.

It is perfectly clear that the free world and the Communist world are now engaged in a battle for the minds of men. We need desperately to reach the peoples who live under Communist rule. Yet the Voice of America is operating with equipment so inadequate that the word "inadequate" really does not begin to describe the situation.

Mr. President, I came to the Senate from the broadcasting business. For that reason, I am familiar with industry standards for equipment.

Not so long ago the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS) and I and others went over to the Voice of America to examine the capability from a technical sense of VOA, in terms of distributing information to the people of this world.

Mr. President, I was appalled at what I saw. The transmitters, I must say, are even in worse shape than the technical equipment in the studios, and the studio equipment was obsolete years ago.

We are actually using World War II vintage equipment in some cases, and now with the tradgedy of KAL 007 I think it is clear that the free world needs to reach the Soviet Union more than ever with the truth.

In recent months, VOA has made great strides in improving morale and broadcast content. A good example was the recent interview with the Soviet defector Victor Belenko. Mr. Belenko was a Soviet fighter pilot, as the distinguished occupant of the chair knows. Mr. Belenko knows intimately the command and control

system involved in the shooting down of KAL 007. It is significant that the VOA interview was not only an exclusive but a significant contribution to world information.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Belenko interview be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

VICTOR BELENKO INTERVIEW ON KOREAN AIRLINER

Q. Victor, you have heard the tape of the exchange between the Soviet pilots and the command post. Judging from this exchange, would you say that warning shots were fired or not?

A. The answer is negative—no!

Q. What could have been done during the two and one half hour period to avoid destroying the Korean passenger plane?

A. Many things could have been done. The American embassy could have been contacted immediately. The Korean embassy could have been contacted, or the Japanese. They all could have been warned that an airplane which the Soviets cannot identify is in Soviet air space; and if nothing is done about it, the USSR will shoot it down. I believe that after such a warning something would have been done, and there would have been no victims.

Q. The Soviet fighter pilot of the SU 15 pulled abreast of the passenger plane. In your opinion did he recognize it as a Boeing 747 or was it an unknown entity to him?

A. For him it was a complete mystery. A Soviet pilot has never seen a Boeing 747. For him it was a big puzzle. He most likely thought it was an American reconnaisance plane, a bomber or a transport plane which had lost its direction.

Q. Having listened to the radio communications do you think that the Soviet pilot made an effort to warn the Korean pilot?

A. In accordance with his limited capabilities, I think he made an effort. But in those circumstances, at night, at that altitude it was a very difficult thing to do. But I think he tried.

Q. Marshall Ogarkov said that the decision to shoot down the plane was made at the regional command level. What's your opinion?

A. I think that is not true. In the USSR there can be no regional decisions because everything there is centralized—the Central Committee of the Communist Party, the Central Statistical Administration on the Central Command Post, etc. I think that the decision was made in Moscow because if it had been made regionally, the plane would have been shot down within minutes. Thereby the decision was made centrally—probably in the Central Air Decision Command. However, no decision is really necessary at all. In accordance with the standing order given by the Minister of Defense, if the target doesn't respond to your signals, and does not follow your orders, it must be shot down.

Q. Marshall Ogarkov said that the Korean plane ignored more than 120 warning shots. You were a SU15 pilot-instructor. Does the SU15 have the capability to fire warning shots?

A. No!

Q. What are the plane's capabilities? What does it carry besides air to air missiles?

A. According to the radio transcripts, that particular interceptor (805) had only two rockets and fuel tanks. Therefore, he had no cannons to fire tracer bullets. If he had fired warning shots with his rockets, he would not have had anything left to shoot down the airliner.

Q. What is Soviet policy towards those who violate Soviet air space?

A. The policy is very simple—follow the orders of the Defence Minister. [If] the target is in your air space, you must intercept it. If you can't force it to land, you must destroy it. And that is what Comrade Gromyko stated at the Madrid Conference. If the same (violation of Soviet airspace) occurs again, the result will be the same.

Q. Everywhere else in the world, there are attempts to assist planes which stray off-course, to help them land safety. Why isn't this done in the Soviet Union?

A. They have to follow the (standing) orders of the Ministry of Defense, which states that the target must be intercepted and, if the target doesn't obey your commands, then you have to shoot it down. Its very simple. Soviet pilots can't—they don't have the right to think. They have to carry out the orders of their commanders. The commanders do the thinking for them.

Q. Several days ago, a Novosti Press Agency representative stated that the Soviet pilots attempted to communicate with the pilot of the Korean airliner on a special frequency which is used internationally (121.5 MH).

A. (Soviet pilots) don't have this frequency. A Soviet pilot cannot communicate with any foreign pilot! All his frequencies are classified and are changed almost every month. Everything he said was untrue!

Q. Why don't Soviet pilots have the international frequency?

A. If they had it, they could initiate a two-way conversation. Such an exchange could influence the heart and mind of a Soviet pilot, who is supposedly dedicated to the Communist cause.

Q. In other words, would two-way communications make it easier for Soviet fliers to defect?

A. Yes!

Q. President Reagan said he is closing Aeroflot offices in the United States and taking other measures. International airline pilots groups have agreed not to fly into the USSR. Do you think these measures are sufficient?

A. These measures aren't sufficient. The West should refuse the Soviets all landing rights. This policy must be continued until the Soviet Union changes its standing orders (to shoot down any aircraft violating Soviet airspace). A sixty or ninety days boycott won't have any effect on them. To prevent their flights indefinitely—until they change their policy—will be effective. Aeroflot has a five-year plan which must be fulfilled, or they will be in trouble with the Politburo. Certain elements in the Politburo will then pressure the military, because plans have to be fulfilled. Eventually, they will change their policy—I think. We have to be firm with them.

Q. What other measures could we take in addition to denying them landing rights?

A. In critical flightpath areas, there should be representatives (of countries concerned). Then, in the event of such an event as this one, the Soviet and Western representatives could settle the matter on the spot. So that they wouldn't blow innocent people out of the air. We have to find some way of getting together and cooperating to enable people safely to fly around the globe.

Mr. HELMS. But here is the problem, Mr. President, and I hope Senators will focus their attention on it. It is doubtful how many people in the Soviet Union heard this interview.

Let me review the VOA transmitter situation.

First of all, VOA has 107 transmitters. Of these better than 90 percent are 15 years old or older. More than 35 percent are 30 years old or older. Our important sites in Tangier and Munich broadcasting to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union have transmitters that are vintage World War II equipment. The U.S.S.R. spends more to jam VOA than VOA spends for all of its broadcasts.

So I say, Mr. President, no wonder the message of the free world is not being heard. VOA has been neglected and I say for far too long. We either ought to get in the business or confess that we are unwilling to stay in it.

Now, VOA has only six 500 kilowatt superpower transmitters and they are all patched together from 250 kilowatt transmitters. In contrast, the Soviet Union has 37 modern superpower transmitters, France has 11, West Germany has 9, and the United Kingdom has 8.

Because of lack of transmitter time and inadequate staffing, VOA's hours of broadcasting do not reflect America's place and influence in the world. Let me give some illustration:

The Voice of America broadcasts 956 hours per week. The Soviet Union broadcasts 2,158 hours per week. China broadcasts 1,430 hours; Taiwan, 1,006 hours; West Germany, 787 hours; the United Kingdom, 721 hours; and Egypt, 707 hours.

VOA broadcasts in 42 languages, the Soviet Union in 82, China in 43, West Germany in 37, United Kingdom in 36, and Egypt in 30.

The Voice of America is in fifth place in broadcasting hours to Africa. VOA is in sixth place in broadcasting hours to Latin America and the Caribbean. VOA is in sixth place in broadcasting hours to Eastern Europe, if RFE/RL is not considered.

It is in sixth place in broadcast hours to East Asia and in 10th place in broadcast hours to Europe.

Mr. President, I consider this deplorable. Radio Moscow broadcasts 5 hours in Pashto to Afghanistan for every 1 hour of VOA programs. Radio Moscow broadcasts in 10 languages to the Middle East and North Africa. VOA has only 8.

At the beginning of 1983, VOA had about 1,000 technicians worldwide but fewer than 20 engineers with engineering degrees to manage a plant with a replacement value of $2 billion. Let me repeat that. VOA had about 1,000 technicians worldwide but fewer than 20 engineers with engineering degrees

to manage a plant with a replacement value of $2 billion.

VOA's technicians have gone from crisis to crisis in trying to keep the Voice on the air. They have had to manufacture parts for VOA's ancient equipment because new spare parts simply do not exist. Mistakes have been made—poor design of antennas resulting in less than full signal, burned out generators, acceptance of equipment that would not do the job. Only by adding a staff of qualified engineers can VOA reverse its record of poor performance in facilities design.

Of 42 language services, 38 are understaffed by internationally accepted broadcast standards. We have a news staff of about 60 for 956 broadcast hours per week; BBC has almost twice that many for 721.

VOA's headquarters broadcasting and recording studios are incredibly outmoded.

I suggest that Senators do precisely what Senator SYMMS and I did recently: Go over to VOA and look for themselves. If they think I am exaggerating, they should take a look, and I think they will come back with the same reaction that the Senator from North Carolina has.

For the most part, the equipment in these studios is from the 1950's. Broadcasters from India and China who recently visited the VOA expressed amazement that "the world's most advanced Nation can be using some of the world's most backward broadcasting facilities."

Mr. President, the President summarized the situation in his radio broadcast last Saturday:

> Within minutes of the report of the Soviet destruction of the Korean jet, the Voice of America aired the story in its news programs around the Globe. . . . Accurate news like this is about as welcome as the plague among the Soviet elite. Censorship is as natural and necessary to the survival of their dictatorship as free speech is to our democracy. That's why they devote such enormous recourses to block our broadcast inside Soviet-controlled countries. The Soviets spend more to block Western broadcasts coming into those countries than the entire worldwide budget of the Voice of America.

Furthermore, the President said:

> Today I am appealing to Congress, help us get the truth through. Help us strengthen our international broadcasting effort by supporting increased funding for the Voice of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's entire statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

RADIO ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE NATION

THE PRESIDENT. My fellow Americans: During my first press conference, nine days after being sworn in as your President, I was asked a question having to do with Soviet intentions. In my answer, I cited their own words, that they have openly and publicly declared the only morality they recognize is what will further world communism, that they reserve unto themselves the right to commit any crime, to lie, to cheat, in order to attain that. And I pointed out that we should keep this in mind when we deal with them.

I was charged with being too harsh in my language. I tried to point out I was only quoting their own words. Well, I hope the Soviet's recent behavior will dispel any lingering doubt about what kind of regime we are dealing with and what our responsibilities are as trustees of freedom and peace. Isn't it time for all of us to see the Soviet rulers as they are rather than as we would like them to be.

Rather then tell the truth about the Korean Air Lines massacre, rather than immediately and publicly investigate the crash, explain to the world how it happened, punish those guilty of the crime, cooperate in efforts to find the wreckage, recover the bodies, apologize and offer compensation to the families, and work to prevent a repetition, they have done the opposite. They have stonewalled the world, mobilizing their entire government behind a massive cover-up, then brazenly threatening to kill more men women and children should another civilian airliner make the same mistake as KAL 007.

The Soviets are terrified of the truth. They understand well and they dread the meaning of St. John's words, "You will know the truth, and the truth will set you free." The truth is mankind's best hope for a better world. That's why in times like this, few assets are more important than the Voice of America and Radio Liberty, our primary means of getting the truth to the Russian people.

Within minutes of the report of the Soviet destruction of the Korean jet, the Voice of America aired the story in its news programs around the globe. We made sure people in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, Europe and, most important, the people in the Soviet Bloc itself knew the truth. That includes every Soviet misstatement, from their initial denials through all the tortured changes and contradictions in their story, including their UN representative still denying they shot down the plane even as his own government was finally admitting they did.

Accurate news like this is about as welcome as the plague among the Soviet elite. Censorship is as natural and necessary to the survival of their dictatorship as free speech is to our democracy. That's why they devote such enormous resources to block our broadcast inside Soviet-controlled countries. The Soviets spend more to block Western broadcasts coming into those countries than the entire worldwide budget of the Voice of America.

To get the news across to the Russian people about the Korean Air Lines massacre, the Voice of America added new frequencies and new broadcast times. But within minutes of those changes, new Soviet jamming began. Luckily, jamming is more like a sieve than a wall. International radio broadcasts can still get through to many people with the news. But we still face enormous difficulties.

One of the Voice of America's listeners in the Middle East wrote: "If you do not strengthen your broadcasting frequencies, no one can get anything from your program." Our radio equipment is just plain old, some of it World War II vintage. I don't mind people getting older; it's just not so good for machines.

More than 35 percent of the Voice of America's transmitters are over 30 years old. We have a similar problem at Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. We have 6 antiquated 500-kilowatt shortwave transmitters. The Soviets have 37, and theirs are neither old nor outdated. We regularly receive complaints that Soviet broadcasts are clearer than ours. One person wrote and asked why it's not possible for a Nation that can send ships into space to have its own voice heard here on earth.

The answer is simple. We are as far behind the Soviets and their allies in international broadcasting today as we were in space when they launched Sputnik in 1957.

We have repeatedly urged the Congress to support our long-term modernization program and our proposal for a new radio station, Radio Marti, for broadcasting to Cuba. The sums involved are modest, but for whatever reason this critical program has not been enacted.

Today I am appealing to the Congress, help us get the truth through. Help us strengthen our international broadcasting effort by supporting increased funding for the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and by authorizing the establishment of Radio Marti.

And I appeal to you, especially those of you who came from Eastern Europe, Russia, and Soviet-dominated countries, who understand how crucial this issue is, let your representatives hear from you. Tell them you want Soviet rulers held accountable for their actions even by their own people. The truth is still our strongest weapon. We just have to use it.

Finally, let us come together as a Nation tomorrow in a National Day of Mourning to share the sorrow of the families, and let us resolve that this crime against humanity will never be forgotten anywhere in the world.

Until next week, thank you for listening, and God bless you.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, that is why I feel that the priorities of this bill are wrong. The committee has earmarked funds for some purposes, which, while deemed important by some, ought to be placed upon a lower priority at this time.

A case in point is the excessive increase in funding for the Fulbright exchanges.

I wish money grew on trees in Washington, D.C., so that we would not have to worry about priorities. We could do everything everybody wants to do. But we cannot. We have to establish priorities, and this Senator is convinced that if we do not get back to the business of providing truth to the world through our facilities, we might as well get out of it entirely.

The committee effectively added $21.6 million over what the administration asked for this purpose in fiscal year 1984 and $42.3 million in fiscal year 1985. The Fulbright exchange is a worthy purpose. Nobody denies that. But we have a total of $116,429 million for fiscal year 1984 and $142.535 million for fiscal year 1985. We certainly are not skimping on the Fulbright ex-

changes. Nor is there a demonstrated need for increased Federal spending. In the academic year 1981-82, there were 326,300 foreign students enrolled in colleges in the United States. Only 2.3 percent of all these students were sponsored by the U.S. Government. By far the vast majority of foreign students are able to come to the United States without U.S. Government help.

That is why, through this amendment, I propose to shift back to the President's priorities, and try to recover some of the funding for the VOA transmitter enhancement.

I propose to cut back the earmarkings to the levels requested by the administration and shift those funds to VOA transmitter enhancement.

Similarly, we have $31.3 million in the bill for the National Endowment for Democracy. This is a proposal which has been considered by this Senate in a scant fashion, to say the least. It was put into the bill by the committee after we had already earmarked $32 million for Project Democracy, which was the administration's original request. We had a 45-minute hearing on NED—45 minutes, Mr. President—and the very next day it was rushed into the markup with less than 10 minutes of discussion. The record shows general confusion over what was being put into the bill.

Now I happen to think that NED needs far more consideration, careful consideration, than it has received. It is not an urgent item like enhancing the Voice of America's capabilities. I think that we could profitably shift the NED funds into transmitter enhancement, as well, and give more thought to the structure and purpose of NED.

Now, let me summarize, if I may, Mr. President. The pending Helms amendment does not add new funds to this bill—not one penny. It only changes the priorities of the earmarks. The amendment zeros the earmarkings for the National Endowment for Democracy for both fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985, making $31.3 million available only for VOA transmitter enhancement in each of those 2 years.

The amendment reduces earmarkings for the Fulbright exchange by the amounts not sought by the administration. The point is the Foreign Relations Committee added $21,600,000 to the amount that the administration said it could spend wisely, earmarking a total of $116,429,000 for fiscal year 1984 and an unsought increase of $42,300,000 for fiscal year 1985 for a total earmarking of $142,535,000 for fiscal year 1985.

So, Mr. President, the Helms amendment transfers both unsought amounts—that is to say amounts over what the administration feels they could spend wisely—we would take that amount and apply it to enhancing the transmitting capability of the Voice of America.

In addition, the administration estimates that the committee bill provides an unearmarked $21,686,000 for transmitter enhancement for each year. The Helms amendment earmarks these amounts, also.

The Helms earmarkings are in addition to the amounts appropriated in the Radio Marti bill, S. 602, of $26,062,000 for each of the fiscal years.

Mr. President, I have an accompanying table which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

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

Effect of Helms amendment on VOA transmitter enhancement

	Thousands
Fiscal year 1984:	
1984 request	$47,959
S. 1342	21,686
Unsought exchanges earmarking	21,600
NED earmarking	31,300
Total Helms earmarking	74,586
Additional from S. 602	26,062
Total VOA transmitter	100,648
Fiscal year 1985:	
1985 request	179,426
S. 1342	21,686
Unsought exchanges earmarking	42,300
NED earmarking	31,300
Total Helms earmarking	95,286
Additional from S. 602	26,062
Total VOA transmitter	121,348
Combined request 1984-85	227,385
Total Helms and S. 602	221,996
Shortfall without Helms earmarking:	
Combined request 1984-85	227,385
Total S. 1342 and S. 602	95,496
Shortfall	131,889

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY—COMPARISON OF AGENCY'S 1984 AND 1985 BUDGET REQUEST WITH CONGRESSIONAL ALLOWANCES

[In thousands of dollars; excludes $10,000,000 for Asia Foundation shifted to State]

Account	Fiscal year 1984							Fiscal year 1985				
	1984 USIA request	Senate authorization action, 1984			House authorization 1984, H.R. 2915	House appropriations 1984, H.R. 3222	Senate appropriations 1984, S. 1721	1985 USIA request	Senate authorization action, 1985			House authorization 1985, H.R. 2915
		SFRC S. 1342	Senate S. 602	Total					SFRC S. 1342	Senate S. 602	Total	
Salaries and expenses:												
Voice of America	153,680	123,540	28,738	152,278	153,680	153,680	150,237	160,115	117,531	28,738	146,269	160,115
Exchanges (subject to Pell amendmemt)	94,858	116,429		116,429	94,858	94,858	93,909	100,283	142,535		142,535	100,283
Project Democracy (administration, nonexchange program)	44,491				13,191	13,191		44,877				13,577
National Endowment for Democracy		31,300		31,300	31,300	31,300			31,300		31,300	31,300
O'seas Post, TV, programs, support	331,336	314,223		314,223	331,336	327,165	317,616	344,581	294,126		294,126	344,581
Total, S&E	624,365	585,492	28,738	614,230	624,365	620,194	561,762	649,856	585,492	28,738	614,230	649,856
Salaries and expenses, Foreign currency	10,556	10,454		10,454	10,556	10,556	10,450	12,412	10,454		10,454	12,412
VOA Radio construction	47,959	21,686	26,062	47,748	47,959	34,013	41,438	179,426	21,686	26,062	47,748	179,426
East-West Center	18,547	18,368		18,368	18,547	18,547	18,362	19,345	18,368		18,368	19,345
Total	701,427	636,000	54,800	690,800	701,427	683,310	632,012	861,039	636,000	54,800	690,800	861,039
Radio Marti			14,130	14,130						16,130	16,130	

TRANSMITTER AND ANTENNA COSTS

The most efficient manufacturing company in the world would fold overnight if it couldn't get its products to market. The Voice of America is not about to fold—but our old and aging technical equipment make it increasingly difficult for listeners to hear our steadily improving product. Of our 107 transmitters, more than 90 percent are 15 years old or older, and more than 35 percent are 30 years old or older. At important sites in Tangier and Munich, where VOA broadcasts to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, the transmitters were built before World War II. Currently the VOA has six 500 KW superpower transmitters, patched together from 250 KWs. In contrast, the USSR has 37 modern superpower transmitters.

It is simply essential for VOA to put a high quality signal into all areas of the world important to the U.S. national interest. And the only way to do this is to make steady progress in all VOA construction and upgrading projects.

Major components of the Voice of America Radio Construction authorization for FY 85 include: upgrading facilities at eight existing sites; new site construction at some eight sites; and antenna upgrade and design at three existing sites.

TRANSMITTER COST

A typical VOA relay site includes six 500 KW transmitters. One 500 KW transmitter and associated antenna system cost is approximately $15 million.

The components of the $15 million (in 1982 constant dollars) include:

	Millions
Transmitter: Purchase, shipping, installation, associated buildings, and spare parts	$4.0
Antenna systems: Purchase, shipping, installation, and associated equipment	5.6
Prorated share of the cost to build a VOA power plant	2.9
Site preparation	1.0
Prorated complete engineering design costs	1.5
Total 500 KW tansmitter cost	15.0

ANTENNA COSTS

VOA has identified existing relay stations which will require varying degrees of replacement/upgrade of antennas and associated components. Current antennas are inefficient, obsolete and in some cases misdirected. The new antenna system would provide for a 360 degree coverage area, providing better coverage with fewer antennas and long term savings due to more efficient land use and upkeep.

It is expected that a modern efficient antenna and associated components, fully installed, will cost about $2-3 million each depending on such details as size, complexity and location. VOA has targeted some 10 antennas at each of three locations for upgrading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. PERCY. I thank my distinguished colleague very much, indeed.

The thrust of his amendment is such that I would regrettably have to oppose it. I will have the distinguished ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee speak on that aspect of it which deals with cutting the exchange program.

There is no overall reduction, as I understand it, in the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina. What he does is cut down the educational exchange programs. He takes the money that would be saved there and transfers it to a program for engineering, site preparation, and enhancement of radio transmitter facilities for the U.S. Information Service and for VOA. So there is no money saving at all.

Furthermore, I believe that the VOA enhancement is unnecessary because in the Radio Marti bill we have fully funded additional amounts. And I read directly from the authorization of appropriations, section 8, subparagraph (b) as follows:

In addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated the Agency for the fiscal years '84, '85, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Agency $54,800,000 for the fiscal year '84 and $54,800,000 for the fiscal year '85, which amounts shall be available only for expenses incurred by essential modernization at facilities and operations of the Voice of America.

Certainly, Mr. President, we have demonstrated in recent weeks with the Korean flight 007 tragedy the necessity of our telling the truth to the world as to what is going on and what went on in that action against humanity by the Soviet Union. Certainly to modernize, to update, improve, and strengthen our facilities is a laudable and commendable objective with which I fully agree, but we have already provided $54,800,000 in fiscal 1984 and $54,800,000 in fiscal 1985 in the Radio Marti bill. Therefore, we have anticipated and taken into account the concern of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina about our not having modernized, efficient, effective, up-to-date facilities. We gave them every penny that they asked for.

With respect to the section in the amendment of the distinguished Senator that would deal with the National Endowment for Democracy, it essentially would remove those funds. The proposal to establish and fund a National Endowment for Democracy was the product of an extensive study by four highly responsible groups: the Republican National Committee, the Democratic National Committee, the AFL-CIO, and the American Chamber of Commerce.

In addition, a number of other prominent public figures, reflecting the broad spectrum of American political opinion—from Richard Allen to Tony Lake—participated actively. They were at the session. They participated actively, and they were deeply involved. I was honored to be a founding member of that organization.

The Foreign Relations Committee discussed the proposal and no member of the committee argued that the discussions were inadequate regarding the nature and purpose of the endowment.

Beyond that, I want to emphasize my strong feeling that the endowment is an idea whose time has come and that it is important to press ahead with this highly promising initiative.

It is worth noting that to let this legislation fall by the wayside—the inevitable result of the proposed amendment—would disappoint a large number of friendly foreign governments who have looked forward to cooperating with the endowment's activities.

These governments included Costa Rica, Jamaica, Venezuela, El Salvador, Liberia, Nigeria—to name just a few from the developing world.

But most importantly, this is a genuinely bipartisan proposal at a time when bipartisanship is desperately needed in this dangerous world. We cannot let this opportunity pass. With democracy at stake in so many parts of the world, for example Latin America, it would be tragic for this country to deprive itself of the energies and resourcefulness of its private citizens and nongovernmental organizations.

The Department of State strongly endorses the legislation, as amended, regarding a National Endowment for Democracy.

The legislation represents a major step in pursuit of the purposes set forth by the President in his speech to Westminster in June 1982. It constitutes a broadly bipartisan effort to enlist the energies and enterprise of our private citizens and nongovernmental organizations in strengthening democratic institutions worldwide. The Endowment thus promises to strengthen the ability of the United States to encourage and advance those ideals and practices which all Americans share.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as much as I have a high regard for the Senator from North Carolina, I must join my colleague, the chairman of the committee, in opposing this amendment. What the amendment would do, when you analyze it, is to wipe out the National Endowment for Democracy which is strongly supported, as we all know, by the Chamber of Commerce, the AFL-CIO, and the Republican and Democratic National Committees. This would be wiped out.

In addition, it would vastly reduce or really wipe out the committee's action in increasing the Fulbright academic exchange funding. The amendment would also reduce the general exchange efforts that we had been making in the committee. And I think there is a direct link between exchanges and our influence abroad.

For example, in this vital area, we have fallen way behind the Soviet Union. They send 10 times the number of students from Latin America as an example to the Soviet Union as we take in on our side. And when you travel around the world, you find the one program that seems to mean the most to our various ambassadors and chiefs of missions abroad and our embassy personnel there are the exchange programs. That is the one program they really want enlarged, enlarged, enlarged.

I know I have seen the effect of the exchange programs firsthand. I remember living behind the Iron Curtain at one point in my life. And I used to see Communist citizens of that country come to the United States and come back less convinced, less good Communists, more citizens of the world. I do not ever recall seeing the opposite occur.

The more exchanges we have, I think the more the citizens in other parts of the world will learn that we are not as we are portrayed by the Soviet Union, but we are as we are—a freedom loving, individual human rights respecting nation. To my mind, there is no money that is spent more advisedly and better than is the exchange programs.

In doing this I am in no way derogating the importance of the Voice of America, but I am just saying it is a question of priorities. And in this work we do here, we have to give priorities

of A over B, or B over C. And in my view there is no better priority than the exchange program.

For this reason, I join with the chairman of the committee in opposing this amendment.

In closing, I would read in for the RECORD an official news release from USIA of May 1983 giving basically the administration's viewpoint. It says that we simply cannot do without the link, the exchange program, provided to significant levels of the thinking leadership in the world, and that the Fulbright program is incentive that must be attended to.

So I would hope that my colleagues would not accept this amendment, and leave the language that is carefully crafted in the committee with a certain priority in the exchange programs which is so vigorously supported by our chiefs of missions from all over the world.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. 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.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, there is no one in whom I have more affection or respect for than Senator PELL. But I would say to him and other Senators that this amendment does not—I repeat, does not—reduce the educational programs. It merely reduces the huge increase proposed by the committee for that purpose. It reduces the rate of increase.

Let me say again that the President's request was $54,786,000. The authorization for fiscal year 1983 was $51,569,000, and for fiscal year 1982 was $42,127,000. So the Helms amendment still calls for an actual increase.

Now I note that the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. PERCY, spoke of the funding added in the Radio Marti bill.

Mr. President, I do not want to appear didactic, but let me say again that I went over to the Voice of America a few weeks ago, as did the distinguished occupant of the chair. We saw what they have and we saw what they lack. And I came back to this Senate very depressed in terms of the capability of the Voice of America to make any dent against the barrage of Communist propaganda that is pouring forth throughout the world.

The funding for Voice of America, I contend, is inadequate with respect to construction.

Now let us draw a line, Mr. President, and see what we are talking about and what we are looking at. Over half of the new funding that the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. PERCY mentioned, is related to personnel costs for enhancement. Now, they have need for more engineers and that sort of thing to handle the modernization. I acknowledge that. But the big need is in technology.

My amendment would not even restore all of the construction money requested. There still is a considerable shortfall in construction money over the 2-year period, a shortfall, I am advised, of about $5,400,000, even with the Helms earmarkings.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I am not here to complain about the Fulbright funding. All I am talking about is priorities. If we really want to get the truth out to the world with respect to episodes like the shooting down of KAL 007, then we have got to have the equipment. We do not have it. I reiterate that the VOA is sitting over there and out there using equipment so outmoded, so obsolescent that no responsible commercial broadcaster would even think about using it. Radio stations all over this country realize that if you cannot get the signal out it does not matter about the quality of what you are broadcasting because nobody is hearing it anyhow. And that is where the priority rests as far as I am concerned.

Now, Senators may vote as they wish, but I want them to know that if they vote against this amendment, they are establishing a priority that telling the truth to the world is really not very important.

Unless and until this Congress provides for funding for the technology to get us back into the ball game, we simply are not going to be able to get the truth out. Any Senator who doubts what I am saying should do precisely what Senator SYMMS, who is now presiding over the Senate, Senator HELMS and others did in recent days when we went over and made an inspection of what VOA had and what VOA lacks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. DENTON) be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina. The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Maine (Mr. COHEN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Florida (Mrs. HAWKINS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COCHRAN). Is there any other Senator in the Chamber who desires to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 68, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 264 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Abdnor	Helms	Pressler
Andrews	Humphrey	Simpson
Armstrong	Kassebaum	Specter
Denton	Kasten	Symms
Dole	Long	Thurmond
East	Mattingly	Trible
Garn	McClure	Wallop
Grassley	Murkowski	Warner
Heflin	Nickles	

NAYS—68

Baker	Evans	Mitchell
Baucus	Exon	Moynihan
Bentsen	Ford	Nunn
Biden	Glenn	Packwood
Bingaman	Gorton	Pell
Boren	Hart	Percy
Boschwitz	Hatch	Proxmire
Bradley	Hecht	Pryor
Bumpers	Heinz	Quayle
Burdick	Hollings	Randolph
Byrd	Huddleston	Riegle
Chafee	Inouye	Roth
Chiles	Jepsen	Rudman
Cochran	Johnston	Sarbanes
Cranston	Kennedy	Sasser
D'Amato	Lautenberg	Stennis
Danforth	Laxalt	Stevens
DeConcini	Leahy	Tower
Dixon	Levin	Tsongas
Dodd	Lugar	Weicker
Domenici	Matsunaga	Wilson
Durenberger	Melcher	Zorinsky
Eagleton	Metzenbaum	

NOT VOTING—6

Cohen	Hatfield	Mathias
Goldwater	Hawkins	Stafford

So Mr. HELMS' amendment (No. 2191) was rejected.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2192

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine (Mr. MITCHELL), for himself and Mr. STAFFORD, proposes an amendment numbered 2192.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On Page 24, after line 19, add the following new section to Title I of the Bill:

"SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available under this Act for "International Commissions" for fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985, shall be available for the use, by such commissions or their agents, of herbicides containing dioxin compounds.

(b) Unless the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and the Governors of the affected border

states are notified forty-five days in advance of the use of a herbicide by an international commission, funds appropriated for such use shall not be available for obligation or expenditure. Such notification shall include—

(1) the name of the herbicide;

(2) an estimate of the quantity of herbicide planned for use;

(3) an identification of the area on which the herbicide will be used;

(4) a description of the herbicide's chemical composition."

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, this omnibus authorization measure provides authority for activities conducted by many organizations. Among these organizations is one of the smallest units in the Federal Government, the International Boundary Commission, which deals with matters between the United States and Canada.

During the August recess, NBC news revealed that this tiny commission, unbeknownst to the public and this Congress, used a herbicide known as agent orange to maintain a 36-mile-long, 20-foot-wide clear cut strip of land in Maine and New Hampshire along the Canadian border. This defoliant was used by the Commission as late as 1978, over 6 years after its use was discontinued in Vietnam for health safety reasons.

The jury is still out on the specific results to personal health from direct exposure to agent orange. However, sufficient evidence exists to conclude that the risks posed by this mixture of chemicals clearly outweighs its benefits as a defoliant.

Technically, agent orange is a mixture of two primary ingredients, 2,4,5,T and 2,4,D (2,4,5-trichlorophenoxyacetic acid and 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid) and a third component, TCDD (2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-para-dioxin).

The TCDD, a contaminant which is produced during the manufacture of 2,4,5,T, is the part of the mixture which is so dangerous. Skin conditions, cancer, nervousness, birth defects, and numbness in the extremities all may result from direct exposure to this dangerous toxin.

As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs which is studying the agent orange problem, I was extremely concerned when I learned of the NBC report. My concern was heightened when I subsequently learned that because of the passage of time little or nothing can be done by the Federal Government to even measure the degree to which dioxins originating in the herbicide may have penetrated the soil, water table, and watershed in the affected area. It was at that point that I decided to seek a congressional statement on the issue in the form of an amendment to the pending bill.

The amendment which I propose with Senator STAFFORD will place clearly on record, the views of Congress concerning boundary commission use of herbicides containing dioxins.

The first section of the amendment flatly prohibits the use of such herbicides by any international commissions authorized by the bill.

The second section will insure that Congress is vigilant in the future. It stipulates that boundary commissions may not use any herbicides unless they provide prior notice to the Governor of the affected State, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

In addition, the second section is clear as to what such a notification should contain. It shall include first, the name of the herbicide; second, an estimate of the quantity of herbicide planned for use; third, an identification of the area on which the herbicide will be used; and fourth, a description of the herbicide's chemical composition.

Mr. President, the administration should have no complaint with this amendment. This is because its primary component—the prohibition section—reflects what is currently the policy of the International Boundary Commission. In approving this amendment, the Senate will be saying that it concurs with that current policy and does not want that policy changed without the Congress being involved in the decision.

I understand, Mr. President, that this amendment has been cleared and that the floor managers will, I hope, see fit to accept this amendment, which is the first of three amendments, Mr. President, which I have to offer.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, the committee does accept this amendment of the Senator from Maine and feels that it is well stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, representing the floor leader on this side of the aisle, it is my understanding this amendment has been cleared and there is no opposition to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine.

The amendment (No. 2192) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2193

Mr. MITCHELL. Now, Mr. President, I ask that my second amendment be immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine (Mr. MITCHELL) proposes an amendment numbered 2193.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 5, line 7, after the term "agricultural commodities," insert "fisheries commodities," and

On page 6, line 9, after the word "agricultural", insert ", fisheries,".

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, this amendment concerns section 106 of the bill, added by the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. PRESSLER) in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Section 106 expresses the sense of the Senate on the need to facilitate U.S. exports by opposing international restrictions on the marketing and distribution of U.S goods. It is intended to direct U.S. Government representatives to various international organizations to oppose all proposed marketing and distribution regulations which might harm U.S. industries seeking to export their commodities, goods, and services.

My problem with section 106 does not concern what it contains, but what it omits. The fact is that its emphasis is on the need to create an international trade environment under which U.S. agricultural commodities may be easily exported. My concern is that our country's other important food producing sector, the fishing industry, is not even mentioned.

I support fully the view, often expressed by the distinguished assistant majority leader, the senior Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), that greater Government appreciation should go to this important industry.

Those Americans who harvest marine resources are far less organized than those who work the soil and raise livestock. Though the fishing industry has responded to the challenges of the last decade by increasing its focus on Government policies which affect it, the industry has a long way to go before it comes close to claiming its proper share of attention from Federal policymakers.

As the representative of an extremely important segment of the American fishing industry, I have pledged to fishing harvesters and processors in the State of Maine to do everything I can to permit their traditional way of life to survive and flourish. One way that those of us who represent fishermen and processors of fish products is to try and win for the industry a corresponding share of the attention which this Congress and the Federal bureaucracy directs toward American agriculture.

The amendment I am offering at this point should be considered a part of this effort. In the preambular clause of section 106, I add the term "fisheries commodities" to the congressional finding that "* * * in an increasingly interdependent world economy, Government measures that re-

strict the economic and efficient marketing and distribution of American exports of agricultural commodities, goods, and services hurt not only U.S. producers but also consumers in countries around the world."

Later, in section 106's resolved clause, I add "fisheries products" to the congressional directive that "* * * United States representatives to United Nations-related agencies and to other international organizations should oppose the adoption of international marketing and distribution regulations or restrictions which unnecessarily impede the export of United States agricultural and other products."

I should point out that very few of America's fishermen want all of the benefits which the Federal Government bestows on American agriculture. For instance, Maine fishermen oppose vehemently any suggestions that price supports be directed toward fish harvesters for landed product. They believe, and I agree with them, that the market mechanism is the best means to insure that expert harvesters are rewarded, inexpert harvesters are penalized, and that the industry prospers. Maine's fishermen do not want to become in any way dependent on Government, they only want the Government to promote freedom in the marketplace. That is one of their chief goals domestically and is becoming one of their chief goals with respect to overseas marketing as well.

In a report of the U.S. International Trade Commission, "Summary of Trade and Tariff Information," April 1982, I learned that until recent years U.S. exports of fish had been negligible. However, shortages of fish abroad and favorable exchange rates have resulted in increased exports of many species harvested by U.S. fishermen. For example, herring, dogfish shark, monkfish, and eel, according to the USITC, are now shipped to Europe or the Orient. In addition, underutilized species such as mullet, drum, jack, crevalle, and ladyfish are being shipped from gulf ports to nations such as Egypt, Nigeria, and Venezuela.

U.S. policy should encourage rather than hinder this exporting effort. I am hopeful that the congressional direction contained in section 106, as amended by my amendment, will prompt U.S. representatives to international trade conferences to concentrate on U.S. fisheries exports and to seek agreements and regulations which will permit our Nation to increase its fisheries exporting activities.

I understand that this amendment has been cleared on both sides as well and the managers will accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. The committee accepts this amendment as well. It is my understanding that it has been cleared on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine.

The amendment (No. 2193) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2194

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask that my third amendment be immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine (Mr. MITCHELL), on behalf of himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, and Mr. LEVIN, proposes an amendment numbered 2194.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 17, strike "$344,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$369,500,000";

On page 24, after line 19, add the following new section to title I of the bill:

"SEC. —. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1984 under section 102(4) of this Act, $25 million shall be available only for Lebanon for relief and rehabilitation assistance to benefit refugees and displaced persons."

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, S. 1342 authorizes U.S. assistance to migrants and refugees through contributions to the International Committee for Migration, the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, the International Committee of the Red Cross and direct assistance to or on behalf of refugees from various countries through voluntary agencies. Although this program is funded through the Foreign Aid Appropriations Act, it is authorized through this bill.

This authorization was reported last May and has been awaiting floor action for almost 4 months. I am offering my amendment at this time because one of the assumptions which underlies the refugee and migration figure contained in this measure was valid in May, but is no longer valid today.

In May, the Committee noted that the recommended authorization total for fiscal year 1984 and $50 million less than actually authorized for fiscal year 1983. The reason provided in the report is as follows:

Half of this decrease has been made possible by the success of the Department's efforts to reduce refugee admissions to the United States, while continuing to respond to humanitarian needs and U.S. foreign policy interests and responsibilities . . . The other half is credited to the absence of such large-scale refugee crises as were experienced in past years . . .

Mr. President, as all of my colleagues are aware, since May, the strife in Lebanon has accelerated tremendously to a point where many Lebanese people are now being displaced from their homes and villages.

Mr. President, at this point, I ask unanimous consent that two items appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MITCHELL. The first item is a letter from Lebanon's distinguished Ambassador to the United States, the Honorable Abdallah Bouhabib, concerning the current situation. The letter was written yesterday. It indicates that since May—when S. 1343 was reported by the Foreign Relations Committee—150,000 Lebanese citizens have been displaced from their homes The Ambassador notes that these displaced persons face "* * * daily enormous problems of housing and a lack of supplies of all sorts."

The Ambassador's conclusion is echoed in the Special Mideast Report (No. 31) of the International Committee of the Red Cross. This report is dated September 15, 1983, and states that:

. . . Concomitantly with the Emergency actions of several teams in the Chouf (evacuation of the wounded, transport of medical and food assistance, cease-fire negotiations, etc.) the ICRC was investigating the situation of persons displaced by the fighting. The number of persons displaced is now 150,000. Some have taken shelter in the homes of relatives and friends and need assistance action within the next six weeks. Others, numbering about 105,000 need immediate assistance . . . to these must be added some 18,000 people in different regions that the ICRC has not yet been able to reach because of hostilities.

Not all of these persons will be permanent refugees; however their immediate needs are acute, and the international organizations to which I referred at the beginning of my statement are doing their very best to meet these needs. These people and these relief agencies urgently require U.S. assistance and they will still need it after October 1. If the troubles in Lebanon continue—and we all hope and pray that they will not—the needs of displaced persons will, of course, become even greater.

In an effort to facilitate the meeting of these needs, I am proposing that the bill before us be amended by adding an additional $25 million to the refugee and migration assistance total recommended by the committee and that it be earmarked for Lebanon. Even with this add-on, the refugee and migration assistance authority contained in it, the measure will still be some $25 million less than will actually be spent in fiscal year 1983.

The suffering which the people of Lebanon are experiencing is tremendous, ongoing and is creating havoc in

that country. The amendment I propose will, in a modest way, help to mitigate this suffering and I believe reinforce a view held by most Lebanese citizens that American involvement in their tragic country, in a volatile region in the Mideast, is driven by humanitarian considerations for the people of that country and that region. This bill provides us with an opportunity to send such a signal to those of our friends in Lebanon who have a need to which the United States, as a responsible leader in world affairs, should respond. I hope other nations will follow our country's lead.

EXHIBIT 1

EMBASSY OF LEBANON,
Washington, September 21, 1983.

Senator GEORGE J. MITCHELL,
Senate Russell Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MITCHELL: Since May 1983, the ongoing war in Lebanon has led to the displacement of 150,000 Lebanese citizens who were driven from their homes by the intensity of the fighting and the threat of massacre.

These Lebanese are living presently in the bitter situation of refugees in their own country. They are facing daily, enormous problems of housing and lack of supplies of all sorts.

Senator, I wish to express our deep thanks for your concern in the plight of the Lebanese people, and your commitment to help achieve peace and freedom for Lebanon and its beleaguered people.

With best personal regards,

Sincerely,

ABDALLAH BOUHABIB,
Ambassador of Lebanon.

[Mideast Report No. 31, Sept. 15, 1983]

LEBANON: URGENT APPEAL

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Since the beginning of the Israeli intervention in Lebanon in June 1982, ICRC activities have substantially increased to meet an emergency which dragged on until October last year. It was necessary to increase the number of delegates, send out medical teams and large quantities of food and medical supplies and extend our local organization to cover West Beirut, Ashrafieh, Junieh, Tripoli, Baalbeck, Ksara, Sidon and Tyre, with logistic bases in Larnaca, Damascus and Tel Aviv.

1.2. Once the emergency had abated the ICRC again directed itself to its conventional activities, such as visiting daily and assisting some 5,000 prisoners of war at Insar, regularly visiting and assiting security detainees in Lebanese prisons, removing wounded and sick from combat zones, providing medical aid to dispensaries and hospitals, protecting endangered sections of the population, transmitting family messages and enquiries within Lebanon and abroad.

1.3. At the end of August 1983 there were still 53 ICRC delegates and 102 local employees engaged in these activities.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. The tension prevailing in Lebanon during the last eight months of this year heightened on 28 August, the upheaval in Beirut towards the end of August rapidly spread to the Lebanese mountains, and fighting has been going on since 4 September in the Chouf, the Caza of Aley, the Meth and in the suburbs of the capital.

2.2. The ICRC immediately dispatched 4 additional delegates to the area (1 doctor, 1 nurse, 1 radio-operator, 1 delegate) and a senior member of the organization from the Geneva headquarters.

The ICRC has decided to reestablish the logistics base at Larnaca (Cyprus), and has sent out a delegate for this purpose.

2.3. In the field the ICRC has worked closely with the Lebanese Red Cross and has evacuated 70 casualties of the fighting in one week.

2.4. The stocks of medicaments and materials at the dispensaries and hospitals treating the wounded have been replenished from emergency medical supplies held in Beirut, Sidon and the Bekaa. The ICRC has so far dispatched 5 tons of medical supplies to Lebanon via Larnaca, and in addition the Swiss and Finnish Red Cross Societies have sent supplies of blood and human albumin.

2.5. Between 9 and 12 September more than 50 tons of food supplies reached the Chouf. On 12 September, 25 tons was distributed to the refugees in the village of Deir El Kamar, to which the ICRC finally gained access after three fruitless attempts. Apart from these foodstuffs intended for the estimated 25,000 displaced persons now in this village, medicaments and other medical supplies were conveyed to the hospital at Deir El Kamar, where more than 100 casualties are currently being treated.

3. OBJECTIVES

3.1. In view of the very serious deterioration in the situation in Lebanon, and since the fighting will probably continue for weeks to come, the ICRC is forced to considerably increase its assistance.

3.2. Concomitantly with the emergency actions of several teams in the Chouf (evacuation of the wounded, transport of medical and food assistance, cease-fire negotiations, etc.), the ICRC was investigating the situation of persons displaced by the fighting. The number of persons displaced is now about 150,000. Some have taken shelter in the homes of relatives and friends and need assistance action within the next six weeks. Others, numbering about 105,000 need immediate assistance. The later group may be geographically divided up as follows:

East Beirut	1,500
West Beirut	10,000
Caza Aley (high metn)	4,000
(Sofar and Hammana)	4,000
Caza Saida	4,900
Caza Jezzine	2,450
Caza Nabatiyeh	5,950
Caza Zahrani North	3,780
Caza Zahrani South	4,795
Caza Tyr	2,100
Deir El Kamar	25,000
Chhim	18,000
Baalbeck	50
Zahle	300
Total	86,825

To these must be added some 18,000 people in different regions that the ICRC has not yet been able to reach because of the hostilities.

3.3. In view of recent events, of possible developments by the end of the year and of assessments made to date, the ICRC is obliged to reinforce its operations in Lebanon in order to deal with the new situation and be able to bring food and medical assistance to the victims of the conflict and to displaced persons, to support the efforts of the Lebanese Red Cross and facilitate the running of hospitals and dispensaries in combat zones.

4. FINANCE

4.1. The extra cost for this larger assistance programme is estimated at 12 million swiss francs.

4.2. This amount comes in addition to the 18 million swiss francs appeal for 1983 (see our Lebanon emergency appeal No. 3 of January 1983).

4.3. Consequently the ICRC urgently appeals to governments, national societies and other organizations for cash to finance its continuing operations in Lebanon until the end of 1983.

High consideration.

J. P. HOCKE,
Member of the Directorate,
Director for Operational Activities.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I understand that Senator KENNEDY wishes to offer an amendment in the second degree to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 2195

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. SIMPSON), as a second-degree amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), for himself and Mr. SIMPSON, proposes an amendment numbered 2195.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On line 2 of the Mitchell amendment, strike "$369,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "354,500,000".

On line 10 of the Mitchell amendment, strike "." and insert in lieu thereof "and $10 million shall be available only for El Salvador for relief assistance to displaced persons."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join today with Senator SIMPSON in offering an amendment to increase by $10 million the funding earmarked for the migration and refugee assistance account in order to respond to urgent relief needs among displaced persons in El Salvador.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy, Senator SIMPSON and I, as ranking member, asked the subcommittee's chief counsel and minority counsel to undertake a study mission to Central America to review the many refugee and related humanitarian problems in the region. They returned last week, and in a joint report they filed with the subcommittee they have described some alarming conditions and reported on urgent needs for additional humanitarian assistance, particularly among displaced persons in El Salvador.

Their report, which will be available at the subcommittee's hearing scheduled for Monday on worldwide refugee problems, clearly documents what many of us have feared—that we are facing a regional crisis of people in Central America, with nearly 1 million refugees and displaced persons fleeing the violence and conflict spreading through the region.

In El Salvador alone close to half a million people are displaced, many living in camps under deplorable conditions. Over 10 percent of El Salvador's population are refugees or displaced persons and there are growing relief needs.

Mr. President, let me read from a portion of the subcommittee's staff report:

For nearly a year, the escalating number of displaced persons in El Salvador was not addressed by the United States and the Government of El Salvador. The first effort to assess their numbers and needs was not launched until January 1982, when there were already between 165,000 to 200,000 displaced persons throughout the country. Most of them had moved in with friends or family members or were living in shantytowns around urban centers. About 5 percent of the displaced persons were considered at the time to be living in "extremely deplorable conditions." Over the following year, but particularly since the beginning of 1983, the number of displaced persons in such conditions has mounted rapidly as the problem in many locations escalated into large-scale refugee camp situations.

The response of the Government has lagged behind refugee needs even after a formal Government program of assistance was established. During the past year, the United States provided a small employment generating, food-for-work type of project, and an immunization program. However, by mid-1983 it became apparent that such efforts were inadequate to meet growing relief needs—inadequate to deal with camp-like conditions (which are still deplorable in some areas)—or to respond to shortages of food an medicines.

Mr. President, it makes no sense for us to pour millions of dollars of military assistance into a government that cannot provide basic assistance and protection to its citizens displaced by the violence and conflict for which military aid is sought.

The report recommends doubling the current U.S. aid to meet an increased need in the coming year and to upgrade camp conditions; the amendment we are offering to that of the Senator from Maine would dispense the $10 million in the following way: $7 million for food, medicines, and shelter to support the displaced persons program in El Salvador; and $3 million to support the work of the International Committee of the Red Cross. That has already been requested. These funds would be designated for those particular purposes. The needs are there.

Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Maine for the work he is doing on Lebanon, and I join in supporting his amendment. This is a related matter with regard to the suffering of many children and innocents caught up in the conflict in El Salvador. Their conditions are desperate.

This is an extremely modest amount of funds. It will be administered through the International Red Cross and through the voluntary and church agencies, including the Archdiocese of El Salvador. I hope the amendment will be accepted and that it will be considered favorably in conference.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, I think we all can sympathize with the efforts of the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Massachusetts, particularly in relation to the modest amounts of increase they are requesting.

However, I ask the Senator from Maine if he can indicate to us the manner in which these funds will be spent. Are they to administer to the needs that exist in the native countries of the refugees who are now there? Are they designed to promote a movement of those refugees into the United States?

Mr. MITCHELL. It is to provide assistance to those persons in their native countries through private agencies that are established for that purpose.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The figure to which the Senator is adding this amount, if I am correct, in the current bill, is not exactly an inconsequential figure. It is $344.5 million. Is that correct?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is correct.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. So the Senator's part of the amendment adds $25 million. Is that correct?

Mr. MITCHELL. That was the original provision in my amendment. But as I understand the second-degree amendment offered by Senator KENNEDY, it would further amend mine to increase the total by a total of $10 million. The authorization would continue the earmarking proposed in my amendment.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The Senator is aware that the subcommittee recommendation of appropriation for that figure has been set at $314.5 million. On the basis of the original authorizaton, $344.5 million, they have not been able to use that amount in this category.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is my understanding that while the total amount of the authorization would be increased by only about $10 million, the remainder for the earmarking would be obtained from other funds provided which were not utilized.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts indicated in his comments that these funds were to assist refugees who exist now in their home country.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct.

Basically, the specific request is some $3 million for the Red Cross, and the other money would be used for those humanitarian purposes I mentioned earlier.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. In either case, it is not for a resettlement program?

Mr. KENNEDY. No; only for food and medicines and relief programs inside El Salvador.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, the amendment is cleared on this side of the aisle.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, we are willing to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine (Mr. MITCHELL), as amended by Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. SIMPSON. It is under the amount of the administration for this program. I think it does address the concerns that have been raised as to the large number of refugees now in Lebanon and in El Salvador. The committee accepts the amendment as amended.

HUMANITARIAN AID TO EL SALVADOR

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I am most pleased to join with the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy, Senator KENNEDY, and other colleagues in offering an amendment to the Department of State authorization bill to increase the funding earmarked for the migration and refugee assistance account by the sum of $10 million in order to provide additional humanitarian aid for displaced persons in El Salvador.

Two fine and very capable members of the staff of the subcommittee which I chair on immigration and refugee policy, Dick Day, chief counsel and staff director, and Jerry Tinker, minority counsel, traveled to Central America this month to study the refugee and displaced persons problems in that very troubled part of our hemisphere. The staff report filed with the subcommittee describes thoughtfully and realistically the dimensions of the displaced persons problem in El Salvador and the critical need for additional humanitarian assistance—10 percent of the population has been displaced from their homes by the conflict, the violence, the anguish and the economic problems which beset that nation.

Among the various assistance programs which our Nation funds is a displaced persons work project sponsored by the Agency for International Development (AID) which is providing employment for tens of thousands of displaced persons. Over 300 projects are being carried out, including road repair, repair of schools, drainage systems installation and repair, reforestation, and improvement of health facilities have been approved in 7 departments (states) of El Salvador. The workers involved are paid half of the minimum wage, thereby providing the displaced persons with a minimal

income in order to supplement the food and medical assistance which they receive from the Salvadoran Government, but the wages are low enough to avoid increasing the number of Salvadorans who might register as displaced persons. This is the form and content of humanitarian assistance program we should support.

It is also our intention that $7 million of the additional $10 million shall be used for the AID work program. We intend that the remaining $3 million will be used to support the remarkable work of the International Committee of the Red Cross which is providing food and medical assistance to the displaced persons in the combat areas where other assistance groups simply cannot go.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SYMMS). Is there further debate?

Mr. HELMS. No debate. I just have a question for the Senator from Massachusetts. Will the Senator say now, for the record, precisely how this money will be spent or distributed in El Salvador?

Mr. KENNEDY. The $3 million is intended for the International Committee of the Red Cross; and $7 million for food, medicines, and shelter for displaced persons.

Mr. HELMS. I am not quibbling about it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Basically, the moneys are distributed through church and voluntary agencies, and the administration of it is through the Agency for International Development. Generally, AID requests such agencies to undertake such programs.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment (No. 2195) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine, as amended.

The amendment (No. 2194), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to move to reconsider en bloc the votes by which the three amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. I so move.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2164

(Purpose: To deobligate certain funds obligated for Syria, and for other purposes)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2164 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) proposes an amendment numbered 2164.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the bottom of page 48, add the following:

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEOBLIGATION OF FUNDS FOR SYRIA

SEC. 701.(a)(1) All funds appropriated in the fiscal year 1983 or in any prior fiscal year to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 which have been obligated for Syria shall be deobligated.

(2) All funds deobligated pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by any provision of law for the fiscal year 1983 or any prior fiscal year may be available for Syria.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment cuts off all U.S. foreign aid support to the Government of Syria.

Now it may come as a shock to many Americans that our Government is giving foreign aid to a country which today is providing arms, ammunition, personnel, and tactical leadership behind the shelling of U.S. marines in Lebanon. But it is true. At the same time that the Syrians have participated in the shelling of our marines, and may have helped to kill American servicemen in Lebanon—incidentally, one of them was from Wisconsin—at the same time we are quietly handing over to this same Syrian Government millions of dollars of U.S. tax funds.

In effect, we are financing the shelling of our marines since developmental aid to Syria displaces their own funds for their military effort. It is not too far off the mark to say that U.S. taxpayers are indirectly buying the shells which rain down on our marines. How? Because we are providing the money for roads, water projects, and 19 other developmental programs which the Syrian Government would have to fund otherwise. By paying for these programs ourselves, we free up Syrian dollars for their war effort in Lebanon.

How much money is involved? While there is no new funding for Syria in this bill, nor has there been in any foreign aid request since the Proxmire amendment stopped such funding 4 years ago, still there is an enormous amount of money flowing from the State Department or AID to Syria out of prior year appropriations.

At the start of fiscal year 1983, there was $228.5 million in the AID pipeline for Syria. Of that amount, some $96.1 million was scheduled for deobligation. The balance of $132.3 million is now being paid out to the Government of Syria. This year, that is fiscal year 1983, a total of $85.9 million will be calmly handed over to the Syrians. The balance will be paid out in fiscal years 1984 and 1985.

I cannot imagine a more self-defeating policy that this Government has ever entered into. We are financing a government that at any minute may attack our troops in Lebanon or may already have done so by supporting the PLO, the Druze and other Moslem combatants.

And what does our State Department say about this situation? They have the same refrain year after year. When I first put up an amendment on Syrian aid in 1979, they said, "please, please don't do this. We need the cooperation of the Syrians to reach a peace agreement in the Middle East." That was under the Carter administration. They said just give us some more time to work with these reasonable people, the Syrians.

In 1980 the plea was the same. "Don't hamper our efforts for peace by cutting off aid to Syria. Just give us some more time." Then came the Reagan administration and I thought we might have a change in State Department attitudes. But nothing has changed. Earlier this year, they said, "The administration strongly urges that no steps be taken to deobligate funds for AID projects in Syria." They want more time. More time.

Well, time has run out for this Senator. The pleadings and excuses are no longer valid. We have given the negotiators 5 years to work with the Syrians. And they have not made 1 inch of progress—not 1 inch. In fact, during that time the Syrians have become more involved in Lebanon, more aggressive, and less willing to reach any position of compromise about the withdrawal of their troops.

Remember that Syria is the country that called for "destroying" the Middle East Peace Treaty and "foiling its results by every means possible." Our response—provide them with more U.S. dollars.

Syria has repeatedly said that, "there is no room for neutrality concerning the Zionist enemy and its allies" and therefore Middle East Arab States "must reject middle-of-the-road stands on the issue of alliance with Zionism." Our response—send them more money.

Syria has provided aid and assistance to several different terrorist organizations operating against the United

States and other Western governments. And what is our response—the State Department turns its head, looks the other way, and hands out some more dollars.

How can anyone justify keeping open the U.S. foreign aid spigot to this regime—one of the most brutal governments in the history of the Middle East—and that is saying a lot. A regime that thinks nothing of sending in security forces to kill thousands of protestors in one of their cities. A regime that sponsors attacks by the PLO across the border in Israel that has resulted in the deaths of defenseless children and women.

I cannot imagine how there would be one vote in this body for continuing aid to Syria—but there always seems to be support for these funds in the State Department and the State Department always seems to be able to keep the Congress from cutting off these funds.

I am going to bring this amendment up time and time again until we stop sending tax dollars to Syria. I hope we can put an end to it here today.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to my good friend from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that he has reduced by one my list of amendments. I commend him for offering it. I would ask him respectfully if he would add me as a cosponsor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am delighted to do so. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from North Carolina be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nebraska, Senator ZORINSKY, also be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, the committee can accept the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. But I would like to note that $138 million economic assistance funds for Syria are frozen and have been for several years. We also have no intention to provide additional aid to Syria under the current circumstances. I think it is important to note that, when we are analyzing the present situation. But the committee does accept the amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the distinguished manager of the bill yield?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that a portion of the funds were indeed frozen but $85 million is being sent in 1983 from the U.S. taxpayers to Syria.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, in addition to the funds that are frozen, there are $89 million in the pipeline to pay U.S. contractors for services performed. The committee does accept this amendment.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, again, speaking for the floor manager from this side of the aisle, this amendment is acceptable.

Speaking for myself, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for offering this amendment and correcting what either is, might be, has been, or could be a ridiculous situation.

I ask, also, that I may be added as a cosponsor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do hope my good friend will fight for this amendment in conference. It is the kind of amendment, frankly, which, if it does not prevail in conference, I can see some trouble on the floor when the conference report comes before the Senate for approval. I think there will be more than one protest against that conference report.

So I hope they will press hard to have it accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE).

The amendment (No. 2164) was agreed to.

Mr. HELMS. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2163

(Purpose: To prohibit the availability of funds for international organizations to the extent of the U.S. proportionate share for programs to Libya and Syria)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment numbered 2163 to section 121 of the bill S. 1342.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) proposes an amendment numbered 2163.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 24, line 19, insert "Libya, Syria," after "Cuba,".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment would add Libya and Syria to the list of parties—and there are other countries, also, which I will mention at the end of this short statement—that cannot be the beneficiaries of any program funded by the U.S. proportionate share of contributions to any international organization.

The reason these two countries should not benefit from U.S. contributions to international organizations is clear: No American tax dollars should be used in any way to support any country or organization which directly or indirectly endorses terrorism as a means to force political change.

It is no secret that Libya and Syria are two countries that openly participate in and support international terrorism. Both have consistently and wholeheartedly lent support over the years to a wide range of terrorist groups—they have freely provided arms, training, and logistical support—and even worse, they themselves engage in terrorist activities.

The Libyans and Syrians see terrorism as an effective and useful tool to selfishly further their own radical goals. Terrorism, these two countries feel, is a tool to intimidate and coerce, a tool to strengthen regional and global influence, a tool to undermine legitimate authority throughout the world.

Under Colonel Qadhafi, terrorism is an integral part of Libya's foreign policy. Libyan "hit men" comb the world, hunting down Libyan exiles and alleged enemies of Libya. State Department reports have linked Libyan assassination squads to more than 20 terrorist raids and assassinations in Western Europe, the United States, and the Middle East over the past few years.

After the 1981 Gulf of Sidra incident when the United States shot down two Libyan fighters which were attacking American vessels in international waters, both the State Department and the CIA confirmed that Qadhafi's assassination squads were plotting to assassinate President Reagan and other high-ranking U.S. officials.

Libya's current aggressive and destabilizing activities in neighboring Chad and Upper Volta show Libya's true color. Qadhafi's armed forces, equipped with billions of dollars of sophisticated Soviet weapons, have regularly ventured into neighboring African countries. Libya lends unparalleled military and economic support to subversive movements which operate all over the world, from North Africa to Latin America to South East Asia.

Qadhafi's Libya also actively supports radical terrorist groups, from the Palestine Liberation Organization to the Irish Republican Army to the Moslem rebels in Ethiopia.

Syria has also been a major supporter of terrorist organizations; namely, radical Palestinian and Armenian

groups. Syria generously supplies these groups with arms, training, and even use of Syrian diplomatic facilities. It was the Syrian Government that lent support to Armenian terrorists responsible for the recent wave of bombings at Orly Airport in Paris and in Lisbon.

Syria has consistently used all the means at its disposal to undercut relatively moderate forces and support radical groups which oppose a Middle East peace and Syrian withdrawal from Lebanon.

One such group is the Black June Organization, which strongly opposes a political settlement with Israel and all American peace initiatives. The BJO has used Syrian aid to carry out attacks on moderate Palestinian leaders, Israelis, and non-Israeli Jews. It was responsible for the June 1982 assassination attempt against an Israeli Ambassador in London, the September 1981 bombing of an Israeli shipping company in Cyprus, and the 1981 killings of moderate Palestinian leaders in Brussels and Rome.

I am deeply concerned about the dramatic increases in both the number and seriousness of terrorist attacks witnessed over the last decade. In 1970, terrorists launched 213 attacks on diplomats from 31 different countries. Just one decade later, in 1980, this figure had doubled: 409 attacks were carried out against diplomats from over 60 countries.

Yet, terrorist attacks have not been confined to diplomats alone. According to State Department figures, in 1981, citizens of over 71 countries were the innocent targets of terrorism. In that same year, a record 258 terrorist attacks were leveled against U.S. citizens or facilities.

We must do everything in our power to try to curb terrorism. I commend my distinguished colleague from South Dakota for originally introducing this section to the authorization bill. The PLO, SWAPO, Cuba, and Iran, the four countries and organizations now listed in this section, all deserve international condemnation. No American money should be used to help these terrorist-supporting countries and organizations. Yet, this list of four is incomplete. We must add Libya and Syria.

Because of these two countries, many lives have been lost, property damaged, the nature of foreign affairs altered. Diplomacy is now a high-risk profession; American diplomats and citizens living abroad, as well as those home in the United States, are vulnerable targets for terrorist attacks.

Mr. President, I earnestly hope that the managers of the bill can see their way clear to accepting the addition. As I pointed out, this simply adds Libya and Syria to the list that we have of the PLO, the SWAPO, Cuba, and Iran.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, the committee does accept the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

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

The amendment (No. 2163) was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2196

(Purpose: Zero-Fund The National Endowment for Democracy)

Mr. ZORINSKY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself and Senator HELMS and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska (Mr. ZORINSKY), for himself and Mr. HELMS, proposes an amendment numbered 2196.

Mr. ZORINSKY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 33, line 21, strike all through page 43, line 3.

On page 26, line 16, strike all through the period on line 22, and renumber all subsequent sections accordingly.

At the end of Title II, insert the following: None of the funds appropriated for the use of the United States Information Agency shall be used for the National Endowment for Democracy.

On page 25, line 4 strike "$636,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "604,700,000"

On page 25 line 5 strike "$636,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$604,700,000"

Mr. ZORINSKY. Mr. President, this is a simple amendment which I am sure needs not a great deal of explanation. It is probably one of the best greased and the best wired amendments to hit the U.S. Senate Chamber this year. If this amendment succeeds, I, as one U.S. Senator with 8½ years experience in this body, will feel that I know nothing about the voting habits of my colleagues because I assume this is wired so well the taxpayers of this Nation are so unaware of what this really implies, that it is destined for success, unfortunately.

But that being as it may, I would like to offer this amendment to give my colleagues an opportunity to choose whether they are really concerned about a $200 billion deficit budget or if, in effect, the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, the chamber of commerce and the AFL-CIO are more important than the deficits that we will say we are so concerned about.

What this does, in effect, is it deauthorizes the funding for the National Endowment for Democracy, it eliminates the charter for the National Endowment for Democracy, and it reduces by $31.3 million the expenditure of the USIA for that purpose.

Obviously, I have received several letters from Chuck Manatt, being a Democrat. I am sure the Republicans on the other side of the aisle have received numerous letters from the Republican hierarchy to support the Project Democracy. I have even heard it referred to jokingly by some of my colleagues and some of my Democratic friends in the State of Nebraska as a new opportunity to help bail the airlines out by purchasing more airline tickets for junkets abroad to promote democracy.

Well, this promotion of democracy is the reinvention of the wheel. We have several U.S. Ambassadors throughout this world whose job primarily it is to communicate the feelings of the United States of America to their host country. To me, that is selling democracy. We have the USIA, the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe—a host of people selling democracy. We have student exchange programs. Everybody, in effect, who travels abroad is selling democracy, including the U.S. citizens who are tourists who annually take vacations to other countries.

I can see that we have really covered all the bases. Generally, when there is a piece of legislation involved, the primary people you hear from on one side of the issue generally is labor and on the other side the chamber of commerce. Well, uniquely enough they have both been taken care of in this bill, and uniquely enough both parties are taken care of in this amendment. Indirectly, this probably will be very beneficial for the airlines. They will sell more tickets.

A few years ago we started something similar to this. We needed to increase the export of grain abroad, so we created new export specialists within the USDA to do that because we felt our other avenues of selling grain abroad were not working. Ever since we did that and spent more money from the taxpayer dollars, our exports have decreased annually. So maybe our Project Democracy would, in fact, decrease our ability to sell democracy.

I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HELMS. If the Senator will yield, Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from Nebraska. His amendment is really half of the

amendment which I proposed a little while ago which attracted 26 votes.

Let me call his attention to page 36 of the bill, line 22, section 405(a):

The Endowment shall be governed by a Board of Directors (hereafter in this title referred to as the 'Board') composed of 15 members. The initial members of the Board shall be the incorporators designated in section 404; and thereafter the Board shall be self-pertetuating, with members to be elected in accordance with bylaws of the Endowment.

I repeat, Mr. President, it says "self-perpetuating."

That means they are saying this bill is saying to the taxpayers, OK, you poor slobs, you send the money in and we will run it just like we want to.

Mr. President, I have a number of concerns about S. 1432, and I have prepared some legislative proposals to accommodate those concerns. However, my major concern is with section 205 and title IV, authorizing funds and establishing the National Endowment for Democracy.

My concerns about the National Endowment for Democracy go not only to the substance, but to the method by which the legislation emerged in committee and was reported to the floor.

I think that we have to look first at the concept of a fund, supported by the taxpayers of this country, being used for political purposes by the political parties of this country, by the labor unions, and by big business.

I think, as the Senator from Nebraska has so eloquently said, that it is a very dangerous precedent to give our political parties money from the taxpayers to use for political purposes, even though the specific political purposes of NED are directed outside of the United States.

I know that other countries have established foundations for such international political meddling. That does not make it appropriate for the United States to do the same thing. The concept of government support—taxpayers support—of ideology, is alien to the American way of life. It may be appropriate for countries with a different historical background, but it is not appropriate for the United States.

Now we can all agree on the concepts of liberty and freedom. But I doubt if we can agree on how those concepts should be implemented. Even the very word "democracy" is used in completely different senses by different people. The Communists, for example, claim to be democratic. The Socialists claim to be democratic. We claim to be democratic. We cannot all be right, if the word democracy is to mean anything.

If we are using democracy in the sense of constitutional government with limited powers and checks and balances, then democracy is something that I support and we all do. But if democracy is used in the Communist and Socialist sense of redistribution of property enforced by the State, then this Senator dissents strongly. There is no evidence that the Endowment for Democracy will not become, predominantly, a propaganda organ for international socialism.

The evidence, rather, goes in the opposition direction. The overwhelming majority of the funds authorized will go the international operations of organized labor. These operations are widely touted as "anti-Communist." Well, in my book, it is not enough to be anti-Communist. I think we should be anti-Socialist as well, even if the socialism is alleged to be democratic. There is plenty of evidence that the AFL-CIO has gone around the world already on taxpayers' money promoting Socialist reorganization of economic systems, and leaving disaster in their wake.

One example is El Salvador, where the AFL-CIO promoted and directed the ruinous concept of land-reform, which has destroyed agriculture in that country, imposed untold economic hardship on the very persons who allegedly were to benefit, and exacerbated the tensions in that society. The official United Nations statistics, as I have often pointed out on the floor, showed that in the midseventies El Salvador was a rapidly developing country, making a very strong rate of progress, and distributing those gains equitably among the people in a free-market system. I know that this is exactly the opposite of the picture presented by the propaganda in the news media, but the facts are there for those who want to examine them.

But the AFL-CIO was also in El Salvador, supported by taxpayers money, demanding land reform, nationalization of the banks, and nationalization of exports. Ultimately, the AFL-CIO got its way, and the result was a disaster, providing very fertile ground for agitation by the Communist guerrilla movements. A very good case could be made that the AFL-CIO has prepared the way for communism in the name of "anticommunism" more often than it has been successful in halting the spread of Marxism.

So I would object to giving more funding to the AFL-CIO to prepare the way for communism around the world, and to support international socialism. Now I realize that some citizens do support the AFL-CIO's activities, and do not mind their tax dollars going to support socialism. But I do mind, and I am a taxpayer too. What is one man's meat is one man's poison. The fact that the Republican National Committee has a chance to propagandize too is irrelevant. What should I, as a taxpayer, have to pay both for the poison and the antidote? I am sure that those who support socialism would feel the same way about having to pay for the Republican Party's propaganda.

I feel that if the Republican Party or the Democratic Party want to promote ideology they should raise the money privately. The resources of both committees are astounding. They ought to raise funds on a voluntary basis from citizens, and not force the taxpayers to support their particular views.

The same goes both for the AFL-CIO and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. They both have astounding resources if they want to apply themselves. But I do not respect either of them when they line up at the public trough.

After all, both the AFL-CIO and the chamber of commerce represent minority points of view. I know that it is fashionable to look upon them as representing a "spectrum" of the American political society. It just happens that they are organized. Everyone knows that most workers in this country do not belong to a union—the ratio is about 5 to 1—and when given a chance to join a union or not join a union, refuse. Learned economists have produced extensive papers which demonstrate that organized labor preys not upon business, but upon organized labor. By using compulsory membership and threats of economic force, they shift the Nation's resources from those who do not use such tactics to those who do—in other words, the union workers gain at the expense of those workers who do not.

But the gains are short lived. In the long run, the unions have priced their workers out of the market, driving jobs away from established areas and even out of the country. So it seems that organized labor is a very strange source to look to for lessons in democracy.

By the same token, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce can hardly be described as a democratic organization either. It most assuredly represents its membership, as it is supposed to do. But as a voluntary organization, it cannot claim to represent business as a whole. Why is it that there are other business organizations, such as the National Federation of Independent Businesses? It is not because the chamber is falling down on the job, but because there are different constituencies out there.

And let us look closely at the national committees of the two parties. There are wonderful men and women on each of the committees. They are experts at politics. But can the national committees, representing as they do a political constituency rather than the ordinary American, be considered as a well-spring of democracy? Certainly they are elements of the democratic process, but are they democratic in and of themselves? Both committees have different views from the majority of Americans at large, because,

by and large, the committee members come from the leadership groups in the country.

A year or so ago, the CBS poll studied the attitudes of members of both committees. The CBS poll showed that only 4 percent of the Democratic National Committee members considered themselves to be conservatives. Yet the CBS poll showed that 79 percent of the rank-and-file Democrats favored a school prayer amendment. Yet only 19 percent of the Democratic National Committee members favored a school prayer amendment.

Of the rank and file Democrats, 48 percent favored an increase in military-defense spending. But only 2 percent of the Democratic National Committee favored an increase in defense.

And let us be evenhanded here and look at the Republicans. Eighty-one percent of the Republican rank-and-file favors a prayer amendment—along with the President of the United States. Yet only 46 percent of the Republican National Committee favors a prayer amendment.

So there is a question of just how democratic, small d, the national committees of both parties really are, and whether they ought to be entrusted with taxpayers funds to promote ideology.

Moreover, we need to look at the way this proposal was conceived and brought up. We all know that the President talked about promoting democracy in his speech to Parliament last year. But the broad concept was nothing like what has emerged. The administration's request was originally for an increase in USIA funding to do more of USIA-type things. But that suddenly went by the boards. This thing whipped through the committee in less than 3 days.

On April 26, at the USIA markup, we earmarked $32 million for Project Democracy—the original administration request.

On April 27, at a quickie hearing, the proponent of the National Endowment, presented a rosy view of general statements about the project, without any specifics, and without any opposition speakers.

On April 28, without preannouncement—the House language, which had never been considered in committee, was proposed by the distinguished chairman and voted upon in less than 10 minutes. The record shows general confusion of what was being voted on.

Now, I understand that the chairman has a new proposal of his own, which has not been considered either.

I submit that the NED should be cut out of the State bill, and be taken back to committee for careful consideration.

Furthermore, I say to the Senator from Nebraska that this matter was given precisely 45 minutes of consideration by the Foreign Relations Committee, 45 minutes, and he is a distinguished member of that committee and he knows that is correct. The following day, as I recall, there were 10 minutes of consideration and then blip, it was rushed on through.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the very brief committee hearing of April 27 on NED, be printed in the RECORD so it will be clear to all that no opposition was heard from; as well as excerpts from the markup record of April 28 where NED was voted on.

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

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS—MARKUP OF AUTHORIZATION BILLS

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:38 a.m. in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Charles Percy (Chairman of the Committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Percy (presiding), Pell and Dodd.

The CHAIRMAN. Today, the Committee will hear testimony on the Democracy Program from Professor Allen Weinstein, Program Director of the Democracy Program and University Professor at Georgetown; and Congressman Dante Fascell, Chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations, House Foreign Affairs Committee, a very active participant on the Democracy Program Board.

The Democracy Program is a bipartisan, nongovernmental six-month study project designed to seek methods to assist in the effort to build democratic values and institutions abroad. This question has long been of serious concern for political parties, labor, business and media, Congress and successive administrations of both parties.

Although there are already a number of private and nongovernmental programs to bolster democratic movements abroad, a comprehensive, nationally-based private sector program that would promote the growth of democratic processes internationally has never existed.

The Democracy Program is an attempt to obtain participation of both national political parties, organized labor and business, as well as other American institutions. It is the first conservative efforts by these four key sectors of American society to create a genuinely bipartisan program to aid democracy abroad.

Today, we hear the recommendations that have resulted from that effort.

Congressman Dante Fascell, we welcome you very much indeed, and we are very pleased that you could be here and I was pleased, indeed, to participate last week in the panel discussions we had from 4:00 to 7:00 and then at a dinner meeting addressed by Secretary Shultz on this important subject.

Congressman Fascell, we are delighted to hear from you.

[The statement of Hon. Dante Fascell follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. DANTE FASCELL, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES' COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Representative FASCELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am delighted to be here, and thank you very much for extending the courtesy to us who are here today in support of this proposal to establish a nonprofit corporation to be known as the National Endowment for Democracy.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal is, I think, on all fours with the long struggle that you have personally undertaken since I have known you in the Congress of the United States to have an effective program by this nation in dealing with ideas and in the struggle for ideas in the world. As a strong supporter of our information agency, its independence and the budget struggle that we have had, particularly in these times of constraint, you have been a stalwart and I have been delighted to work with you and to cooperate in every way because we both have a strong belief in the need for our government, the principles we believe in, to be spread and understood by people all over, because what we have is not automatically understood by everyone and it has to be told in a very clear, honest and concise fashion as often as we can.

So the National Endowment for Democracy, Mr. Chairman, is a natural extension of this proposal, and it comes about as a result of the study which has—it came about because of a letter written by the Chairman of the Republican Party and the Chairman of the Democratic Party and the Chairman of the American Political Foundation to the President of the United States. And an interim report was made, which you have, of certain recommendations and the proposal which is before you flows from those recommendations of this study, and the study is still ongoing.

This is an historic event, I might say, Senator, because here we have the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, the President of the AFL-CIO, representatives of business, academic community and others who have come together in a truly bipartisan effort to strengthen the capability of the private sector in this country to encourage the growth of democratic institutions and principles abroad.

Up to now, for some reason, we have had our hands tied. The political parties have not had the capability to work in the international arena, and we have followed the general model—very successful, I might add—of the German political parties who have established their own international arms. So part of this recommendation would be that each of the parties—and they have each established an international institute which would give them the capability of dealing with and working with their counterparts abroad in relaying to them a full exchange of people and ideas on political principles of our system.

With labor, of course, they have had a very successful Labor Institute which has been in operation for years, and they are part of this process also. And then, of course, private enterprise comes into it in a very meaningful way because they have a great contribution to make and they are part of this process.

So we have the leaders of all of these institutions who support fully the concept of the Endowment for Democracy which would get a grant from USIA and then these institutes would, in turn, be grantees of the Na-

tional Endowment to carry out the purposes of the charter, which are laid out in the information which you have.

That is the broad, general concept.

Other organizations, other groups who are also interested and who have the capability to enter into this effort, would have an opportunity to submit their proposals to the National Endowment or USIA or other governmental agencies but, in this case, with particular reference to the National Endowment, they would have the opportunity to do that, and if they have a worthwhile project, then the Endowment would consider it.

The Endowment itself is a nonprofit, private organization chartered under the authority—in this law it would be a District of Columbia Corporation—and the Board would be representatives of the groups that are representative in reaching the consensus which is before you, that is to say, the same kind of group that was part of the Brock Study Group under the American Political Foundation's aegis.

So that means that business and labor, the two political parties and other interested groups—now, Mr. Lane Kirkland could not be here today, Mr. Chairman. Unfortunately, he is out of town. He very much supports this, however. He has a prepared statement which, on his behalf, I would like to make part of the record, with your permission.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be made a part of the record following your comments and those of Dr. Weinstein.

Representative FASCELL. Our other two participants are in other parts of the country and cannot be here, but they have people here. Mr. Brock, who is Chairman of it, could not be here, but his representative is here and he has a statement which, with your permission, I would like to make a part of the record.

In short, Mr. Chairman, this represents a real occasion because it is the first opportunity since I have been here, and I have been 28 years in Congress—when we had this matter considered on the House side, we were very fortunate, because all of the principals happened to be in town. We took advantage of that and had them come up and testify, and it was a very encouraging day, believe me.

We need a strong, bipartisan approach to this issue, and we may not get it confused, either by fear or doubt, because what we are talking about is ourselves, and we cannot just assume that the rest of the world automatically knows who we are and what we are and how we operate. Therefore, we need to tell them, and we need this additional instrumentality in the private sector to help those government institutions that we now have do the job that they are doing, if you will.

We are not concerned with the short-term partisan gain here. We are more concerned about the long-range interests of the United States in this struggle of ideas in the world. Basically, this is what we present to you, Mr. Chairman. We are very happy to do that.

I have a prepared statement which I would like to submit for the record, and my colleagues who are here are very capable and anxious to give you their ideas on this project. We commend it to you, and Senator Dodd is a member of our study group, as I have the privilege of being. There is a lot of hard work here in the evolving of the consensus and the concept which is before you.

So I hope that it will be unanimously supported in the Committee. It was overwhelmingly supported in our own subcommittee, and I am sure that it will be likewise supported in the full Committee on the House side.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, very kindly.

Senator Dodd, I know you have no conflict of interest. As I said before, you have interest but no conflict.

Would you like to make an opening statement as a member of the Executive Board?

Senator DODD. No opening comment, Mr. Chairman, other than to welcome our witnesses this morning and to express my deep support.

Congressman Fascell has really said it all. It would be somewhat redundant, I think he is absolutely correct, if those of us who disagree—I might point out that, in the past, with not just this Administration but with other administrations and actions in terms of our foreign policy, this approach ought to bring all of us together. This is clearly something that obviously all of us ought to support. It is designed specifically to improve the institutions around the globe, understanding of us, and us to play a meaningful role in helping to develop the kind of democratic institutions which we, at least, proudly proclaim that we support on the Fourth of July and Memorial Day. Well, here is a chance to do something about those speeches we make, in effect.

That is why I support it. It has been a pleasure to work, by the way, with Chuck Manatt and Chairman Fahrenkopf, Dante and Allen Weinstein. They have done a fine job with all of this. In fact, we had some interesting meetings where interesting coalitions developed in support of various things. We sometimes found ourselves where Democrats and Republicans were more together and labor and business were fighting us. It was an interesting experience, just putting this thing together, an educational process in itself.

So I am delighted to associate myself with the remarks of Congressman Fascell and the statements he made on the House side as well as here this morning. I would like to thank the Chairman. This has been a bit awkward for us, over the last week or so, these mark-ups and everything else going on, and as a result of Senator Percy's support, Senator Pell's support, we in a bipartisan way here have already addressed this issue, and we obviously wanted to have the benefit of testimony of the principles involved in developing this program.

But a great deal of credit should go to Chairman Percy and Senator Pell for helping us achieve the success it did only a few hours ago in this Committee room. So it is a bit awkward, the way we are proceeding, but I think all of us will be benefitted as a result of your testimony.

I thank all of you for being here. I welcome Sarah Weddington, obviously one of my friends as well, from sometime back.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the only time, I think, in my 17 years where in any hearing where, if a mistake was made, you could undo all the authorization provided yesterday in our bill. We wanted to have this on the record so that all of our Committee members could hear directly from you.

I mentioned before you came in, Senator Dodd, I greatly enjoyed the six hours I spent with this remarkable group last week. I decided to go and spend the whole time to just hear it first hand and get a feel for the meeting, and it was a marvelous concept, a marvelous idea that we were moving forward, and I saw a lot of enthusiasm for it.

And the combination of business and labor, Democrats and Republicans, and we have a pilot run that the Federal Republic of Germany has run for a number of years. We can learn from their experience, and learn a great deal.

So I think without any hesitation, I think there is going to be a highly cost-effective investment that we are going to make in Project Democracy.

With that introduction, Dr. Weinstein, we are delighted to have you hear and I appreciated very much, indeed, the opportunity to consult with you last week.

Mr. WEINSTEIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Senator Dodd, Congressman Fascell, colleagues. I think I will submit most of my statement for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. The full statement will be incorporated in the record.

[The statement of Allen Weinstein follows:]

STATEMENT OF ALLEN WEINSTEIN, RESEARCH DIRECTOR, THE DEMOCRACY PROGRAM

Mr. WEINSTEIN. I would also like to provide a chance, as quickly as possible, for Sarah Weddington, representing the Chairman of the DNC and for Mike Farren, representing Chairman Fahrenkopf of the RNC, to make their statements.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say on behalf of all of us involved in the Democracy Program that we are deeply grateful to you, Senator Pell, Senator Dodd and the other members of the Committee for holding this hearing, taking time out from your extraordinarily busy schedule and allowing us to testify.

I would simply second Congressman Fascell's observation, I suppose, that all of us who have been involved with the Democracy Program feel that the core recommendation of our Interim Report which is for the creation, by Congress, of a National Endowment for Democracy, along with the creation in the private sector of the two party international institutes, the Labor Institute and a Center for International Private Enterprise to be sponsored under the auspices of the National Chamber Foundation, all of these together should have a decided long-range, but virtually immediate impact in strengthening democractic values and institutions abroad.

Mr. Chairman, the only part of my statement that I would like to actually read, if I may, is that which concerns the essential question that as you noted yesterday in inserting into the record the editorial in the Washington Post supporting this program, a question which may be of some concern to members of the Committee.

Some Americans have argued that the United States should abandon all efforts, whether governmental or private sector, and no matter how sensible those efforts to foster and support democratic institution-building abroad. In this view, democracy—and I am quoting here from the Linowitz-Galo Plaza report—"democracy is not an export commodity; it must be nurtured and developed within each nation."

Mr. Chairman, the members of the Democracy Program subscribe to that sentiment, but not to its corollary namely, that existing democratic nations cannot contribute much in a very direct way to building democratic political institutions in other countries.

I make my living, Mr. Chairman, as a historian, and I would argue at least that history, at least since the Second World War, simply contradicts that pessimistic pre-

sumption. Both Japan and the Federal Republic of Germany emerged as strong democracies after their respective periods of occupation allowed the nurturing of democratic values and structures. Such countries as India and Nigeria, along with other Third World powers, have proved themselves viable democracies through adapting to national practices institutions which began during their colonial period.

Closer to home, Mr. Chairman, would the democratic renaissance in Spain and Portugal in our time have been so effective without timely assistance from friends in other European countries, both at the governmental and nongovernmental level. I might add, Mr. Chairman, that this is where the German foundation played a critical role in keeping Spanish and Portugese democracy alive.

Similarly, in Greece, the transition from military dictatorship to democracy was expedited because of pressures not only from Western European states but also from such intergovernmental bodies such as NATO and the Council of Europe. And finally, nor have the actions of Latin American democracies such as Costa Rica, Venezuela and Colombia, been without consequence in accelerating the process of redemocratization elsewhere in the hemisphere.

From Franklin Roosevelt to Ronald Reagan, Mr. Chairman, every American President has been personally committed to the goals of democratic institution-building abroad. From the 1940s to the present, Congress under both Republicans and Democratic leadership have supported and helped to shape the national consensus in favor of such initiatives.

Quoting Arthur Vandenberg here, "Whenever we find free peoples having difficulty in the maintenance of free institutions, we do not necessarily react in the same way each time, but we propose to react." That was Arthur Vandenberg on the Marshall Plan, and that sentiment remains a valid one.

On those occasions when such national response has led to the successful launching of new programs-from the earliest days of the Marshall Plan and the Fulbright-Hays Act to the present—several themes, I will argue, Mr. Chairman, have occurred, and I will conclude with this.

First, the proposed programs reflected concretely and practically the underlying national consensus on our broad American foreign policy goals.

Secondly, the new programs did not threaten to undermine the funding and operations of other existing programs which Congress and the public support.

Third, the new programs enjoy genuine and impeccable bipartisan support across a wide spectrum of American leadership and opinion.

In the view of this Executive Board, Mr. Chairman, the Democracy Program, and my personal opinion, our proposal for the National Endowment for Democracy now before this Committee meets all of this criteria. I thank you for this opportunity to testify and especially, Mr. Chairman, for your personal interest in the work of our program.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much indeed.

Now, if we could have the statements of Charles Manatt and Chairman Fahrenkopf put in the record, and any summary statement that you would care to make on their behalf would be appreciated.

The statements of Lane Kirkland, Charles Manatt and Frank J. Fahrenkopf, Jr. follow:]

STATEMENT OF SARAH WEDDINGTON, ON BEHALF OF CHARLES MANATT, COCHAIRMAN, THE DEMOCRACY PROGRAM AND CHAIRMAN, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Ms. WEDDINGTON. Mr. Chairman and Senator Dodd, I would simply say on behalf of Chuck Manatt that he was disappointed in not being able to join you today, but I was pleased to be able to appear on his behalf. It has been a pleasure to serve with the Senator, with Congressman Fascell, with the very fine members of this team.

In view of Senator Dodd's service and your personal familiarity, I would simply end by saying on behalf of Chairman Manatt how much the Democratic Party looks forward to participating in this expanded effort to encourage democracy and to demonstrate the advantages of the democratic way of government.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate that very much indeed.

I sat for hours between the Chairman and Peter Kelly, and he did not get a campaign contribution out of me for the Democratic Party.

Senator DODD. I bet he tried, though.

The CHAIRMAN. He did not even try.

I said my son-in-law will give on my behalf.

Mr. FARREN. Mr. Chairman, Senator Dodd?

The CHAIRMAN. Now on behalf of the Republican Party.

STATEMENT OF J. MICHAEL FARREN, ON BEHALF OF FRANK J. FAHRENKOPF, JR., CHAIRMAN, REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. FARREN. Mr. Chairman, my name is J. Michael Farren. I am speaking on behalf of Frank J. Fahrenkopf, Jr., Chairman of the Republican National Committee.

I want to express the strong and enduring support of the Republican Party not only for the proposals contained in the Interim Report of the Democracy Program but perhaps more importantly for the objectives and traditions which underline them.

It has been charged in many quarters that the United States has little to say to the world these days, that the fact of American leadership has faded in recent years, and that Americans remain so hopelessly divided on questions of our own destiny that we are unable to lead by action or by example.

The proposals in this report should go far in reversing these images both at home and abroad. The world appears to long for clear and unmistakeable signal of American resurgence, and of a return to leadership based on the broad values and traditions that have made America the most truly free and prosperous nation in the world.

These proposals, reflective of the broad bipartisan vision of democracy as mankind's ultimate destiny, can be taken as but a part of that signal and, if implemented, they can serve as more than a signal, they can become the process itself.

For its part, the Republican Party anticipates and supports fully the creation of the National Endowment for Democracy and its related institutions. We believe that we as Republicans have a message for the world, both the developed and nondeveloped regions. We stand by our basic principles and philosophy as our guide to the vision of a better America, and a freer and more prosperous world. Where appropriate, we hope to express that vision abroad, while at the same time recognizing that ours is not the only voice to be heard.

We also recognize that the inner strength of American democracy derives from its ability to foster and promote the creative expression of individual and collective viewpoints from within, and it is in that spirit that I appear today with representatives from labor and the Democrat Party.

Senator DODD. What party is that?

Mr. FARREN. The Democrat, sir.

Senator DODD. I will teach you Republicans how to speak.

Mr. FARREN. Together, we bear a joint responsibility for expanding the frontiers of democracy, pluralism, and individual liberty abroad.

Not so many years ago, such a statement would have been unfashionable, at best. Today, however, as Americans recapture their confidence in our basic systems of government and the value that support them, such a statement can not only be made with pride, it can be carried forth into action.

I ask then, on behalf of Chairman Fahrenkopf, your favorable and rapid consideration of the proposals before you. In these recommendations are embodied the lifeblood of American Democracy, and the offer of wise and prudent assistance to those abroad in search of an enduring political entity.

Thank you.

Senator Dodd, I was taking the name of the Party from a sign outside of the Democratic headquarters in Hartford, Connecticut.

Senator DODD. It just says the Democrats.

Representative FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for this opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to thank you very much. In as much as we did finish the mark up yesterday, we will submit some questions to you for the record.

Representative FASCELL. We will be happy to respond.

The CHAIRMAN. So that we can fill that record up.

A couple of questions occurred to us on some details in the funding and where the funding would be spent, I think. I think to fill this record up we will keep the record open long enough for you to get back to us.

I very much appreciate your being here.

Senator Pell?

Mr. WEINSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, may I simply say that Ambassador Samuels, representing the Chamber of Commerce, is not here, but in his absence, I will submit his statement for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. We will put that in the record.

Senator Pell?

Senator PELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have one question to ask my old colleague, Congressman Fascell, and that is, do you believe the Democracy Program pretty well compliments the action of our Committee in earmarking the $116 million of traditional exchanges in fiscal 1984.

Representative FASCELL. Absolutely, Senator.

We have been very, very forthright in saying that we support all the existing programs and that what is presented here is complementary to the maintenance and existence and the enhancement of those programs. We are talking now basically of the Fulbright-Hays, the other exchange programs, the private sector programs that are the core of the operations of USIA. Absolutely.

Senator PELL. They provide the base upon which it is based.

Representative FASCELL. This is not a substitute for those programs, in any sense.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Senator Dodd, do you have a quick question?

Senator DODD. No question at all, but one point. We have talked about the study group and the members of the Committee and so forth who have worked and are present in the room, and many of the staff people in any effort, while there are those who are both for the cameras and the lights, it is really in most cases the staff people do the laborious job of putting these efforts together, and we have had an incredible contribution from a wide variety of people who have worked long and hard to make this a reality in this coming fiscal year, and I think we would be remiss in not recognizing one, that they are present here today but, more importantly, the contribution they made to this effort.

I just did not want to let the opportunity go by without making note of that.

Representative FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, Ambassador Samuels is now here, and I am sure he would like the opportunity to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. If you could be very brief, sir, we would appreciate it. We are running overtime on our next hearing.

But we are very happy to have you here.

Mr. SAMUELS. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I have prepared a full statement which I hope will be included in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be incorporated into the record.

[The statement of Michael A. Samuels follows:]

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL A. SAMUELS, VICE PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SAMUELS. Let me say the gist of the statement is to express pleasure with the decision of the Executive Branch to encourage the private sector to become involved in programs that would help build the political institutional background that may evolve into democracies throughout the world, and to indicate the hope that the Congress chooses to support this emphasis on such private institution building, and to say that the business community looks forward to participating fully in this effort, and that on behalf of the business community, whom I represent on the Executive Board of the Democracy Program and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, where I am Vice President, internationally we support strongly the creation of the Democracy Endowment and urge that this Committee and the Congress view a positive role for business at a level commensurate with its ability and with its role as an important institution for private enterprise throughout the world.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, indeed. The President of the United States will be engaged in a battle of ideas tonight before world television and certainly before the American public. Secretary Shultz is in the Middle East in a battle for ideas there to end that terrible turmoil and bring peace to that area.

I do not know of any group that has come together that offers greater hope for the future than this group to engage in that battle for ideas, a battle that we have not always really put a high enough priority on. You cannot just put the priority on the military. There is not a military solution that exists to a lot of problems that exist in the world.

Our ideas, we feel, are fundamentally sound and we just simply have been somewhat reticent about espousing what we believe to be the most ingenious form of government that has been devised for building stability and peace in the world. And when we consider that 80 percent of all the raw materials used by our factories and an increasing proportion of our exports and jobs depend upon international trade, we can recognize that a stable world, a peaceful world, a prosperous world, is absolutely essential to every single American.

We very much appreciate everything that you have done to bring this idea before us and the rapidity with which we have done our authorizing and the funding of it, I think, is an indication of the confidence that we have in your group and the basic concept itself.

[Whereupon, at 10:09 a.m., the Committee proceeded to the discussion of other business.]

Mr. HELMS. I commend the Senator for his amendment and I, as the Senator, do not see how Senators can fail to support it.

Mr. ZORINSKY. I thank the Senator from North Carolina, and I certainly respect his views on this issue inasmuch as we both sit on the Foreign Relations Committee and understand what is happening, and what is really happening is the people of America once again are going to become the "stuckees" for a new program which they have no control over.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I can appreciate very much what the distinguished Senator from Nebraska is doing here. I think he raised some legitimate points, and that is, are we rushing pell-mell into something without having the necessary hearings and the necessary preliminary work done in order to justify what we are doing?

Reluctantly, I cannot support this amendment. At least I cannot support killing all of the funds and all of the programs that this particular section 4 really wants to implement.

I do share the concern of my friend, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. I do think it would be well for us to hold some hearings.

I cite right from the President's letter himself, and he is advocating it as strongly as he can that we should pass this particular part of the bill, in fact this whole bill. He said:

If enacted, the National Endowment for Democracy Act will allow our two major political parties, the business community, and organized labor to undertake serious and long-term programs in support of democracy and pluralism abroad.

He then goes on to say and I cite with particularity this next sentence:

At present our nongovernmental involvement in the international political world except for the AFL-CIO Training Institute has been haphazard at best.

Now, I think that is a very important admission in that letter. What he is saying is that the only entity that is to be funded by this particular piece of legislation that is capable or presently has the machinery in force to do the job happens to be the AFL-CIO through its training institutes. I happen to believe that is true.

Of the four groups mentioned in this particular bill, only one of the four literally has any experience in exporting democracy and the principles of democracy. And that is the Free Trade Union Institute of the AFL-CIO.

I am concerned, I think, that it is a good idea to have both political parties and the chamber of commerce or the business community in this country involved in exporting democracy, in exporting the principles of pluralism throughout the world. I think that is a good idea.

But I wonder if maybe it is premature since the other three do not have a pattern or a system of exporting democracy at this point and do need a little bit of time.

As I understand it, and correct me if I am wrong, I refer to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that they are in the process of setting up the mechanisms in which to accomplish these acts, that is, the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, and the business community. Am I correct on that?

Mr. PERCY. I have to say in this case I have a conflict of interest, but I will say very quickly, as Senator DOLE did when he presented his wife Elizabeth to the committee for confirmation, that he really has a deep interest but no conflict.

I have been disassociated from the business community officially for 17 years. I resigned from every bank board and every corporation board, including my own corporation, and I resigned all membership in business organizations, and I was a member of the U.S. Chamber for 28 years.

I have, however, kept up intimately with them as I have with the AFL-CIO, and I concurred with everything that the distinguished Senator said. He knows that the AFL-CIO have been preparing themselves and are the most credible possible source to talk with people abroad, to communicate with them abroad, because they have had an international organization for a long time.

But I do believe from what I know of Dr. Lesher, of what I know of that great board that they have, a number of members of which come from Illinois—I was thrilled that the U.S. Chamber would undertake the responsibility jointly with the AFL-CIO, with the Democratic National Committee and the Republican National Committee, and put their expertise to work in seeing what we could do with a very modest amount of money but with huge resources that all four of those organizations can put behind it to carry that message.

I have been over recently and looked at the highly sophisticated system of

technology they now have for communicating regularly, as has my distinguished colleague, the television, radio, and they know how to package things, put ideas down in 30 or 45 second or 60 second spots. They can do an immense amount of work that could supplement the work of the AFL-CIO and our two committees.

So I really feel they should be put on a par, that they will be ready, they can deliver. Selling a product and idea has been really the business of their membership ever since they were formed.

Mr. HATCH. If I could just maybe add to this, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I think it would be a wonderful thing if we could have both political parties and the business community doing this as well.

My only point is that they are not presently doing it and they do not presently have the mechanism in place to do it, and I am suggesting that we should allow them to do it, but I wonder if it is not premature to do it at this particular point, in other words, to fund those three entities.

As I understand it, and if the distinguished Senator from Illinois would correct me or at least tell me if I am incorrect, the House of Representatives has already deleted both political parties from this section of the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. PERCY. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. That is correct.

Well, let me make a suggestion. Assuming that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska fails, and it may not, but if it does fail, there is a lot of concern in this body about these provisions in this particular State Department bill. And I have some concerns about how moneys are going to be delivered as well.

I do support, as does the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the basic thrust of this provision within the bill. But I would suggest maybe it might be that the following suggestion may be something to consider, and that is, let us fund the AFL-CIO since they are doing a good job, have the mechanisms in place and have a past pattern in history of doing the job at this time; let us justify, and I will work to do so, the two political parties and the business community and help them to get the mechanisms in place and the systems whereby they can also export democracy.

Let us justify their position by perhaps holding hearings and giving them some time to set the mechanism in place. Maybe what we should do is defer the funding to those three entities until 6 months or a year from now when they have their mechanisms in place, we have had hearings, and we can establish the efficacy and utility of what they would be doing with regard to the exportation of democracy. We would accomplish the same ends. It would be somewhat of a deferral. We would have hearings. I think hearings should be held in both the Foreign Relations Committee and Labor and Human Resources Committee. I think it would be helpful to both committees to hold the hearings.

One last thing I would like to say is that I believe the AFL-CIO not only does a good job, but I believe they would work very well if the funds were funded through the Department of Labor rather than through the USIA, as I understand it. I think it would be a better approach and a better way of utilizing those funds.

I might also say that I go to the ILO at least once a year over in Geneva as a nonvoting delegate, and I see the excellent job that Irving Brown, Lane Kirkland, and Albert Shanker and others do working with international labor union leaders, business people, and government officials of the International Labor Organization in Geneva, Switzerland.

I think perhaps these suggestions may get us off the problem of how to fund this, how to resolve it, how to get more support for it, and in the end get to the same result that many of us would like to perhaps achieve today.

In any event, I cannot support killing this proportion of the bill at all, even though I do share the concerns of my friend from Nebraska. I hope that the distinguished floor managers of this bill will consider some of the suggestions I have made and let us see if there is some way we can resolve this today, keep these provisions alive but justify them through hearings. Perhaps some consideration should be given to my suggestion that we already have been working well through the Secretary of Labor. That may very well be one of the most important suggestions that I have made today.

I am going to vote against this amendment, and I would hope that my colleagues will also vote against it, even though I have these concerns.

Mr. ZORINSKY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. ZORINSKY. Mr. President, I would just like to point out that even though the House version deleted the money for both parties, it did not negate the opportunity for USIA to give them that money if they so desired, which I think is even a little more devious based on past performance of the way we do things around this place. The money was left in, but I admit it is not earmarked for the parties. However, that does not preclude them from giving the money to the parties, and that is how the game is played around here. I would have been very disappointed if they had taken the money out to the extent that they could not have then been able to give it to the parties at a later date so the public would not have been aware of what happened.

I say to my colleague, whom I deeply respect and admire, the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the letter from the President indicating at present our "nongovernmental involvement in the international political world except for the AFL-CIO training institutes is haphazard at best" I agree with wholeheartedly. I think it is a very valid statement. Why do we need additional help to sell democracy from the nonpolitical element of our country?

It is because the political element is not doing the job. And I look right down there at shady bottom, Foggy Bottom, or wherever it is, that the State Department resides. Supposedly we have people all over this country that the taxpayers are paying to help promote and sell democracy to the rest of the world. That is why I think the President is entitled to want to support something like this, because I feel the people we have had under both administrations have obviously been inadequate in selling democracy abroad to other nations.

I should like at this time to yield to my colleague from Wyoming (Mr. WALLOP) for a comment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Nebraska. I ask unanimous consent that I be added as a cosponsor of this amendment.

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

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, I, like most Americans, was thrilled when President Reagan told the British Parliament that henceforth the United States would promote the spread of democracy in the world overtly. The President put totalitarian regimes on notice that henceforth we were going to put public money behind our beliefs, and with it would raise opposition to them among their subjects and in the world at large. The President spoke well, and I think he spoke for all Americans. But then, over the year that has followed, I watched with increased dismay as the President's intentions were translated, or should I say garbled, into an instrument that looks more likely to fill its officials with caviar and champagne than to do any spreading of democracy.

I was further upset by the lack of scrutiny that this project received in the Foreign Relations Committee. It was just simply railroaded through. A few words about its lofty purposes sufficed. But the point of the committee process is to give some assurances that a bill actually does something akin to what it says it is going to do.

Then I noticed that under the terms of the bill in front of us there is no provision for congressional oversight

of how the money is spent. There are no standards. There is no oversight. That is not my way of doing responsible business.

Finally, I understand that the printed version of title IV was considered so defective by its sponsors that, with the advice of the Department of Justice, it was rewritten completely. As a result, we will be asked to vote on something that none of us has seen.

I hope that the floor managers will agree to detach title IV from this bill. It deserves real scrutiny in committee. And if they do not agree, then we ought to have the scrutiny on the floor of the Senate.

I wonder if I might ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Illinois, a few questions that relate to this.

The only justification for this title I know of is the so-called Weinstein report delivered to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Now, that report defined itself, did it not, as an interim report?

Mr. PERCY. I am very happy to respond to my distinguished colleague. I attended a full day meeting at the State Department with the AFL-CIO, the U.S. Chamber, the Democratic national chairman, and the Republican chairman discussing every aspect of this. We had been preceded by similar smaller meetings, each of them on their own working together to bring the best that they could before that full-day meeting.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee subsequently had a day of hearings on the matter. We had pro and con. Those hearings could be made available to the distinguished Senator.

Some critics in the House debate did charge that this was a hastily conceived measure and represented a single ideological viewpoint. The question obviously that we asked ourselves was, is that true? And I came up with the answer that it is not true in the least.

The bill emerged from a year-long effort. It was a year-long effort by the American Political Foundation's democracy program study and research group. That group included as cochairmen the two political party chairmen, Lane Kirkland of the AFL-CIO, Ambassador Michael Samuels of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, representatives of both the House and Senate, and conservatives, moderates, and liberals among its board members as well. Even a hasty scrutiny of its report will indicate the research included extensive assessment of the ability of private sector U.S. organizations to assist democratic development throughout the world. The research staff either traveled to or met with political leaders of all democratic persuasions, conservative socialists from over 50 different countries. The interim program has been available ever since April. And when I make my own comments, I will go into some considerable detail about the studies that have been made because the Federal Republic of Germany has operated in over five dozen countries for the past few decades without a major incident and with complete success.

So it is almost a federal system. We have other examples to draw from, to note and to draw from their experience how successful this project can be made.

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, the Senator did not answer my question. He gave a long, involved answer, but my question was, the report was an interim report, was it not? Since it was, what has happened to the final version?

Mr. PERCY. The report was labeled as an interim report and there has not been submitted, to the best of my knowledge, a final report. I can find out within a matter of an hour when that final report will be available.

Mr. WALLOP. I assume, then, that the Senator is asking Congress to authorize $25.5 million on the basis of a report that has not yet been made finally to the committee.

Mr. PERCY. From what I understand, there is not going to be a basic difference between the final report and the interim report. The interim report was considered a fairly complete report. We shall find out within a matter of minutes what has happened to that final report and why we do not have it available today.

Mr. WALLOP. But the authors have gotten money since the interim report for a final report which is not going to be substantially different. What use did they make of the money if they were not going to make any further substantive work?

Mr. PERCY. I can assure my colleague that, within a matter of minutes, I can give him a full answer as to why we do not have available in front of us the final report or if the final report, when it is submitted, will differ in any major respect from the interim report.

Mr. WALLOP. In a sense, what the Senator is telling me is that the quarter of a million dollars that they spent between the interim and the final report was not necessary.

Mr. PERCY. I can give the Senator assurance whether or not that conclusion will be reached by the final report within a few minutes. I would be astounded, because the Members I have had contact with in making up this report are more enthusiastic than ever about the result of what I consider to be a modest sum, a pittance compared to what the Soviet Union is spending to sell their system. The Soviet Union has denounced it by every mechanism that they can marshal. I am always interested in a project that is denounced as strongly as this is by the Soviets.

Mr. WALLOP. If the Senator would permit me, I would be, too, but perhaps they are denouncing it for different reasons than would I. I suspect they object to the purpose. They should.

I have no quarrel with the purpose. I have a great deal of quarrel with the instrument that has been put before us.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, could I just point out the size of the interim report?

Mr. WALLOP. Size has little relevance to the question that I asked, in all due respect.

Let me further ask the Senator in what ways the USIA, with its budget of two-thirds of $1 billion, is inadequate for the pursuit of these same goals.

Mr. PERCY. The question being why is not the budget of USIA as it now stands adequate to absorb this project?

Mr. WALLOP. Are not the goals precisely those enumerated in section 403?

Mr. PERCY. All I can say is that the budget of USIA was inadequate to expand and extend its facilities and its transmissions to even approach the transmission capabilities of the Soviet Union.

Mr. WALLOP. $25 million is not going to change that. Broadcasting is not at issue here.

Mr. PERCY. We just added, in Radio Marti, $54.8 million in 1985 in order to modernize those facilities.

Mr. WALLOP. I understand, but that is not the thrust of my question. My question is, If we have an established function to do those things—I read from section 403(a):

> SEC. 403. (a) the purpose of the Endowment are—
>
> (1) to encourage free and democratic institutions throughout the world through private sector initiatives, including activities which promote the individual rights and freedoms which are essential to the functioning of democratic institutions;

Is that not the function of the USIA? Is that not part of their target?

Mr. PERCY. Let me just use an illustration. Why is it that we have continually depended more and more on the private volunteer organization in foreign aid—Catholic Relief, Save the Children—and are putting more and more of our Government funds into those organizations? For one reason: They can do a better job. They have a huge structure behind them. They get an expertise and a point of view that bureaucrats, sitting here in Washington, good as they may be, simply do not get.

What we are saying is that USIA, for something as important as this, should really go not to the bureaucrats who are sitting there, some of whom have

never been in the private sector, never belonged to a labor union, never been a part of private business—they should be working with the largest labor organization in the world, the largest business organization in the world. It has thousands of business members, millions of union members. They should be working with them to get new ideas, new approaches as to how our free enterprise system and our free system can be better packaged for trade and implemented and sold to the people of this world.

Mr. WALLOP. I have no quarrel with what the Senator is saying about the value of private initiative. But the first six paragraphs of this title are lifted from the mission of the USIA. Each of them. I shall not go into reading them all, but there they are. We are simply establishing yet another entity, with no scrutiny. There is no provision for monitoring the expenditure of these funds within the provisions here.

Mr. PERCY. We are establishing another entity, but I remind my colleague that we are establishing another entity that will put its own resources in, but now its effort will be coordinated with the Government and USIA.

Mr. WALLOP. Then let me ask some questions about that entity: The change from the printed version of title IV to the typed version removes the names of the officers of the endowment from the legislation—transparently, I believe. That is because clearly, this bill recognizes one and only one National Endowment for Democracy, with the same list of officers we see in the printed bill. Otherwise, anyone could incorporate under the same label and lay claim to the money.

So we are dealing with a list of names. I believe the Senator would agree with that. Let me ask a few questions about that list of names.

There are Messrs. Fahrenkopf and Manatt, who, the chairman knows, are national chairmen respectively of the Republican and Democratic parties. What happens to their status in the Endowment after they leave their present posts?

Mr. PERCY. They retain their present positions, they take that expertise and point of view, just as in the Federal Republic of Germany. For years, the heads of major political parties have given a spectrum and a point of view that have a broad-based appeal.

Mr. WALLOP. But they will not be replaced by their successors. We are, in fact, appointing Messrs. Manatt and Fahrenkopf to this Endowment for life.

Mr. PERCY. I have no doubt we are going to find in this first year of trial areas where we can improve, we can strengthen. This is a 1-year authorization. At the end of that year and during the course of that year, we shall have close oversight over this operation. The Committee on Foreign Relations shall be getting reports regularly. We shall be reporting directly and regularly to Members of the Senate, particularly those who have evidenced their interest by being on the floor in this very important forward step we are taking now.

I can assure my distinguished colleague we shall be very pleased indeed when we have such oversight hearings to have the distinguished Senator present at our Foreign Relations Committee meeting, to directly question the witnesses on what is being accomplished.

Mr. WALLOP. We are asking the American people to endow these two men—I have great respect for both of them—with a great deal of money. I see nothing particularly relevant in their writings or record that leads us to conclude that the American people ought to trust them, beyond their posts, with this kind of endowment.

There is Mr. Spencer Oliver. I wonder if the Senator can tell us what he has ever done or said or written which leads the Senator to believe that we should endow him with millions of the taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. PERCY. Spencer Oliver is the staff director of the Helsinki Commission and has certainly had an intense experience in human rights infractions all over the world. He has been in the forefront of pointing out to the world the infractions of the Soviet Union.

Mr. WALLOP. Is he not a staff member for Representative FASCELL, principally?

Mr. PERCY. That I do not know.

Mr. WALLOP. He also has taken at least 34 trips abroad at the expense of the USIA with what results? We are not talking about anybody with so distinguished a record as to endow him with $25 million.

This is the point: The printed version of the title says that in the case of the Endowment's dissolution, the officers shall dispose of its assets in a manner they see fit, not inconsistent with the purposes of the Endowment.

What would prevent the officers transferring a lot of funds to institutes controlled by their friends and retiring there?

Mr. PERCY. Will the Senator repeat that?

Mr. WALLOP. The printed version of the title says that upon dissolution, the officers so endowed—and there are no provisions for their replacement by succeeding chairmen of the Republican and Democratic Parties——

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President——

Mr. WALLOP. I will restate the question.

It says that they shall dispose of the Endowment's assets as they see fit, in a manner not inconsistent with the purposes of the Endowment. What would prevent the officers from giving funds to institutes controlled by their friends and then retiring there?

Mr. PERCY. It has to be consistent with the purposes of the institution.

Mr. WALLOP. And it is the purpose of the institution to insure their retirement?

Mr. PERCY. The purpose of the institution is made very clear.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I wonder if I might venture——

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, two Senators are speaking.

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

Mr. WALLOP. The Senator from New York may answer the question, if he can.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. The Senator asks what would prevent the members of the board from acting in a way that would be disreputable or contrary to purposes for which the Corporation is established.

I offer an answer which I think the Senator from Wyoming would accept as a legitimate answer. I say it would be the character of DANTE FASCELL, Lane Kirkland, Albert Shanker, William Brock, and Charles T. Manatt.

I do not know of a Member of this body who is more sensitive to the role of character in public life than these men. There are some things you know some people will not do, and one of the things these people I have just named—who will be among the initial members of the board of directors—will not do is to misuse the trust placed in them by the U.S. Congress.

Mr. WALLOP. If men were always so trustworthy I would be willing to do it. But I question what Mr. Spencer Oliver's 34 trips abroad paid for by USIA have done for the United States.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I claim that to be a different question.

Mr. WALLOP. All right.

Mr. ZORINSKY. Mr. President, I think we are losing the point in this discussion when we are asking which of our colleagues would dare violate the laws of the land.

Not too long ago, I was tired of going back home every time and being asked by my constitutents: How did Abscam miss you?

This is how it is perceived by people who are paying the bill, not how we perceive it in this Chamber. We all praise one another, and we are all great people, but the people back home are getting sick and tired of reading about Congressmen going to jail, and that is where we have to provide the protection and the indemnification.

Mr. WALLOP. That is really the point. The thrust of my question does not regard the character of Fahrenkopf or Manatt. My point, among others, is that there is no provision for

oversight of this legislative proposal. It is not there. Rather in all this there is very evident the thrust of haste to get done badly what started out as a legitimate, good purpose. I do not believe that good purpose will be served. We have come to a situation in which $25 million is thrust out to an unformed and undirected group of people endowed with a generalized statement of purpose which mirrors the statement of purpose that exists for the USIA.

I just say that the answers I have received to my questions from the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from New York simply reinforce my view that this title is a perversion of the President's expressed wish to fight totalitarianism and promote democracy. It is a lot of things, and one is the financing of political parties with the taxpayers' money, which is in here.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that we can clear up another point?

We now have consulted, through the staff, with the program director of the democracy program. I am assured that the board will be taking up the final report next week at its meeting. We shall receive the final report no later than October 7.

However, we have this assurance: The final report will be essentially the interim report we have had to study for some time. It will contain only additional addenda to support the conclusions reached. There will be no new recommendations—no recommendation made of any major character will be modified.

So that, in essence, we have what we might call the executive summary of the final report now, but the full addenda will be available in our hands on October 7. But it will not materially in any way change any of the framework and the directions in which we have been moving.

Mr. WALLOP. The Senator answers my question and makes my case for removing this title from the bill now. One of the things we do not have is samples of the projects to be undertaken: Some kind of direction, some kind of capability for oversight, some kind of clearly stated purpose, other than a rehash of the USIA's mission. I understand that is what the AFL-CIO has. But the others do not.

I have made my case. I believe we should remove this title, that we should have a final report, and that the Senate and the committee are entitled to a final report.

I believe we need more in this legislation which provides us with the comfort and security of oversight, and we need to know samples of what kinds of projects they might undertake with the $25 million.

The $25 million in terms of what we spend on the floor here is not so much. Perhaps we talk about it because it is a more comprehensible figure than $1 billion. The fact is that this is a reflection, in my mind, of many of the things we do wrong when we have so many great opportunities to do right.

I am a cosponsor of the Senator's amendment, and I hope the title is deleted.

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

Mr. WALLOP. I yield.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, my colleagues have been good enough, in accordance with the customary courtesy, to discuss some of their concerns with me ahead of time. I am prepared to offer an amendment, a part of which would read as follows, anticipating the concerns of some Senators:

> Not later than December 31 of each year, the Endowment shall submit an annual report for the preceding fiscal year to the President for transmittal to the Congress. The report shall include a comprehensive and detailed report of the Endowment's operations, activities, financial condition, and accomplishments under this title and may include such recommendations as the Endowment deems appropriate. The board members and officers of the Endowment shall be available to testify before appropriate committees of the Congress with respect to such report, the report of any audit made by the Comptroller General pursuant to section 408, or any other matter which any such subcommittee may determine.

That kind of regular reporting will be valuable to us, and I assure my colleagues that we will scrutinize those reports carefully. They will be cordially invited to any hearings. Senator ZORINSKY is a valuable member of the Foreign Relations Committee and will be deeply involved in those hearings.

Anybody on the Endowment reading this RECORD—they will get a copy—will know that the operation will be subject to very close audit by Congress and by the Foreign Relations Committee.

But I deeply appreciate the interest. I think this colloquy has been extremely valuable for the reasons that I shall state when I get the floor in my own right and the ranking minority member handling the legislation today can speak on his own. We will speak to various aspects of it.

I will defer to my colleague to speak particularly about the long history of the labor unions in this area and the valuable contributions that they make.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak to a point just made by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. He asked the question: Why has it been that in recent years so much of the overseas activities of the U.S. Government in the area of public welfare and economic development has been subcontracted, if it would be permitted to use that term, to private organizations?

Senator PERCY mentioned religious organizations—the Catholic Relief Service, Lutheran World Relief Service and such like organizations. And there is also the AFL-CIO. And he made the point, incomparably important, that these organizations go abroad with constituencies at home. These constituencies give them strength and actively guide their work abroad, because the organizations are participatory.

It is the 15 million members of the AFL-CIO who are represented in the back streets of Bombay and Calcutta and New Delhi by the representatives of the Asian-American Free Labor Institute. I have had the opportunity to meet them when I was American Ambassador to that country.

It is 50 million American Catholics who give aid to the refugees from South Vietnam through the Catholic Relief Service. It is Lutherans the world over who are represented in Africa by the men and women of the Lutheran World Relief Service, who are helping people in that Continent.

Of all these institutions, none is older, none more experienced—and none more supportive of the enterprise proposed in the legislation before us—than the American labor movement.

Mr. President, the American labor movement 2 years ago observed its 100th anniversary. There can be not a dozen institutions—political or otherwise—in the world that can point to such continuity and stability of purpose and performance. It is worth noting the spirit that has guided the movement for this century and 2 years.

The Federation of Organized Trade and Labor Unions, predecessor to the AFL-CIO, was organized in 1881. From the first moment of this first enduring federation of unions, devotion to the enhancement of human rights and democratic liberties in other countries was at the center of its concerns.

The first convention adopted in 1881 called particular attention to what it considered to be the unjust imprisonment of:

> Hundreds of Ireland's honest spirits . . . in consequence of their heroic attempts to ameliorate the condition of her oppressed people.

That resolution, Mr. President, resolved to:

> Extend to these champions battling in the cause of human liberty our hearty sympathy, and that we also extend to the oppressed of all nations struggling for liberty and right, the same encouragement and words of sympathy.

In 1910, Mr. President, the organization, now called the American Federation of Labor, found in the administration of President Francisco Madero of Mexico hope for a progressive society in our neighboring country. They

watched Gen. Victoriano Huerta engaged in trying to overthrow that government—which Huerta eventually did, murdering Mr. Madero in the process. The 1912 Convention of the AFL went on record sending greetings to the Mexican people who, with Madero were: "Fighting to eliminate ancient wrongs and land tenure."

Some years later, Samuel Gompers, in his very last act as a leader of the American labor movement, was in Mexico meeting with the Mexican Federation of Labor to see if he could not bring our two nations together in this regard. He had a heart attack there. He asked to be carried across the Rio Grande that he might die on American soil. But his last act typically, even while much remained to do in America, was abroad.

In 1918, Samuel Gompers, at the request of Woodrow Wilson, chaired the commission which founded the International Labor Organization. Of all the organizations created or envisioned in company with the League of Nations, the one that exists to this day is the ILO. Why does it exist to this day? Because it has a constituency in this country to this day.

Even when our Government has not been prepared to work with the ILO, America has supported its work. Recall that the Treaty of Versailles stipulated that the International Labor Conference meet here in Washington in January 1919. When that group of delegates from around the world—representing business, labor, and government—arrived in Washington, the President of the United States was in a coma and this body was immobilized in the protracted debate over the Treaty of Versailles.

And who found them quarters? Well, the official secretariat was found quarters by a young Assistant Secretary of the Navy named Franklin D. Roosevelt, later a friend of our distinguished colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will my able colleague yield for a brief comment?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I am happy to yield.

(Mr. GORTON assumed the chair.)

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator has been speaking of Samuel Gompers and of that great labor leader's desire to have his last hours in this country, the United States of America, after being in Mexico.

I remember when his funeral train moved across West Virginia and stopped at 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning at Clarksburg. Hundreds and hundreds of workers viewed his body. Tears were in the eyes of coal miners who slowly filed pass his casket to express a final tribute to Samuel Gompers.

I was a young reporter for the Daily Telegram and was at the railroad station to write of the shared sadness and sorrow before dawn.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I dare to think that Mexican and Canadian and French and English coal miners would have done the same. The British Trade Union Congress and the American Federation of Labor have had fraternal delegates going back and forth for almost a century.

Go to the lobby of the AFL-CIO building in this city and what do you find but a large cast tribute from the British Trade Union Congress to the U.S. labor movement for its help during World War I.

Of all of the organizations in the League system, the ILO was the one we were least likely to join. Yet the ILO was the one we did join, in 1934. We did not join the League itself. And though every President, every prominent lawyer in this country said we must join the World Court, we never joined the World Court. We joined the ILO. Why? Because it had a mass of American citizens behind it.

The American labor movement has always acted on the mandate it has had from its members to promote workers' rights, and democratic liberties abroad.

I would point out that when the AFL-CIO was formed by merger in 1955, one of the first things they did was declare their support for the peoples of Africa to achieve independence. The merger convention declared that the people under colonial rule should be assisted in their efforts to "choose the form of government they desire".

Labor's support for these principles through the decades of this century of its active life has not been without cost and sacrifice.

Within the last 3 years we have seen the cold-blooded murder in El Salvador of Michael Hammer, Mark Pearlman, and Rodolfo Viera, men working for, or alongside, the American Institute for Free Labor Development, since 1962 the AFL-CIO's affiliate in Latin America and the Caribbean.

I cannot speak for today, but when I last knew these numbers, half the budget of the AFL-CIO national headquarters was spent overseas. Doing what? Promoting free labor unions; fighting on the streets of Paris, practically, to keep the French Communists from seizing power in 1947; fighting up and down the nation of Italy in 1948 to hold that country out of reach of the Communists, to hold it for democracy; helping rebuild the German trade unions, which were the first institutions Adolph Hitler had set out to destroy.

This is not new to the American spirit; it derives from the American spirit. What the President is asking is that we extend it. My good friend from Wyoming has said, where have the political parties been all these years? Yes, where have they been? Where has American business been? Yes, where have they been? Well, they ought to have been where the labor movement has been for 102 years. To their credit, they have now begun to emulate labor. The President has asked Congress to establish an independent Endowment for Democracy in which these institutions may cooperate in sharing abroad their contributions to the American democracy. It is a simple beginning. We ought permit this to be done.

Mr. WALLOP. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I will yield for a question.

Mr. WALLOP. My question is, Will he listen to a statement that would say that I would have no objection if all $25 million was going to the labor unions in this country and the right to work movement for these purposes because of that track record of which the Senator speaks? They are good at it. But our party chairmen have absolutely a zero record in this part of the world. They do not belong here.

I agree with everything the Senator has said about the track record of labor. They have been among the best anti-Communists we have had.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I think the Senator from Wyoming and I have a very friendly difference. It comes down to a matter of judgment. I think the experience of the labor movement can be shared. I think our political institutions, and the two major parties are our largest political institutions, can learn and can in turn share that knowledge.

The European experience tells us this can be done successfully. The political parties in Germany have shown this best, with their foundations named for their great party leader,—the Konrad Adenauer, Freidrich Elbert, Friedrich Neumann and Hans Seidel foundations. The concept has its roots in an international socialist movement, which has proclaimed itself international and thought of itself as such.

The Senator and I know too much about our respective political parties to have an excessive confidence in either. But we ought have a certain confidence. Their very existence is a constant reminder of the first rule of successful democracy: while the majority governs, the minority rights must be protected. In almost every political forum in this great land, one or the other party is the minority, and seeks through peaceful democratic means to become the majority. The vitality of the opposition is the measure of the strength of a democracy. Parties organize the opposition more so then they affect the government. They have a special contribution to make abroad in this regard. They have a long experience of it in this county. I belong to the oldest organized political party in the world. We know some-

thing, we in the Demorcatic Party. I dare to think we are capable of learning more. I do not want to keep anybody from participating in this debate. I know that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, who is actively involved in this matter, wishes to speak, and there may be those who wish to speak against it.

I should like it understood by those who might read this RECORD that we seek with the Endownment for Democracy to formalize, and in some sense to institutionalize, an old American experience.

I think we ought to try this. If it does not succeed, we can acknowledge that and more on to something else. But let us not expect anything to show for 20 years. We expect to be here in 20 years.

We are not talking about large sums. We are talking about large hopes, hopes tempered with prudent expectations.

I hope we might do this.

I would like to say to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the distinguished ranking member I thank them for bringing this matter to the floor. They have my vote.

A final note about the thoroughly bipartisan nature of this enterprise. Once again, here we are, Senator DODD and I, carrying forward the White House policies. It is a measure of the importance of the matter that we do.

I am happy to yield the floor because I would like to see the debate go forward.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, we will be ready to vote, for the benefit of our colleagues, certainly within a quarter of an hour.

As I understand, the proponents of the amendment have offered all of their arguments now and are willing to go immediately to a vote. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

I would like to sum up, however.

First of all, I commend my distinguished colleague from New York. Once again he has proven, as he has so many times, on bipartisan matters that involve the national interests he can always vote right. It does not matter who is President. If he thinks the President is right, he votes for him.

I have been criticized from time to time because I have seen fit to support Democratic Presidents on occasion. But, I have always said, "we have one President and once the election is over politics ought to be over." You do not support him just becasue he is a member of one party over another. Democrats certainly did not support Lyndon Johnson in the final days of the Vietnam war. If they had, we would still be in that war.

Nor did Republicans always support President Nixon in that regard. We vote as a separate branch of government. In this case, I commend my distinguished colleague for taking a piece of legislation that I think has a fine background and has a great future. I commend my colleagues who are offering this amendment for the colloquy we have had because I think it will immensely strengthen interest in the legislation. Also, I hope that they will accept my invitation to attend the oversight hearings the Foreign Relations Committee will be holding, and that they will scrutinize carefully the annual report, and will support the amendment I will be subsequently offering calling for an annual report.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Will the chairman allow me to express my appreciation for his generosity?

Mr. PERCY. Of course.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I must say that no one can speak on this floor about the subject without acknowledging the extraordinary contribution of Mr. George Agree, who may be said to have conceived this idea and, after many careful years of pilgrimage and pioneering, saw it realized in the first instance when the President of the United States proposed it in the great hall at Westminster in London in June of 1982. Today the Senate merely builds on a foundation laid by George Agree.

Mr. PERCY. I thank my colleague.

First, let me pose the question, Why do we need the endowment? Rarely has a single piece of legislation received so quickly such a broad measure of support both in this country and among our Democratic friends of all political persuasions worldwide.

I was, as I indicated before, privileged to sit in on a full-day meeting where there were representatives of our allies in Europe sitting there who had participated in this kind of an activity on behalf of their governments, whether it be from labor unions, whether it be from political parties. They were able to give us, as we questioned them, the benefit of their years of experience. We drew our legislation based on that worldwide experience.

The National Endowment for Democracy bill—bitterly opposed, as we have noted, by Pravda and other Soviet organs—has been endorsed editorially by a range of leading U.S. newspapers.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my comments, samples of the Washington Post, Wall Street Journal, and the Christian Science Monitor endorsements.

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

(See exhibt 1.)

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, its support cuts across traditional conservative-liberal lines, and the bipartisan leadership of the Congress remains as deeply committed to the passage of this legislation as the White House. President's letter to Senator BAKER enclosed. Whether among our European allies, our friends throughout Latin America, or those who wish this country well in Africa and Asia, there exists a common recognition: the National Endowment for Democracy legislation is arguably the most important single U.S. foreign policy initiative of this generation that we have taken structually and organizationally from the standpoint of putting together some legislation here in the Chamber of the Senate.

By engaging the energies of America's major political parties, labor, business, and other private sector institutions in the tasks of democratic political exhange and institutional development throughout the world, the endowment will provide a focal point for a positive, constructive, realistic set of long-range programs to assist democracy throughout the world in the coming decades.

I referred a while back in a colloquy with my distinguished colleague, Senator WALLOP, to the reaction of the Soviet world, and I am delighted that both Senator WALLOP, and Senator ORRIN HATCH are in the Chamber now because I wish to read to them what Radio Moscow, what Tass, and what Pravda has to say about this project. They are not likely to castigate any program unless they think that program is going to be contrary to their own national goals and interests.

On April 20, 1983, we tape-recorded this reaction to Radio Moscow:

> The Soviet reaction to the Democracy program and the National Endowment for Democracy has been shrill and abusive. In its many virulent attacks in major Soviet media, Moscow has apparently been concerned that these private sector American initiatives will counter effectively long-standing Soviet efforts to impede democratic development in Europe and the Third World.

Let me extract now at this point the following short representative excerpts indicating the Soviet reaction, and I quote:

> Leaders of the Republican and the Democratic Parties have called upon Congress to support the efforts directed at organizing a so-called National Endowment for Democracy * * * that fund is given the function of coordinating and financing the most important of the ideological diversions planned by the administration.

That was Radio Moscow, April 20, 1983.

Now Tass just before that, February 18, 1983, said this, and I quote:

> The United States attempts, under the pretext of protection of democracy, to usurp the right to interfere on a large scale in the affairs of other states * * * Large funds have been allocated * * * for infiltrating parties, trade unions, business circles.

And then Pravda just the day before that, February 17, 1983 said:

> This notorious democracy program * * * is in fact the most cynical interference by Washington in the internal affairs of sover-

eign states. The new program is one more link in the chain of ideologically subversive measures undertaken by the ruling circles of the United States against freedom-loving peoples * * *. The ruling class in the United States in mobilizing all of its strength: Big business, the leaders of the bourgeois parties, the reactionary heads of unions, militarists, and others, in order to rebuild and reorganize its propaganda machine.

I think anything denounced that severely by the Soviets must be pretty good from the standpoint of the United States and its allies.

Some critics have charged that public funding of the U.S. political parties, through their respective Institutes for International Affairs, to engage in work abroad might become an embarrassing boondoggle or, conversely, might interfere with the conduct of U.S. foreign policy in specific countries.

The risks of either happening are minimal. For one thing, the political party foundations in the Federal Republic of Germany—Adenauer, Ebert, Naumann, and Seidel—have operated in over five dozen countries for the past two decades without major incidents and have, in the process increased the overall influence of West German national efforts abroad under both SPD and CDM governments. Similarly, the Venezuelan parties have operated foundations effectively throughout Latin America since the early 1960's with similar results. Other countries—Spain, Portugal, and Finland among them—have undertaken similar efforts. The State Department, the National Security Council, and the USIA all strongly endorse the Endowment legislation and have worked closely with its sponsors. It is effective overdue way in which the political parties, labor, business, and other U.S. groups can contribute to the overall goals of American foreign policy under any administration.

It should be pointed out that the Soviets have denounced the Endowment bill and its key participant groups repeatedly and that the Soviets view the bipartisan, private sector work to be undertaken by the Endowment and the four institutes as a major threat to its own international activities.

As for the boondoggle allegation, the Endowment will come under continuous and extensive scrutiny by the appropriate committees of both Houses of Congress. The additional provisions for GAO oversight, as well as the terms of the USIA grant agreement under which it will function, assure a convergence of oversight procedures virtually unique among grantees of Federal funds.

Some critics in the House debate charged that this was a hastily-conceived measure that represented a single ideological viewpoint. Is this true?

Not in the least. The bill emerged from a year-long effort by the American Political Foundation's democracy program research study group. That group included—as cochairmen—the two political party chairmen, Lane Kirkland of the AFL-CIO, Ambassador Michael Samuels of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, representatives of both House and Senate, and conservatives, moderates, liberals among its board members, as even a hasty scrutiny of its report will indicate. The research included entensive assessment of the ability of private sector U.S. organizations to assist democratic developments throughout the world, and the research staff either traveled to or met with political leaders of all democratic persuasions, conservative to Socialist, from over fifty countries. The program's interim report has been available since April.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to read a letter dated July 19, 1983, to Senator HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr., the majority leader, U.S. Senate, from the President of the United States.

Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber? I can hear the Senator louder in my earphone than I can hear myself talk.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

This is a letter from the President of the United States addressing himself to the issue we are just about to vote on, and I think our colleagues on both sides of the aisle should hear what the President has had to say. Let us give him his day in court.

DEAR HOWARD: As you are aware, the FY 84-85 State Department Authorization Bill (S. 1342) contains a set of proposals to create a National Endowment for Democracy and several related institutions. These proposals, sponsored jointly by the Republican and Democratic National Committees, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the AFL-CIO represent a historic achievement of bipartisanship and are of vital importance to an expanded American leadership role abroad.

If enacted, the National Endowment for Democracy Act would allow our two major political parties, the business community and organized labor to undertake serious and responsible long-term programs in support of democracy and pluralism abroad. At present, our non-governmental involvement in the intenational political world—except for the AFL-CIO training institutes—is haphazard at best. Although political parties from virtually every democracy in the world are already engaged in developimg party-to-party links and programs, for example, our parties remain passive observers for the most part. Yet such nongovernmental contacts can enhance government-to-government relationships.

The amounts requested for these programs pale in comparison to the efforts of the enemies of democracy, free enterprise, and free trade unions. Yet there is no reason why we cannot assemble the resources to do the job. The private sector brings with it the practical experience of many Americans in the practice of democracy. There are public entities such as the VOA which, if strengthened, can contribute ever more effectively to the goals all Americans share.

I strongly urge, therefore, that our fellow Republicans in the Senate support the National Endowment for Democracy Act when it reaches the Senate floor. As leader of the free world, the United States must bring to bear all of its resources in the ongoing global struggle for individual liberty and freedom. The National Endowment for Democracy will provide a vital new element in this leadership role, one that is not only overdue but worthy of our wholehearted support.

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN.

Mr. President, I ask the distinguished minority leader whether, because this letter seems to be addressed to the President's fellow Republicans and is addressed to the majority leader, did the minority leader receive a similar letter pleading on a bipartisan basis for the support of the members of the Democratic Party as well because the Democratic National chairman is a full-fledged partner in this whole enterprise?

I feel confident, having discussed this with the administration, that the administration is appealing for bipartisan support, and having sat all day long next to the Democratic Committee chairman we talked half the time about my daughter and my son-in-law and the other half we talked about this project.

We were in absolute bipartisan spirit there. I know the President means this appeal to be a bipartisan appeal, and I only urge that we do take into account that the only people who would be happy with a negative vote, with this amendment adopted, would be Pravda, Radio Moscow, and the Kremlin.

They are the ones who would benefit by it. They would be pleased, indeed, if we backed off and for this relatively small amount of money would not put together what is a powerful mechanism and organization, a powerful idea.

We have been strengthened and reinforced, and I will introduce amendments that will take into account the arguments that have been brought by the proponents of this amendment so that we get an annual report, we have oversight hearings, and each Senator who has expressed an interest in this legislation, whether a member of the Foreign Relations Committee or not, will be invited to participate in it. We will take very closely into account that a very large part of this responsibility will go to the AFL-CIO. The Labor Committee members particularly I think will be involved and interested in following the proceedings of this endowment. Our first annual report should be a most interesting report.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, June 28, 1983]

EXPORTING DEMOCRACY

Congress is hip deep in its consideration of the Reagan administration's "Democracy Program." Most legislators think it's fine to give government money to the AFL-CIO to build unions abroad; it has been doing this work effectively for 30 years. Analogous institution-building by other private groups—business, foundations—also seems assured of approval as part of President Reagan's plan to strengthen the "infrastructure" of frail foreign democracies. But should money be funneled to the Republican and Democratic parties for this purpose? The House denied the administration's request to earmark $5 million for each major party out of the $31.3 million it seeks for the new program. The Senate has questions too.

There is first of all a vision of a giant slush fund allowing party functionaries to junket from one end of the world to another. It is probably inevitable that a new program whose purposes are admittedly rather grand and vague must surmount suspicions of this sort. The answer to them lies in conscientious service and good open bookkeeping.

A deeper objection arises from the pervasive feeling that there is something questionable, unfeasible or even improper about the direct promotion of democracy. In this light, democracy is seen as something that can and should be spread only by example or precept, as a necessarily indigenous enterprise that is bound to be tainted when foreign and especially American hands are laid on. Or it is seen as a matter of culture and spirit and therefore one impervious to transfusions of process and mechanics in the way anticipated by the new program.

These are not frivolous considerations. Other democratic countries, however, have managed. International contacts have their own proven value. The American political process includes a body of knowledge and a range of techniques that can be transmitted at the technical level without unseemly interference. There are ways to do it badly, but there are always ways to do it well—starting small.

The discussion about the Democracy Program does not split people along familiar party or liberal-conservative lines. It seems to come down to a question of sensibility and political taste. We happen to like the idea. Democracy, after all, is the national ideology and the national pride. To preserve it here and build it elsewhere, Americans already spend billions on defense and aid. The CIA has been known to use its resources secretly to bolster democracy abroad. "Do not let the CIA disseminate what democracy is." Rep. Kika de la Garza of Texas said in the House debate. "Let the people who make it work do it."

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 14, 1983]

PROJECT DEMOCRACY

The House has just approved a plan to set up and fund a new National Endowment for Democracy, to promote democratic processes around the world. Present plans for the project are about like attractive blueprints for most activities in the field of politics and ideas: They could get all screwed up as they inch down the road to realization, but they show considerable promise. Maybe the most interesting thing about the endowment plan so far, though, is the set of enemies it has acquired.

The idea for an endowment was meant to confront the fact that totalitarian governments, especially totalitarians of the left, are rolling over us in the battle of political ideas. Among intellectuals and in international forums they deride democratic and free market ideas. Moreover, there is no reason for us to be so passive in return. The political parties of other democracies run substantial programs to promote their principles abroad; why can't we?

The endowment has been set up to do this job. It will get federal money but be a nongovernmental organization. Its planners originally allocated one part of the money to each of our major political parties, to set up institutes of their own. Another part will go to the American labor movement for projects like exchanges, development of free trade unions and training union leaders in politics.

And some money is marked for an institute for private enterprise, meant not only to educate people abroad on the virtues of markets but also to give business leaders some lessons on how private enterprise systems succeed best in a climate of certain democratic values and practices.

The bill to set up the endowment has been to the House now. It passed—but only narrowly, only in part, and not without a lot of opposing argument. It was called a boondoggle, with not enough congressional oversight to insure accountability. It would be too close to the U.S. government, an opposite sort of argument ran, and therefore would not be believed by foreigners. Rep. George Crockett Jr. (D., Mich.) doubted that the organization could sell democracy around the world when it had no Hispanics and only two blacks and three women on its 15-member board.

The critics finally succeeded in killing the part of the bill that would have given money to the Democrats and Republicans.

It is fine to worry about boondoggles, and reasonable to suggest that our present Republican and Democratic parties are not in great shape for conducting ideological warfare. But to assume a project dealing with ideas and basic institutions will be a waste, and to say that the U.S. can never speak up successfully around the world because it has been terminally discredited, ensure that we are never going to be able to defend ourselves in this crucial arena. The reception the endowment idea received on the House floor is prime evidence of why we need it.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 17, 1983]

HELPING DEMOCRACY ABROAD

(By Frank J. Fahrenkopf Jr. and Charles T. Manatt)

During House debate this June over establishing the proposed National Endowment for Democracy, a liberal Maryland Democrat and a conservative California Republican both rose to describe their recent journey to Venezuela. Michael Barnes and Robert Lagomarsino, Democratic chairman and ranking Republican respectively, of the House Western Hemisphere Affairs subcommittee, had traveled to Caracas as representatives of their political parties to confer with leaders of Venezuela's two major polical parties. They described to the Venezuelans how US political parties, labor, and business intended to cooperate in helping democratic movements abroad through the coordinating mechanism of the bipartisan endowment. The enthusiastic response of our Latin American friends came as no surprise to us.

As co-chairmen of the research study that developed the endowment proposal, we know that from its earliest days, our "Democracy Program"—a unique collaboration of the Republican and Democratic parties with labor and business—has gained strong support from foreign observers in every corner of the world representing the spectrum of democratic political belief. The endowment would allow our nongovernmental institutions to help democratic friends and colleagues abroad, much as the political party foundations in the Federal Republic of Germany have developed widely acclaimed programs in five dozen countries since the early 1960s largely through government funding.

With support from both the Reagan administration and the bipartisan congressional leadership, our executive board and staff worked six months before agreeing on an interim report which proposed creating the endowment to fund (among other groups) four major grantees: separate Republican and Democratic Institutes for International Affairs (modeled after the German foundations), a Free Trade Union Institute, and a Center for International Private Enterprise.

No one-man band nor single ideology designed the endowment proposal.

By the time our proposals (in H.R. 2915) reached the House floor where the bill passed as amended, they had already been approved, after hearings by both the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. One aspect of the bill met significant opposition in the full House. A majority of members rejected earmarking funds for the two party institutes, "the most intriguing of these programs," according to the Washington Post, since the institutes "would help the American political parties reach out to their democratic allies abroad."

Opponents stressed two themes: budget deficits and the question of using public funds to support the international activities of American parties. Obviously, the $5 million alloted to each party institute remains more a symbol to some legislators than a genuine element in curing the deficits.

Interestingly enough, it was a cadre of Republican conservatives who pointed to the international record of the AFL-CIO's training institutes in using US government funds for decades in assisting local free labor movements battle communist unions on four continents. Now, with business joining the fray by developing comparable training programs, several GOP conservatives urged defeat of the amendment, (in Rep. Jack Kemp's words) in order "to send a signal to the people of the world who yearn for free enterprise and free labor that we mean what we say when we give speeches in support of democracy, human rights, and movements such as Solidarity in Poland and democracy in Central America or wherever." They were joined by several Democrats including Kika de la Garza, who appealed to the House to "plant a small seed of democratic institutions" and to "let the people who make it work" in this country help their counterparts elsewhere.

We believe that when Congress returns in September both the House and Senate will send that unmistakable signal to those who cherish democracy throughout the world by approving the entire National Endowment for Democracy proposal, including the party institutes. After that, the endowment and its grantees will have a chance to show Congress and the American people that timely, effective, and long-range programs of a non-

governmental nature can prove essential to our friends abroad. Allowing the political parties to help spread the message and methods of democracy in the world is long overdue. Even the skeptics will discover soon enough to coin a phrase, that they have nothing to fear but fear itself.

Mr. BAKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I believe we are close to a vote on this matter, but I would like to make one announcement about another matter before the Senate proceeds to a rollcall on this amendment.

MARTIN LUTHER KING HOLIDAY LEGISLATION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I wish to announce, after consulting with those principally involved in the matter, that the Martin Luther King holiday will not be made the pending business tomorrow but, indeed, it is the intention of the leadership on this side to ask the Senate to turn to the consideration of the Martin Luther King holiday bill on Monday, October 3, which will be Monday a week.

I think I should say why that is so. I have advised the minority leader previously that I would make this announcement.

Mr. President, before we went out for the August recess, as Members will recall, I obtained consent of the Senate to place the Martin Luther King bill as passed in the House directly on the calendar where it now resides.

I also announced at that time, Mr. President, that it was my full intention to ask the Senate to turn to the consideration of that bill shortly after we came back from the August recess, in the first or second week after our return. When we returned, I announced that I intended to take up the bill this Friday, tomorrow.

Yesterday, the minority leader indicated that Friday of this week, tomorrow, posed certain problems of attendance on his side of the aisle and asked if it were possible to take the bill up today and get a unanimous-consent agreement to finish it today.

I replied to the minority leader that there was no objection that I found on this side to taking it up today, but it was virtually certain we could not finish it today.

Now, the reason I am giving this background is to let Members know and refresh their recollection that what we are doing today is in no way intended to delay this bill. No one that I know of is trying to delay this bill but, rather, to set it at a time which is mutually desirable.

Mr. President, I made a representation and a commitment to certain people not at the Senate that I was going to support this measure—and, indeed, I do—and seek its passage as, indeed, I will. Among them were representatives of the Black Leadership Roundtable and the Black Leadership Forum.

Today, I received a call from Mrs. Coretta King, who is a member of that group and one of the people to whom I made that commitment. Mrs. King indicated to me that she and her group felt that the chances for passage of this measure would be enhanced and improved if the consideration of it were postponed because of the attendance situation.

I support this measure. I indicated to her that I would make the statement I have just made.

So I want it thoroughly understood that this change in scheduling is with the full concurrence of those who are actively engaged in the black leadership groups to obtain the passage of this measure. It is made with the full knowledge of the minority leader and those who are principally involved in this issue on both sides, if there are two sides within the Senate.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAKER. So the postponement of this is not for the purpose of delay. It is certainly not for the purpose of diminishing chances that this bill will pass but, rather, is made, I believe, in a spirit of consensus purely for the matter of scheduling.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. BAKER. Yes; I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the majority leader has answered this already to my satisfaction, but to put it in the plainest and simplest verbiage, the delay is not being done because of any feeling on this side or any effort on this side to delay the action on this matter; am I correct?

Mr. BAKER. Yes, Mr. President, the sole purpose of this delay is so that we get the maximum number of people here on both sides of the aisle to consider the matter.

Mr. BYRD. And this has been at the request of Mrs. King and others?

Mr. BAKER. And others in the Black Leadership Roundtable and the Black Leadership Forum.

Mr. BYRD. I just do not want any rumors to start that the Democrats were dragging their feet on this and brought on this delay. I am sure that the majority leader has made it clear beyond any doubt that that is the case.

Mr. BAKER. Nor is it the case, may I say, that any Republican is trying to delay it.

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

Mr. BAKER. Again, no one on this side of the aisle or the other side of the aisle has ever tried to delay. It is a question simply of expressing their position.

I yield now to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Is it the expectation of the majority leader that the bill will be finally enacted on Monday, or disposed of on Monday?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, it is my hope that it will be disposed of on Monday, but it is my full intention to stay on the bill on Monday, October 3, which is not next Monday but a week from Monday.

Mr. BYRD. Just one further question.

Mr. President, I hope that we could arrive at some time agreement which would definitely tell all Senators that there will be a vote on this matter on Monday, the 3d, at 2 o'clock or 3 o'clock or Tuesday, the 4th, at a certain hour so that all Senators may so program their schedules to be here to vote.

So I want to say to the majority leader that I am perfectly willing to work with my colleagues on this side. We offered a time agreement yesterday but, as the majority leader said, there were some problems in getting the time agreement acceded to on his side. I am perfectly willing and hopeful that in the final analysis we can at least set a date and hour so that all Senators on both sides will be able to make it.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, if the minority leader will shop such an agreement on his side, I will do it on this side and maybe we can find out something else.

Let me make one further statement, if I may, while I have the floor, Mr. President.

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, since we are not going to take up the Martin Luther King matter tomorrow, it will be the intention of the leadership on this side to ask us to continue on the consideration of this measure if we have not completed it this evening, and then to turn to the consideration of the Export-Import Bank bill, if time remains during the day on Friday. I do not anticipate a Saturday session.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the majority leader indulge one further question?

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. In his opinion, how late will the Senate go today?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, let me confer with the managers. It would be my hope that we can finish this bill and do so by 6:30 or 7. But if we cannot do it by 6:30 or 7, then I would intend to go out until tomorrow at perhaps 10 a.m.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. PERCY. If the distinguished leader will yield, the agenda we have

ahead of us is the vote on the Zorinsky-Helms amendment, which we are now ready to do. A rollcall has been ordered on that. There are three Kassebaum amendments. A rollcall will occur on one of those. There is a DeConcini amendment, there is a Percy amendment, a Hatch amendment, a Leahy amendment, a Boschwitz amendment, and Senator HUMPHREY has two amendments.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I have one.

Mr. PERCY. Also, we have a Huddleston amendment. We will add that after Humphrey.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It is going to be next.

Mr. PERCY. Excuse me. Senator HUDDLESTON is already listed as following immediately after the Zorinsky amendment.

So the two Humphrey amendments are the last that we have. I ask all Senators to advise the managers of the bill if they do intend to have amendments. We do have Senator DECONCINI down for one amendment and Senator HATCH down for two amendments.

It was the intention of the managers to try to finish at least through the first seven amendments tonight.

I think we can finish those, hopefully by 7 o'clock.

Mr. BYRD. Seven amendments by 7 o'clock?

Mr. PERCY. Would the majority leader yield for just a question, because I would like to have some guidance for Senator PELL and myself?

Mr. BAKER. Yes, Mr. President, I yield.

Mr. PERCY. We shall start an action which then would control the floor of the Senate, ordinarily controlled by the leadership, but the law provides that if we do send the war powers resolution to the floor as we intend to now, if we have passage of it in the Foreign Relations Committee tomorrow, shortly after 12 noon, we would then send it with a written report to the Senate floor by Monday. That would then be the pending business and it would have a maximum of 3 days to be considered, which would mean Martin Luther King could not come up until Thursday. I would like to certify that at every single meeting I have attended, the majority leader has stated his absolute firm intention on that. We might have to set aside the State Department authorization bill to fulfill that pledge which has been made by both majority and minority leaders. We would like some guidance now as to how he would like us to handle the measure involving the war powers resolution.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, in response to the question of the distinguished chairman, I would think that if the resolution on the War Powers Act is passed out of committee tomorrow—and I hope it is—we would be on that by 1 o'clock on Monday. It would be the following Monday, the 3d, a week later, before I would plan to ask the Senate to return to the Martin Luther King holiday bill. So that would not be a problem.

Let me say, on the question of how late we are going to stay tonight, the list the Senator has given me, I am afraid, is overwhelming. I do not see how we can finish that bill tonight and, since we have the Export-Import bill tomorrow, I hope we can go out at a decent hour tonight and come in at 10 tomorrow.

I know both the chairman and the ranking minority member have cleared their decks for tonight, and it is Thursday and this is the usual late evening, but we are going to be in and working tomorrow. May I inquire of the minority leader what his views are on that subject?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, just for the moment, I note that to the ranking minority member of the committee, most of the amendments are acceptable.

Mr. PELL. Some of them are acceptable.

Mr. BYRD. If that is the case, it may very well be that we can finish tonight; in which case, I hope that the Senate will not be in tomorrow. But the majority leader has his own responsibilities and I shall be guided by that.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have to say we must ask the Senate to be in tomorrow. We have so little time between now and October 7. We have the Eximbank and several other things we must do. If we are going to be in tomorrow on those, I would ask the Senate to stay tonight.

Mr. BYRD. If we are going to be in tomorrow, as far as I am concerned, we ought to vote on this one and go home, but I do not know what my colleagues want.

Mr. EXON. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. BYRD. I have the floor. I yield.

Mr. EXON. Could I pose a question as to what the plans are for tomorrow?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am sorry, I do not have the floor. The majority leader has.

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. May I ask what the plans are for tomorrow? As I understand, the Martin Luther King measure will not come up, but there are other measures. As I understand, we will work through this tonight. Has the majority leader agreed to any time tomorrow afternoon beyond which we will not have rollcall votes?

Mr. BAKER. No, I have not, but I know the Senator has a pressing engagement. He and I have discussed that. I have represented to him that I not only understand, but will cooperate with him. I hope he will not mind if I say what the reason is. He has a son getting married tomorrow night. There are not many things I would take as an absolute justification for trying to get a Democratic Member out of town, but that is one of them. I am going to try my best to help the Senator.

I would guess that we shall not have any rollcall votes after 3 or 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. EXON. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRADLEY. Will the majority leader yield for a moment?

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY. Does the majority leader expect that on Monday, when the war powers resolution shall come to the floor, that time will be reserved exclusively for debate?

Mr. BAKER. Yes, Mr. President, let me say that in the Foreign Relations Committee, as a part of the arrangement to report this measure out on Friday and have it out the first of the week as the statute requires, the question was put to me, are we going to be faced with a vote on Monday as soon as it comes up? The answer is no. I think it is simple fairness to say we ought to have Monday to familiarize ourselves with the process and have opening statements and general debate. It will not be my intention to ask the Senate to vote on any aspect of that measure on Monday.

I cannot totally control that. There could be a vote that I have no control over or a procedural vote, but that is not my intention and my wish.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. PERCY. One further thing, if the majority leader will yield.

Mr. BAKER. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. PERCY. As he knows, the Foreign Relations Committee will be meeting tomorrow at 9 o'clock to mark up a resolution on the war powers matter. We hope it will occur no later than 12 o'clock. I think we set a definite time of 12 o'clock. Therefore, both the chairman and the ranking minority member will not be able to be on the floor to carry on with the State Department authorization bill until sometime after 12 o'clock.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the chairman has overwhelmed me twice: Once with his list of amendments, now with the logic of his argument. It is true he must be in committee tomorrow. Therefore, I am going to do what I desperately did not want to do. I am going to change my mind and ask the Senate to stay in awhile longer tonight to see if we can finish this bill. I now estimate we shall be in at least until 7 or perhaps later. I shall make an announcement later.

Mr. PERCY. I thank the leadership and I hope we can have cooperation by the Senators. There are many amend-

ments that can be accepted. I hope statements can be put in the RECORD and I hope we can have a vote right now. I believe we are ready for a vote.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. SYMMS addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. PERCY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for yielding.

Mr. President, I have sat through some of the most interesting debate I have heard in this body over the last 2½ years, listening to Senator WALLOP, Senator PERCY, Senator ZORINSKY, and others talk. Constantly, we talk about the fact that we are trying to appropriate money to spread the word of "democracy." "Democracy" and "republic" means so many things to so many people. I just thought, with this body being so filled with lawyers, so many of which I respect as very good constitutional lawyers, I thought it might be worthy, before we vote on this, to go back and check the semantics of this matter. What is the definition of the word "republic?"

I know the distinguished Senator from California, who is now retired, Senator Hayakawa, specialized in this area of semantics: I am sure if he were here, he could say this without a dictionary. I read to my colleagues the following definition of republic:

> A government having a chief of state who is not a monarch and who in modern times is a president; (2) a nation or other political unit having such a form of government; b(1) A government in which supreme power resides in the body of citizens entitled to vote and is exercised by elected officers and representatives responsible to them and governing according to law.

This definition of republic is from Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary.

I do not know whether that is what people are talking about. That is the definition of "republic" in the dictionary. That is often what I think distinguished constitutional lawyers consider the form of government we have.

Under "democracy" it says:

> Government by the people; rule of the majority; a government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation usually involving periodically held free elections.

I do not know whether that means that if you get 51 percent, you can do anything and anything goes.

The German Democratic Republic in East Germany is a Communist country, and it uses those words.

I think the case was very well made by the Senator from Nebraska and his allies here this afternoon, that we may not be ready to vote on an endowment for democracy and we may not know where we are firing our rifle shots. We may not have enough oversight on this proposal, and it may not have received thorough planning and scrutiny.

I wish that all the people who work in our State Department were as articulate in making the points for the American people as was Ambassador Charles Lichenstein, Deputy Chief U.S. Delegate to the United Nations, when he offered to fondly wave farewell to the Soviets and others at dockside if they wish to leave this country. I think if that were to happen, we would not even need to be talking about this. I believe that is what the Senator from Nebraska is talking about. We do not need to be endowing a foundation for democracy if we can decide just what we believe in, in this country, and clarify our objectives and our purposes and what we believe in, and emphasize that it is really freedom, liberty, free enterprise, and private property, and that there can be no peace in this world without freedom for the people in any country.

It sounds good, but as I hear the word "democracy" thrown all over the floor this afternoon, I wonder if we would not be wiser to save the taxpayers the money and take another look at this proposal for endowing democracy next year, after the proposal has been subjected to proper hearings, scrutiny, and planned forethought. Thus far, it is not a carefully thought out proposal.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of title IV of this bill, establishing the National Endowment for Democracy. As my colleagues know, this would be a private, nonprofit corporation to promote democratic values and strengthen democratic institutions worldwide.

This proposal, if approved by Congress, will open a new chapter in our foreign policy and will represent a step that we will rightly be proud of in the future. Its novelty does not mean that it is without antecedents among the international activities of private U.S. organizations. The outstanding efforts of the AFL-CIO in promoting free trade unions abroad served as a model for this proposal as did the foundations maintained by the major West German parties. The Socialist Party of West Germany received considerable credit a few years ago for its role in strengthening the Socialist Party of Portugal and, thereby, indirectly preventing the takeover of that country's government by its Stalinist Communist Party.

World politics being the way it is, we often have to define the objectives of our foreign policy in negative terms to oppose Soviet expansion, to resist aggression or subversion, to stop the spread of totalitarianism. The National Endowment for Democracy will give a tangible form to a national effort to advance a very positive objective: To support the forces of democracy around the world.

Let me call attention of my distinguished colleages to three features of this proposal that I consider the most important. First, the proposed entity to administer the program is nongovernmental, second, the whole effort is bipartisan and provides an additional balance by involving labor as well as the American business world, and finally it is an undertaking that is totally above the board, it involves no secrecy and lacks any subversive intentions. Let us not be naive: The ideas of democracy are considered subversive in many parts of the world, but that is not something we ought to be embarrassed about.

The bipartisan nature of the effort is obvious and needs no further elaboration. The fact that the endowment is a nongovernmental entity assures not only its relative independence, but also gives credibility to the fact that his venture is not a tool of the day-by-day conduct of our foreign policy in the narrow sense. It is not an effort to disguise narrow U.S. interest as universal, it serves U.S. interest only insofar as the establishment of a future world community, consisting of democratic governments is in the interest of the United States. If there is a strong concurrence there, as I believe there is, we ought not be embarrased about that. We are promoting a universal idea that even the worst tyrants have to pay lip service to. If they are annoyed by this project, let them attack the idea of democracy.

Without going on too long, let me just give a brief summary of the proposal:

Title IV establishes the endowment as a private, nonprofit corporation to strengthen democratic values and institutions internationally. The endowment would receive an annual appropriation from Congress and would be subject to congressional overview and guidance.

The proposal names four organizations to receive funds: Separate Republican and Democratic Institutes for International Affairs, the Free Trade Union Institute affiliated with the AFL-CIO, and the National Chamber Foundation affiliated with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. In addition, the legal profession, media, academic groups, and other private sector organizations could apply for funds. I would like to elaborate now on the idea of party institutes.

I see them as having two parallel sets of objectives and programs: Political exchange and international democratic development.

The development of party-to-party relationships across national borders has served to assist and sustain many

democracies in recent decades. Various transnational groups have provided timely and otherwise unavailable support for their colleagues elsewhere. By increasing direct party-to-party relations, where feasible, the NED's political party institutes will also assist in developing a more solid underpinning for bilateral and multilateral relations between and among governments.

In their opening phase of creating new international relationships through political exchange programs, the party institutes can lay the groundwork for later development assistance, while establishing their credibility and presence. Development assistance programs will reflect thoughtful and extensive consultations in host countries. We will go only where we are invited. In my view, careful planning and review, including discussion with American and other foreign democratic interests already working in the area, will be essential to any successful political party institute program.

Since Franklin Roosevelt, American Presidents have been personally committed to the goals of democratic institution-building abroad. From the 1940's successive Congresses have supported and helped to shape the national consensus in favor of such initiatives.

In closing, I am reminded of a recent observation of a former Foreign Minister of the Netherlands.

There is a bond between almost all the parties in a democratic state: the common will to maintain and strengthen the democratic process.

I believe that we share such a common will in the United States.

Mr. President, I am proud of my personal involvement with this important national undertaking.

I hope the amendment will be rejected and the Percy substitute will be accepted, and that we can get about the business of getting this underway.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment that is before us. I strongly support the authorization for the National Endowment for Democracy which would assist the development of institutional democratic values and structures in the Third World.

The democracy program, the major result of which is the proposal for the National Endowment, was initiated late last year by the bipartisan American Political Foundation. I support the initiative as a valuable contribution to our foreign policy. The Endowment would allow our nongovernmental institutions to help democratic friends abroad, promote the growth of democratic practices and institutions in the Third World, and provide a training ground for the future leaders of democracy.

The program, which began as a major research study to develop nongovernmental approaches to strengthen democratic values and institutions abroad, bring together a unique cross-section of leaders from both political parties, business, labor, and other institutions. The representatives of the two major parties, the international vice president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the president of the AFL-CIO, congressional leaders, and other distinguished figures are included in this group.

The democracy program has focused its research on the role of the private sector in strengthening democratic institutions and values abroad. Other efforts to promote democracy abroad, such as the USIA's Project Democracy, have been directed to the public sector.

The interim report, which was released in mid-April of this year, contains specific recommendations for private sector activity abroad. It specifically recommends the legislative creation of a National Endowment for Democracy as a private, independent nonprofit corporation. It would provide funds and encouragement to private sector groups engaged in strengthening democratic institutions and values abroad. The National Endowment would not administer programs itself. Rather, all program activities would be conducted by those private sector group receiving funds from the Endowment.

The democracy porgram's interim report also calls for creation of political party institutes, a business center, and a labor institute to receive funds from the Endowment. In addition, the report recommends that other private sector groups be encouraged to apply to the Endowment for funding.

I hope that my colleagues will join in supporting the National Endowment for Democracy, and I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Washington Post and an article by Frank Fahrenkopf and Charles Manatt appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 28, 1983]

EXPORTING DEMOCRACY

Congress is hip deep in its consideration of the Reagan administration's "Democracy Program." Most legislators think it's fine to give government money to the AFL-CIO to build unions abroad; it has been doing this work effectively for 30 years. Analogous institution-building by other private groups—business, foundations—also seems assured of approval as part of President Reagan's plan to strengthen the "infrastructure" of frail foreign democracies. But should money be funneled to the Republican and Democratic parties for this purpose? The House denied the administration's request to earmark $5 million for each major party out of the $31.3 million it seeks for the new program. The Senate has questions too.

There is first of all a vision of a giant slush fund allowing party functionaries to junket from one end of the world to another. It is probably inevitable that a new program whose purposes are admittedly rather grand and vague must surmount suspicions of this sort. The answer to them lies in conscientious service and good open bookkeeping.

A deeper objection arises from the pervasive feeling that there is something questionable, unfeasible or even improper about the direct promotion of democracy. In this light, democracy is seen as something that can and should be spread only by example or precept, as a necessarily indigenous enterprise that is bound to be tainted when foreign and especially American hands are laid on. Or it is seen as a matter of culture and spirit and therefore one impervious to transfusions of process and mechanics in the way anticipated by the new program.

These are not frivolous considerations. Other democratic countries, however, have managed. International contacts have their own proven value. The American political process includes a body of knowledge and a range of techniques that can be transmitted at the technical level without unseemly interference. There are ways to do it badly, but there are also ways to do it well—starting small.

The discussion about the Democracy Program does not split people along familiar party or liberal-conservative lines. It seems to come down to a question of sensibility and political taste. We happen to like the idea. Democracy, after all, is the national ideology and the national pride. To preserve it here and build it elsewhere, Americans already spend billions on defense and aid. The CIA has been known to use its resources secretly to bolster democracy abroad. "Do not let the CIA disseminate what democracy is," Rep. Kika de la Garza of Texas said in the House debate. "Let the people who make it work do it."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 17, 1983]

HELPING DEMOCRACY ABROAD

(By Frank J. Fahrenkopf, Jr., and Charles T. Manatt)

During House debate this June over establishing the proposed National Endowment for Democracy, a liberal Maryland Democrat and a conservative California Republican both rose to describe their recent journey to Venezuela. Michael Barnes and Robert Lagomarsino, Democractic chairman and ranking Republican, respectively, of the House Western Hemisphere Affairs subcommittee, had traveled to Caracas as representatives of their political parties to confer with leaders of Venezuela's two major political parties. They described to the Venezuelans how US political parties, labor, and business intended to cooperate in helping democratic movements abroad through the coordinating mechanism of the bipartisan endowment. The enthusiastic response of our Latin American friends came as no surprise to us.

As co-chairmen of the research study that developed the endowment proposal, we know that from its earliest day, our "Democracy Program"—a unique collaboration of the Republican and Democratic parties with labor and business—has gained strong support from foreign observers in every corner of the world representing the spectrum of democratic political belief. The endowment would allow our nongovernmental institutions to help democratic friends and colleagues abroad, much as the political

party foundations in the Federal Republic of Germany have developed widely acclaimed programs in five dozen countries since the early 1960s largely through government funding.

With support from both the Reagan administration and the bipartisan congressional leadership, our executive board and staff worked six months before agreeing on an interim report which proposed creating the endowment to fund (among other groups) four major grantees: separate Republican and Democratic Institutes for International Affairs (modeled after the German foundations), a Free Trade Union Institute, and a Center for International Private Enterprise.

No one-man band nor single ideology designed the endowment proposal.

By the time our proposals (in H.R. 2915) reached the House floor where the bill passed as amended, they had already been approved, after hearings, by both the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. One aspect of the bill met significant opposition in the full House. A majority of members rejected earmarking funds for the two party institutes, "the most intriguing of these programs," according to the Washington Post, since the institutes "would help the American political parties reach out to their democratic allies abroad."

Opponents stressed two themes: budget deficits and the question of using public funds to support the international activities of American parties. Obviously, the $5 million allotted to each party institute remains more a symbol to some legislators than a genuine element in curing the deficits.

Interestingly enough, it was a cadre of Republican conservatives who pointed to the international record of the AFL-CIO's training institutes in using U.S. government funds for decades in assisting local free labor movements battle communist unions on four continents. Now, with business joining the fray by developing comparable training programs, several GOP conservatives urged defeat of the amendment (in Rep. Jack Kemp's words), in order "to send a signal to the people of the world who yearn for free enterprise and free labor that we mean what we say when we give speeches in support of democracy, human rights, and movements such as Solidarity in Poland and democracy in Central America or wherever." They were joined by several Democrats including Kika de la Garza, who appealed to the House to "plant a small seed of democratic institutions" and to "let the people who make it work" in this country help their counterparts elsewhere.

We believe that when Congress returns in September both the House and Senate will send that unmistakable signal to those who cherish democracy throughout the world by approving the entire National Endowment for Democracy proposal, including the party institutes. After that, the endowment and its grantees will have a chance to show Congress and the American people that timely, effective, and long-range programs of a nongovernmental nature can prove essential to our friends abroad. Allowing the political parties to help spread the message and methods of democracy in the world is long overdue. Even the skeptics will discover soon enough, to coin a phrase, that they have nothing to fear but fear itself.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I rise to express my strong support for the National Endowment for Democracy, which the pending amendment targets.

I am particularly supportive of the party institutes which are modeled in part after the very effective political party foundations in the Federal Republic of Germany. These foundations have operated for almost 20 years and have bolstered international debate on a variety of vital issues. Venezuelan party foundations have achieved similar successes in Latin America.

The purpose of the party institutes for international affairs will be, as the Washington Post phrased it, "to reach out to their democratic allies abroad." The authority contained in this bill will be used by the institutes to provide encouragement and technical assistance in an open manner to like-minded entities in other nations. It is also the hope of the endowment's supporters that the activities permitted by this authorization will enable our own political process to be enriched by the linkage our political parties will establish with political parties abroad.

Recent events, I believe, call for more unity among the democracies of the world. It is my hope that working together these democracies can assist fledgling democratic movements to people in nations which now are not able to avail themselves of the fruits of a broad-based participatory system of government such as Americans are so privileged to enjoy.

I urge my colleagues to oppose all efforts to weaken or eliminate the endowment program recommended by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity to join my many colleagues on both sides of the aisle in support of the National Endowment for Democracy title of the State Department authorization bill. This is sound legislation and it deserves the support of the Senate.

Mr. President, many Members of the Senate have found occasion to decry the fact that the various segments of our society often tend to work at cross purposes. Alone among the modern industrialized democracies, America retains an "adversary relationship" between our public and private sectors. We have frequently seen a broad gulf of mistrust separating our workers and their employers. Even in this body, acrimony and partisan politics are occasionally in evidence.

The National Endowment for Democracy provides a unique opportunity for all segments of American society—our major parties, our government and private sector, our unions and employers—to join forces in a worthwhile endeavor important to all of us: the promotion of democratic institutions throughout the world.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt was a Democrat, but his wisdom was uniquely American and has often been quoted by President Reagan. It was Franklin Delano Roosevelt who observed that—

> Democracy alone, of all forms of government, enlists the full force of men's enlightened will. * * * It is the most humane, the most advanced and in the end the most unconquerable of all forms of human society. The democratic aspiration is no mere recent phase of human history. It is human history.

At a time when democracy and freedom are under siege from the forces of repression in many parts of the world, the National Endowment for Democracy gives American society, in all its richness and diversity, a vehicle to use in promoting the cause of freedom. It provides a forum in which we can set aside our partisan differences and work together, as a Nation united, for what is finest and most noble in our American experience.

I thought it was interesting, Mr. President, that the Soviet Union has reacted so strongly and so negatively to the Endowment for Democracy. The Soviet reaction is interesting, but hardly surprising, because concepts like truth and freedom are the archenemies of regimes based on distortion and repression.

I think America should be doing some democratic institution building around the world—and especially right here in our own hemisphere. Many of the problems that exist in such abundance in a region like Central America stem from an inability to deal successfully with the process of change; to channel that change into avenues that lead to greater freedom, justice, and individual dignity.

This democratic system of ours is enormously complex; it is based on two centuries of practical experience and on historical roots that extend back to the Magna Carta.

As Americans, we are fortunate and privileged to be born to democracy. We cannot afford to take it for granted. We have an obligation to explain and promote our system of government in other parts of the world. We should never pretend that the U.S. Constitution, or even all of our freedoms, can be exported to each and every country around the globe. But we can help plant the seeds of democracy, we can combat Soviet propaganda, and we can do it successfully because the truth is on our side.

I believe it makes very good sense, Mr. President, for America to make its case by sending our Nation's finest—our doctors, lawyers, teachers, professors, and political leaders—on a mission to explain the mystery of American representative government and the inherent appeal of freedom.

It has often been said that we Americans will pay any price to protect our freedoms. In this instance the price is modest and the potential rewards are great. To the extent that this country can draw on its enormous resources

and stand united in the effort to instill democratic ideals throughout the world, we can help avoid strife, repression, and bloodshed in the years to come. We can protect our own vital national interests while helping millions of others build a structure for freedom and dignity.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to approve the National Endowment for Democracy.

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the stated goals of the National Endowment for Democracy create, in theory, a commendable program. Who among the Members of the Senate would disagree with its goals? They are indeed lofty objectives, worthy of support. In our tension-filled world we must continue to energetically encourage the development of free institutions. In our tension-filled times we must communicate the character and quality of democratic political systems. We cannot hesitate to reassert the moral superiority of representative, free societies. The question we should ask is, Do other agencies and groups now fulfill the goals? I believe mechanisms presently exist for presenting and defending democratic ideals.

The proponents of this legislation suggest that the work of the National Endowment for Democracy cannot be carried out by any other groups. The criticism has been raised that proposed functions of the Endowment for Democracy nearly parallel the purposes of the U.S. Information Agency as stated in the USIA Charter. The difference between the USIA and the Endowment is said to lie in the private character of all the intended recipients of Endowment funds. It is suggested that by funding private sector groups in the cause of communicating the advantages and worth of free institutions, there would be fewer restrictions on freedom of expression.

I believe a review of the purposes and goals of the USIA shows they are sufficiently broad to allow a wide range of activities that could, in nearly every respect, resemble any proposed activity of the Endowment. In this time of budgetary crisis we must fully utilize the presently existing institutions, not invent new ones that duplicate objectives.●

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I want to add a word of support for the position of the chairman, and I ask my colleagues to reject this amendment.

(The name of Mr. DENTON was added as a cosponsor.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from North Carolina. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Maine (Mr. COHEN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Florida (Mrs. HAWKINS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) would vote "nay."

Mr. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DENTON). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 265 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Abdnor	Grassley	Nickles
Andrews	Heflin	Nunn
Armstrong	Helms	Pressler
Baucus	Humphrey	Proxmire
Biden	Jepsen	Randolph
Boren	Kassebaum	Roth
Burdick	Kasten	Rudman
Chiles	Leahy	Simpson
D'Amato	Long	Symms
Denton	Mattingly	Thurmond
Dole	McClure	Trible
Domenici	Melcher	Wallop
East	Metzenbaum	Warner
Exon	Murkowski	Zorinsky

NAYS—49

Baker	Garn	Moynihan
Bentsen	Glenn	Packwood
Bingaman	Gorton	Pell
Boschwitz	Hatch	Percy
Bradley	Hecht	Pryor
Bumpers	Heinz	Quayle
Byrd	Hollings	Riegle
Chafee	Huddleston	Sarbanes
Cochran	Inouye	Sasser
Danforth	Johnston	Specter
DeConcini	Kennedy	Stennis
Dixon	Lautenberg	Stevens
Dodd	Laxalt	Tower
Durenberger	Levin	Tsongas
Eagleton	Lugar	Wilson
Evans	Matsunaga	
Ford	Mitchell	

NOT VOTING—9

Cohen	Hart	Mathias
Cranston	Hatfield	Stafford
Goldwater	Hawkins	Weicker

So the amendment (No. 2196) was rejected.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS FOR SENATOR EVANS

(The following proceedings occurred earlier and are printed at this point by unanimous consent.)

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may now proceed to the consideration of a resolution which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The resolution will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 226) relative to committee assignments for Senator DAN EVANS.

Mr. BAKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have consulted at length with the distinguished minority leader and others on his side of the aisle on this subject and on this side with my leadership in my caucus as well as the distinguished occupant of the chair, who by pure coincidence is the subject of this resolution.

I might explain that what is being done is the simplest and most straightforward method of handling the committee assignment situation as it relates to our newest Member by assigning to him the vacancies created by the death of our late colleague, Senator Henry M. Jackson. This inevitably changes the ratios between Republican and Democratic seats, but it is clearly understood that it is a temporary change since the authority of this resolution only extends until November 11. It is clear as well that it does not give the air of permanency either to the distribution of seats, the total ratios of assignments to these committees——

Mr. BYRD. Or to the number of committees a Senator may be assigned.

Mr. BAKER. Or the number of committees to which a Senator may be assigned.

It is for the purpose of assuring that the Senator from Washington has committees, as the rules of the Senate require that he must have, and that we accomplish that for the time being by doing the least possible rearrangement.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. BAKER. Yes, I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader has very clearly laid out the parameters of this agreement for the RECORD. I think it was good that he did that. No State can be deprived of its equal representation in the Senate except by its own consent. Therefore, it was necessary that the distinguished Senator from Washington, who now sits in the chair, be given some assignments. I think this was the best way to approach the matter on a temporary basis, and so I have no objection to the resolution. I appreciate the cooperation the majority leader has shown in many ways in connection with this and other matters and I support the resolution.

Mr. BAKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. BAKER. I would be remiss in not saying that in the last several days we have cut, fitted, and tried about half a dozen different combinations and that the proposal just made is eminently satisfactory and is a most generous accommodation by the distinguished minority leader and the minority in the Senate. I think it is a good resolution at this time, and I express my gratitude for their cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 226) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 226

Resolved, That Senator Daniel J. Evans be, and he is hereby, assigned to membership on the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and the Committee on Governmental Affairs, effective immediately for a period not to extend beyond November 11, 1983.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Now, Mr. President, once more I thank the Senator from North Carolina for permitting us to transact this piece of business.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thanks the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader for resolution of this action.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority and minority leaders. I am glad our newest Member was able to be in the chair at the time this happened and to respond to it.

(End of earlier proceedings.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORIZATIONS

AMENDMENT NO. 2197

(Purpose: to authorize appropriations for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the National Broadcasting, the National Endowment for Democracy and the Asia Foundation for fiscal years 1984 and 1985)

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON) for himself, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BOREN, Mr. EXON, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. HELMS, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. JEPSEN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. GARN, Mr. FORD, Mr. DENTON, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. CHILES, and Mr. BINGAMAN proposes an amendment numbered 2197.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following new section:

PRINCIPLES OF EQUIVALENCE

SEC. . (a) It is the sense of the Congress that the President should, consistent with the interests of the United States and as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act, take the necessary steps—

(1) To insure substantial equivalence between the number of officers or employees of the Government of the Soviet Union in the United States (other than members of the news media and those assigned at the United Nations) and the number of officers or employees of the United States Government in the Soviet Union, and

(2) To insure that the restrictions and conditions imposed on the travel, accommodations, and facilities of officers or employees of the Government of the Soviet Union in the United States are not less than those imposed by the Government of the Soviet Union on the travel, accommodations, and facilities of officers or employees of the United States Government in the Soviet Union.

(b) The Congress requests the President to report to the Congress on actions taken to carry out this section, together with recommendations for any additional legislation that may be necessary to carry out this section.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, this is the amendment that I offered the other day when we were considering the resolution relating to the Soviet action against the Korean airliner.

This amendment was part of the package that had been submitted by the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) on that same date and was included in a similar fashion in a package offered too by the Senator from North Carolina. Because of the similarities of his, it is being presented now on my behalf and on behalf of the Senator from North Carolina, Senator HELMS, Senator GOLDWATER, Senator LEAHY, Senator BOREN, Senator EXON, Senator DECONCINI, Senator SYMMS, Senator MCCLURE, Senator JEPSEN, Senator INOUYE, Senator DOMENICI, Senator ABDNOR, Senator GARN, Senator FORD, Senator DENTON, Senator NICKLES, and Senator CHILES.

Mr. President, this amendment expresses the sense of the Congress that there should be substantial equivalence between the number of Soviet Government personnel in the United States and the number of U.S. Government personnel in the Soviet Union, and that restrictions and conditions be imposed on Soviet Government personnel in the United States that are comparable to those restrictions imposed on U.S. Government personnel in the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, we believe that this action is long overdue and fully justified without regard to recent events. Nevertheless, the horrendous act of the Soviet Union in shooting down an unarmed commercial airliner and killing 269 innocent people makes it especially appropriate and necessary for the Congress to place itself on record with regard to the disparity in numbers and treatment between Soviet official representation in the United States and U.S. official representation in the Soviet Union.

This amendment calls on the President to take the necessary steps, as soon as is practicable after the enactment of this legislation, to insure substantial equivalence between the number of Soviet Government employees representing the Soviet Union in the United States and the number of U.S. Government employees representing the United States in the Soviet Union. The amendment also calls on the President to insure that the same or comparable restrictions and conditions are imposed on the travel, accommodations, and facilities of Soviet Government employees in the United States as are imposed by the Government of the Soviet Union on the travel, accommodations, and facilities of U.S. Government employees in the Soviet Union.

In addition, the amendment expresses the desire of the Congress that the President report to the Congress on actions taken to carry out this amendment, together with recommendations for any additional legislation that may be necessary to carry out this amendment.

The ultimate result of this amendment, when implemented by the President, should have been achieved regardless of the Soviet action against the Korean airliner. Why should the official presence of the Soviets in the United States greatly exceed our Government's official presence in the Soviet Union? This parity involves not only the numbers of personnel in each country but, equally to our disadvantage, the disparity in freedom of movement, living accommodations, and working facilities. The conditions for our country's representatives in the U.S.S.R. are abysmal in comparison to the way the Soviet Government's representatives are treated in this country.

This amendment seeks to reduce the total number of positions available to the Soviet Government for placing trained intelligence officers in the United States. What we are seeking, frankly, is to make it more difficult for them to obtain intelligence information while, at the same time, achieving a general balance between our Nation's representation in the Soviet Union and their representation here. The Foreign Missions Act of 1982 pro-

vided a congressional mandate to the President to insist on parity, especially where national security considerations are at stake. That act, in combination with the President's other authorities, permits a wide range of actions to achieve the objectives sought by this amendment.

It is estimated that the total number of Soviet Government employees in the United States today is about 980, while the number of U.S. Government employees in the Soviet Union is about 320. More than half the Soviet numbers in this country are attached to the U.N. Secretariat and the Soviet, Byelorussian, and Ukranian missions to the United Nations, and we cannot change these under U.N. policies. It is not intended that these Soviet personnel at the United Nations, or the roughly 35 Soviet news media personnel in this country, be included in determining "substantial equivalence" in numbers.

However, the official presence of the Soviets in the United States includes not only their accredited diplomatic and consular personnel, but also other Soviet nationals employed by Soviet diplomatic, consular, and commercial establishments. This includes Aeroflot, Intourist, Amtorg, the Soviet Trade Corporation, and other Soviet operations. All such personnel should be counted in determining "substantial equivalence." On this basis there is a disparity of more than 100 between our numbers and theirs. After deleting their approximately 520 Soviet officials currently assigned to the United Nations and about 35 Soviet media personnel, that leaves some 425 Soviet employees compared to our approximately 320 in their country.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation estimates that some 40 percent of the Soviet Government employees here are trained professional intelligence officers of the Soviet KGB and Soviet military intelligence—the GRU. We believe the time has come to draw the line so that the Soviets can no longer take advantage of the imbalance in the numbers of government employees that has existed for so long. The FBI would welcome this, for a reduction of a hundred or so Soviets, many of whom are KGB agents, would help the FBI in its antiespionage efforts.

In summary, this amendment would reduce the number of Soviet Government employees permitted in the United States by about 100 in order to match the official U.S. presence in the Soviet Union. The amendment does not expel diplomats or consular personnel, thus limiting the risk of possible Soviet retaliation against our officials in the Soviet Union now. What the amendment calls for is adherence to the normal and widely accepted principle of reciprocity and equivalency. The amendment makes it possible to lower the ceiling for Soviet official presence by focusing on their commercial establishments, where we have no comparable official establishments in the Soviet Union, and on other nonaccredited Soviet Government employees. The end result of this amendment should also be to help improve conditions for our personnel in the Soviet Union. Insofar as the numbers of Soviet personnel in the United States are reduced, tighter restrictions are placed on their travel, and other conditions are imposed on their living accommodations and working facilities, the result will be to inhibit the ability of Soviet intelligence to operate in this country.

I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment that calls on the President to establish equivalence in the numbers of Government employees allowed in each other's country and comparability in the restrictions and conditions of travel, living accommodations, and working facilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), and Senator NICKLES be added as cosponsors.

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

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, I might add that we have cleared this amendment with the managers of the bill on both sides of the aisle who I believe now find it acceptable.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, we have examined the amendment. There seems to be no objection on this side.

Mr. President, I simply ask the question, is it not correct that this amendment is not binding?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It is binding to the extent of being consistent with the interests of the United States which, of course, the President has the authority to do and it is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment and to that effect, of course, is not binding as if it were law.

Mr. PERCY. Is it not correct that it calls for substantial equivalence consistent with the interests of the United States?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. That is correct.

Mr. PERCY. I thank my distinguished colleague.

We have no objection on this side. We are ready for a vote.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, there is no objection from this side of the aisle either.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, may I in the interest of time, although there are a good many Members of the Senate who wished to be recorded on this particular issue, I am going to ask for a rollcall.

I ask unanimous consent that Members be allowed to sign on as cosponsors during the remainder of the evening on this particular amendment.

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

NEED FOR U.S.-SOVIET DIPLOMATIC PARITY

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, I rise to support Senator HUDDLESTON'S proposal.

The American people strongly support real sanctions against the Soviet Union in the wake of the Korean airlines massacre, according to all of the polls. This amendment proposes precise equality in diplomatic representation and diplomatic privileges between the United States and the U.S.S.R. Who can be against diplomatic parity with the Soviet Union?

The Soviets have an allowed level of representation in the United States of 320. The United States is allowed only 210 diplomats in the U.S.S.R. What is the reason for this disparity? It is simply the Soviet demand that they be allowed to bring their own drivers, secretaries, and clerks, rather than hire Americans to do these subsidiary jobs. Who are the Soviet chauffeurs, typists, and secretaries? Most of them are KGB agents of espionage, subversion, active measures, and disinformation. The FBI has confirmed this.

So the only reason, Mr. President, that the Soviet Union is currently allowed more diplomats in the United States than the United States is allowed to have in the U.S.S.R. is in order to accommodate the Soviet KGB. It is the Soviet KGB that we are condoning when we allow the Soviets to have more diplomats, so-called, than the United States.

Who among us is willing to vote in favor of helping the KGB spy on and subvert America by voting against this amendment?

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to realize that by voting against this amendment, they may allow themselves to be portrayed as weakening America. I hope that there will be a unanimous vote on this amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following article by Tom Braden entitled "Why Not Boot Some Russians," in the Washington Times September 22, 1983, be printed into the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Times, Sept. 22, 1983]

WHY NOT BOOT SOME RUSSIANS?

(By Tom Braden)

Should a nation ever take actions in foreign affairs which serve no useful end except to make its own citizens feel better?

The Mayaguez incident comes to mind, but of course, that was costly. A better example was the Kellogg-Briand Pact. It outlawed war "as an instrument of national policy" and was rightly scorned and rightly laughed at by the country's foreign policy scholars. But it did serve one useful purpose and at no cost whatever. It made Americans

feel better. Is there anything wrong with that?

I raised the question in order to explain the embarrassing circumstance of finding myself these days nodding in agreement with Sen. Jesse Helms and other troopers of the far right. They are much upset with President Reagan because they believe his response to the savage murder of innocent tourists is insufficient. They want him to do more.

Reagan has answered them: "What do they want me to do, declare war?" It is an anguished cry, the cry of a man with awful responsibilities who realizes the limitations on his power. And he is right. There is nothing he can do which will force the leaders of the Soviet Union to the admission that they have violated one of the least exacting standards of human conduct; nothing he can do which will exact retribution; nothing he can do to punish the wrong.

I'm sure the president went over his options carefully with Secretary Shultz. I imagine he was disappointed to learn how little he could do. Thus the statesmanlike cry of anguish. What happened to Ronald Reagan, the politician? A good politician ought to see that if he can't do anything to hurt the Russians he can nevertheless do something to help Americans.

Which is why it seems to me Jesse Helms and his crowd have a point. For example: Why not throw some Russian diplomats out of the country?

Would you not feel better if you saw pictures in your morning newspaper of long lines of Soviet citizens carrying their baggage aboard the aircraft—getting out of here because they were told they had to go? Would such a gesture not be a tempered statement of our anger and our shock? Would it not say, "You have told the world that you are different. So we are going to treat you differently"? I readily agree that the forced exodus of Soviet diplomats—say about half of them, or roughly 160 people, not counting wives and children—wouldn't serve any purpose other than the purpose of making a statement. But a statement is better than a cry, no matter how justifiably anguished.

And we would of course suffer retaliation. We have an embassy in Moscow and a consulate in Leningrad and together they are staffed by 190 people. The more candid among those people will tell you that they don't really have much to do.

Nor will I pretend that there are not some spies among the 190. But spying is a game at which two sides can play and there can be no doubt whatever that the playgrounds we afford the Russians in this country are vastly superior to what they offer us in theirs.

So the penalties for making a strong statement would be light. The satisfactions would be great. And who knows, there is a possibility that the loss of half its apparat in this country might be painful to the Soviet Union and perhaps even a small possibility that the loss might give heart to those in the Kremlin—if there are such—who are now saying, if only to themselves, "I think we blew it."

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, this article is a good example of the kind of broad-based, bipartisan support which the sanctions against Soviet diplomats proposed jointly by our distinguished colleagues, Senator HELMS and Senator HUDDLESTON, has engendered. I, too, was a cosponsor of the Helms-Huddleston sanction attempting to achieve parity and equality in United States and Soviet diplomatic representation in our respective nations. This sanction came within four votes last week of being endorsed by the Senate, and I am confident that a similar sanction will be offered again soon or an appropriate piece of legislation.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, this Senator is convinced that the time has come for the United States to have parity in its diplomatic representation with the Soviet Union. As of today, some 310 Soviet diplomats are accredited to the United States while only 210 U.S. diplomats are accredited to the Soviet Union. The President must act swiftly to bring the number of Soviet diplomats allowed in this country to parity with the number of our diplomats allowed in the Soviet Union.

I feel strongly that this is a grave matter and also a matter of the utmost prudence. It is certainly no secret that the Soviet diplomatic community in the United States contains a high percentage of KGB agents and other Soviet espionage personnel. The Soviets have been loudly proclaiming their concerns about the alleged espionage activity of a civilian airliner laden with men, women, and children which they so brutally shot out of the sky. Of course, there was no espionage activity on the part of this civilian aircraft.

There is real espionage activity, however, in the vast Soviet diplomatic apparatus in these United States. I therefore recommend that the President close immediately the Soviet consulate in San Francisco and expel the Soviet diplomatic personnel at that location. It is known to our counterintelligence services, who are indeed overworked on the subject of Soviet espionage, that the San Francisco consulate contains, a high percentage of Soviet spies engaged in the deepest covert activity to extract the highly classified secrets of our aerospace and computer industry based on the west coast. Closing the Soviet consulate in San Francisco is therefore an act of great prudence as a central measure to the restoration of our internal security from Soviet bloc espionage and subversion.

Mr. President, John Barron, senior editor of Reader's Digest has very ably described and documented Soviet espionage activities around the world and in these United States. His newest book, "KGB Today, The Hidden Hand," is a masterful exposure of Soviet espionage techniques in the United States to obtain our most sensitive high-technology secrets. It is not therefore a matter of conjecture that the Soviets are engaged in a massive covert high-technology acquisitions plan in these United States. Their activity on the west coast is intensive.

For this reason, it would be a matter of prudence for the President to close down the Soviet consulate in San Francisco. There are precedents for the expulsion of Soviet diplomats engaged in espionage activity. Mr. Barron has prepared a list of Soviet diplomats expelled from around the world from 1974 to 1983.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list prepared by Mr. Barron and published in his most recent book be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

SOVIET DIPLOMATS EXPELLED

Unless otherwise stated, all those named in this list are officers of the KGB.

Abramov, Mikhail Nikolaevich: Canada, March 1982.

Aleksandrov, Leonid Nikolaevich: Switzerland, February 1981.

Aleksanyan, Eduard Ivanovich (GRU): Canada, January 1980.

Alekseyev, Vladimir Ilich: USA, February 1977

Andreyev, Anatoli Vitorovich: USA, January 1975.

Andrusov, Eduard Valentinovich: Sudan, May 1977.

Averin, Yuri Dmitrevich (GRU): Sweden, December 1982.

Babayants, Yuri Arkhamovich (GRU): Portugal, January 1982.

Barabanov, Leonid Andreevich (GRU): Switzerland, August 1982.

Baratov, Nikolai Andreevich: North Yemen, August 1977.

Bardeyev, Igor Aleksandrovich (GRU): Canada, January 1980.

Bashmashnikov, Yevgenni Ivanovich: West Germany, June 1979.

Baykov, Vladilen Vasilevich: Pakistan, July 1981.

Besedin, Timor Anatolevich: Norway, April 1981.

Bibikov, Valeri Ivanovich: Italy, December 1982.

Bogomolov, Yevgenni Vasilevich: Switzerland, September 1976.

Bondarev, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich: Singapore, February 1976.

Borishpolets, Vadim Anatolevich: Canada, February 1978.

Bryantsev, Igor Nikolaevich: West Germany, March 1977.

Burmistrov, Gennadi Makarovich: Netherlands, April 1976.

Bychkov, Anatoli Yefimovih: Ghana, August 1978.

Bychkov, Yuri Ivanovich: Spain, March 1981.

Charchyan, Eduard Babkenovich: USA, June 1975.

Chelyag, Ivan Mikhailovich (GRU): Italy, December 1982.

Chernov, Vladimir Aleksandrovich: UK, January 1983.

Chernyayev, Rudolf Petrovich: USA, May 1978.

Chernyayev, Sergei Viktorovich (GRU): Netherlands, March 1978.

Chernysh, Yuri Stepanovich: Costa Rica, August 1979.

Chistyakov, Aleksei Fedorovich: Egypt, September 1981.

Churanov, Oleg Viktorovich: Spain, February 1980.

Dementyev, Aleksandr Vladimirovich: Norway, January 1977.

Dmitriev, Igor Ivanovich: Malaysia, June 1976.
Dokudovsky, Oleg Dmitrevich (GRU): Norway, February 1982.
Druzhinin, Vadim: Bangladesh, June 1976.
Dubas, Oleg Konstantinovich (GRU): Portugal, March 1982.
Dzhashi, Enriko Avksentyevich: USA, July 1977.
Enger, Valdik Aleksandrovich; USA, May 1978.
Fedorin, Vasili Nikolaevich: Spain, April 1982.
Filippov, Boris Anatolevich (GRU): France, June 1978.
Finenko, Aleksandr Pavlovich (GRU): Indonesia, February 1982.
Fomenko, Valentin Petrovich (GRU): Ghana, January 1974.
Frolov, Vyacheslav Ivanovich: France, February 1980.
Gadzhiyev, Abdulkhalik Magomedovich: USA, June 1975.
Geyvandov, Konstantin Yervendovich: Canada, January 1974.
Golovanov, Vladimir Vladimirovich: Iran, July 1980.
Golovatenko, Yuri Vasilevich: Spain, March 1981.
Gordeyev, Vladimir A.: Portugal, March 1982.
Gromov, Sergi, Zakharovich: Norway, January 1977.
Isayev, Yuri Nikolaevich (GRU): Spain, April 1978.
Ivanov, Yevgenni Fedorovich: France, March 1976.
Ivashkevich, Gennadi Vladimirovich: Canada, February 1978.
Kabanov, Boris Nikolaevich: Iran, September 1977.
Kanavsky, Vadim Ivanovich (GRU): India, December 1974.
Kapitonov, Konstantin: Egypt, September 1981.
Karlein, Vadim Vasilevich (GRU): West Germany, May 1976.
Karpov, Yevgenni Petrovich: USA, February 1977.
Kedrov, Viktor Nikolaevich: Denmark, August 1975.
Khamidulin, Zavdat Lutfulovich: Malaysia, July 1981.
Khlystov, Vladimir Timofeevich: Netherlands, April 1976.
Khvostantsev, Lev Grigorevich: Canada, February 1977.
Kinyapin, Andrei Leonidovich: Italy, May 1980.
Kisayev, Yuri: Equatorial Guinea, February 1981.
Kiselev, Anatoli Aleksandrovich (GRU): Netherlands, August 1975.
Klimanov, Yevgenni Aleksandrovich: Norway, January 1977.
Koblov, Yevgenni Konstantinovich: Canada, February 1978.
Kolosov, A. A. (GRU): China, January 1974.
Konyayev, Vladimir Vasilevich (GRU): Portugal, August 1980.
Korniyenko, Anatoli Fedorovich (GRU): Bangladesh, May 1976.
Kovalev, Aleksei Gavrilovich (GRU): Canada, December 1974.
Kovalev, Nikolai Grigorevich: Nigeria, March 1981.
Krasilnikov, Anatoli Ivanovich: Spain, February 1980.
Krysin, Andrei Vladimirovich: Canada, February 1978.
Kukhar, Aleksandr Afanaseevich: USA, October 1979.
Kulagin, Aleksandr S. (GRU): Portugal, August 1980.
Kulemekov, Vladimir Yanovich (GRU): France, November 1981.
Kulik, Vladimir Yevgenevich (GRU): France, October 1979.
Kuznetsov, Anatoli Vasilevich: Italy, August 1981.
Larkin, Anatoli Alekseevich: Singapore, February 1982.
Lazarev, Vladimir Vladimirovich: Bangladesh, August 1981.
Lazin, Viktor Nikolaevich: UK, August 1981.
Leonov, Vadim Vasilevich: Netherlands, April 1981.
Leonov, Yuri Petrovich (GRU): USA, September 1981.
Lesiovsky, Viktor Mechislavovich: Spain, June 1977.
Lezin, Oleg Sergeevich: Switzerland, April 1975.
Lilenurm, Petr Rudolfovich: Canada, February 1978.
Lisin, Yuri Viktorovich: USA, November 1977.
Liyepa, Albert Andreevich: Sweden, April 1982.
Lobanov, Vladislav Sergeevich: Sudan, May 1977.
Lopukhov, Roman Mikhailovich (GRU): Netherlands, March 1978.
Lovehikov, Vasili Dmitrevich (GRU): Switzerland, April 1979.
Lugovoy, Vladimir Vasilyevich (GRU): Switzerland, February 1983.
Lyko, Anatoli Alekseevich (GRU): Malaysia, May 1975.
Machekhin, Aleksandr Yegorovich: Japan, May 1976.
Marakhovsky, Uri Nikolaevich: USA, October 1981.
Marchenko, Vladimir Ivanovich: China, January 1974.
Marchenko, Yuri Fedorovich: Egypt, January 1981.
Markelov, Aleksandr Pavlovich: India, August 1980.
Matveyev, Albert Alekseevich: Portugal, August 1980.
Merkulov, Vladimir Dmitrevich: Denmark, October 1981.
Mikhalin, Anatoli Aleksandrovich: Canada, February 1978.
Minkov, Yuri (GRU): Egypt, July 1976.
Mironenko, Sergei Vladimirovich: Singapore, February 1982.
Mironenko, Yevgenni Sergeevich: Norway, April 1981.
Mizin, Viktor, Vladimirovich: India, March 1976.
Mordovets, Aleksandr Loenidovich: Costa Rica, August 1979.
Morozov, Mikhail M.: Portugal, January 1982.
Motorov, Yevgenni Leonidovich: Denmark, February 1983.
Muerner, Igor Ivanovich: Switzerland, October 1974.
Mushchinin, Sergei Yefimovich: Brazil, January 1975.
Muzykin, Ivan Ivanovich: Liberia, March 1981.
Myagkov, Grigori Petrovich: Switzerland, June 1978.
Nesytykh, Vladislav Leonidovich: Liberia, June 1981.
Nikiforov, Oleg Nikolaevich: West Germany, June 1979.
Nilov, Viktor Prokopevich: Ghana, August 1978.
Obinin, Vyacheslav Aleksandrovich: Portugal, March 1982.
Oshkaderov, Vladimir Ivanovich: Canada, February 1978.
Osipov, Aleksei Nikolaevich: Denmark, August 1975.
Panchenko, Aleksei Yakovlevich: Iran, October 1981.
Pashukov, Aleksandr Alekseevich (GRU): Denmark, October 1977.
Penkov, Viktor Aleksandrovich (GRU): France, July 1978.
Pereversev, Yuri V. (GRU): Egypt, April 1979.
Petrakov, Igor V.: Egypt, September 1981.
Petrosyan, Petros Artachesovich: USA, June 1975.
Petrov, Georgi Georgevich: Norway, April 1981.
Petrov, Valentin Mikhailovich: Liberia, March 1981.
Pivovarov, Yuri Sergeevich: Spain, March 1977.
Pokrovsky, Sergei Georgevich: Switzerland, March 1982.
Poleshchuk, Anatoli Ivanovich (GRU): Netherlands, March 1978.
Polomarchuk, Valeri Vladimirovich: Sudan, May 1977.
Polyakov, Vladimir Profirevich: Egypt, September 1981.
*Poperechny, Vladimir Ivanovich: Liberia, April 1979.
Popov, Yuri Pavlovich (GRU): Spain, May 1978.
Printsipalov, Aleksandr Kirillovich: Norway, January 1977.
Reztsov, Oleg Dmitrevich: Canada, February 1978.
Romanov, Vladislav Petrovich: Malaysia, July 1981.
Rostovsky, Grigori Grigorevich (GRU): France, March 1976.
Rybachenko, Vladimir Ivanovich (GRU); France, February 1977.
Samoylenko, Nikolai Aleksandrovich (GRU): Denmark, June 1977.
Semenov, Yuri A.: China, January 1974.
Semenychev, Yuri Konstantinovich: Portugal, August 1980.
Sepelev, Yuri Fedeevich: Yogoslavia, March 1976.
Shamirov, Elman Ibragim-Ogli: Iran, April 1978.
Sharov, Anatoli Vasilevich: Denmark, August 1975.
Shebanov, Yuri Konstantinovich: Egypt, September 1981.
Shelenkov, Aleksandr Ivanovich: Egypt, October 1978.
Shelepin, Vladimir Leonidovich: Egypt, October 1980.
Shepelev, Viktor Pavlovich (GRU): West Germany, July 1981.
Shiroky, Petr Ivanovich (GRU): Sweden, December 1982.
Shitov, Vasili Ivanovich (GRU): USA, February 1982.
Smirnov, Igor Petrovich (GRU): Switzerland, February 1981.
Smirnov. Valeri Nikolaevich (GRU): Canada, July 1977.
Sofinsky, Vsevolod Nikolaevich: New Zealand, January 1980.
Sokolov, Valdimir Ivanovich (GRU): Canada, January 1980.
Solomonov, Yuri Aleksandrovich (GRU): France, June 1982.
Solovyev, Mikhail Matveevich: France, October 1976.
Stankevich, Nikolai Vasilevich (GRU): Denmark, October 1977.
Stepanov, Gennadi Ivanovich: Malaysia, July 1981.
Stepanov, Svyatoslav Alekseevich: USA, September 1976.
Stolbunov, Vyacheslav Ivanovich (GRU): Switzerland, March 1982.
Suchkov, Vitali Ivanovich: Spain, May 1981.

Suntsov, Vladimir Gennadevich: Egypt, January 1981.
Suvorov, Vladimir Leonidovich: Canada, February 1978.
Sveshnikov, Gennadi Vasilevich (GRU): Spain, June 1977.
Syzdykov, Ased: Egypt, September 1981.
Talanov, Nikolai Mikhailovich: Canada, February 1978.
Telezhnikov, Viktor Andreevich: Egypt, April 1976.
Tertishnikov. Vladimir Lukich: Spain, April 1982.
Timoshek, Vladimir Vladimirovich: Mexico, May 1976.
*Timoshkin, Mikhail Yevgennevich: Liberia, April 1979.
Titov, Gennadi Fedorovich: Norway, February 1977.
Titov, Sergei Nikolaevich: India, March 1976.
Travkov, Gennadi Yakovlevich (GRU): France, February 1980.
*Trekhlebov, Igor Gavrilovich: Liberia, April 1979.
Trofimov, Vitali Konstantinovich: Canada, February 1980.
Trushenko, Yuri: Egypt, January 1981.
Tyurenkov, Aleksandr Ivanovich: Switzerland, March 1981.
Vartanyan, Igor Paruirovich: Canada, February 1978.
Vasilyev, Vladimir Mikhailovich (GRU): Canada, December 1976.
Veber, Voldemar Pavlovich: Canada, February 1978.
Vlasov, Valeri Pavlovich: Egypt, September 1981.
Vopelovsky, Yevgenni Konstantinovich (GRU): Norway, February 1982.
Vyatkin, Sergei Lazarevich: West Germany, October 1975.
Yadroshnikov, Lev Konstantinovich (GRU): Egypt, August 1976.
Yefremenkov, Vladimir Ilich: Spain, March 1981.
Yefremov, Albert Dmitrevich (GRU): Ghana, September 1978.
Yegrov, Sergei Petrovich (GRU): Indonesia, February 1982.
Yemelianov, Igor Konstantinovich: Switzerland, January 1983.
Yermakov, Oleg Vyacheslavovich: Denmark, September 1975.
Zadneprovsky, Vadim Fedorovich (GRU): UK, February 1982.
Zarkich, Yuri Grigorevich: India, March 1976.
Zashchirinsky, Igor Ivanovich: Norway, January 1977.
Zazulin, Anatoli Gerasimovich: Italy, January 1981.
Zinyakin, Vladimir Petrovich: USA, May 1978.
Zolotukhin, Aleksei Nikiforovich: Bangladesh, August 1981.
Zotin, Yevgenni Georgevich (GRU): Norway, January 1977.
Zotov, Anatoli Pavlovich (GRU): UK, December 1982.
Zuyenko, Oleg Sergeevich: Iran, January 1983.

*Although not identified as KGB, Poperechny, Timoshkin and Trekhlebov were involved, probably on behalf of the International Department of the Central Committee of the CPSU, in organizing anti-government demonstrations.

Mr. JEPSEN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky. Currently the Soviet Union has three times as many nationals working in their Embassy and consulates in the United States as we have in our Embassy in the Soviet Union. Recent testimony by high-level members of the Soviet KGB indicates that a large percentage of the Soviets accredited to the Soviet Embassy are doing intelligence gathering work for the KGB. It is ridiculous for us to abet them in their efforts by allowing such a large staff of Soviet officials to operate in this country. This is especially true when one considers that the Soviets have sharply restricted our staff in the Soviet Union.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators STENNIS, MOYNIHAN, RANDOLPH, and LAUTENBERG be added as cosponsors.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment (No. 2197) was agreed to.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, in the lineup that we have given the next scheduled amendment is the DeConcini amendment. I do not see Senator DECONCINI here in the Chamber. The next amendments after that were the Kassebaum amendments.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

Mr. PERCY. Does the distinguished Senator wish to interrupt the order of sequence of events that we have lined up?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. If possible I will only require about 3 minutes at the most.

Mr. PERCY. Just for a comment?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I will submit an amendment with the thought to withdraw it, according to our understanding of this morning, if the Senator from Kansas will not mind.

Mr. PERCY. The distinguished Senator from Kansas graciously said 3 minutes would not disrupt her schedule sufficiently, so we are happy to yield 3 minutes to the Senator for the purpose of offering an amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2198

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) proposes amendment numbered 2198.

At the appropriate place, add the following new section:

"SEC. —. The United States shall maintain no embassy in Israel that is not located in the City of Jerusalem."

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today to address, and to propose a remedy for, a longstanding diplomatic dispute between the United States and Israel. From the time of Israel's founding 35 years ago, eight successive American administrations have needlessly offended a series of Israeli Governments by refusing to acknowledge that the city of Jerusalem is the capital of the State of Israel.

In so doing we have given, and continue to give, unintended succor and encouragement to those enemies of Israel who hope one day to be able to divide the United States from Israel, the only Democractic State in the Middle East. For as long as Israel's most important friend in the world refuses to acknowledge that Israel's capital city is its own—to the extent of refusing even to permit our Ambassador to Israel to set foot in parts of that capital city—we lend credibility and dangerous strength to the lie that Israel is somehow a misbegotten or illegitimate State. The United States therefore fosters intransigence and obstructionism, of even its own diplomatic initiatives in the continuing search for a broad settlement and peace in the Middle East.

Accordingly, in hopes of strengthening the bonds of friendship between Israel and America, and also in pursuit of the broad peace in the region that is rendered more likely as both Israel and its adversaries are reminded of the strength of those bonds, I am today introducing for the consideration of the Senate an amendment that would effectively require the President to declare that the United States recognizes Jerusalem as the capital city of the State of Israel.

As movement of the American Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem would be the first and most significant manifestation of such a policy, that, in its particulars, is what the amendment stipulates.

Before discussing the disastrous consequences the current American policy has had on American initiatives in the Middle East a word about the history of Jerusalem would be in order.

For more than 3 millenia, ever since King David declared it the capital of his Jewish Kingdom and bought the land on which his son Solomon would build his temple, Jerusalem has been the spiritual and cultural focal point of Jewish history. Yet Jerusalem's significance to the Jew goes back even further, for Jewish tradition states that Solomon's Temple was built on the very spot where Abraham was prepared to sacrifice his son Isaac and where Jacob, the third of the Patriarchs, dreamt of a ladder connecting Heaven and Earth.

When the Babylonian armies destroyed Jerusalem in the year 586 BC the exiled Jews sat by the waters of Babylon and swore—

If I forget thee O Jerusalem may my right hand forget its cunning—may my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth if I do not recall Jerusalem above my greatest joy.

For 2,600 years Jerusalem has not been forgotten. The devout Jew prays six times a day—thrice in his daily

prayers and thrice in the grace after meals—for the city of Jerusalem. No Jewish religious ceremony is complete without mention of the Holy City. And twice a year, at the conclusion of the Passover Seder and the Day of Atonement services, all assembled repeat one of mankind's shortest and oldest prayers "Next year in Jerusalem."

Not only is Jerusalem central to Jewish prayer and religous practice but Jews throughout the centuries have risked their very lives to be able to live in, or at least visit, their Holy City. Conquering armies came and went—Roman, Byzantine, Arab, Crusaders, Mongol and Turk—but the Jewish community, despite depravation and persecution, remained in Jerusalem. Indeed, the first authoritative Turkish census of the city, in 1844, discovered that 7,120 of the Jerusalem's 12,510 inhabitants were Jewish—and this before there was a "west" or "new" Jerusalem. Thus even the old city of Jerusalem had a Jewish majority well over a century ago!

With the establishment by the United Nations of the Jewish State that became Israel, in the western part of the old Palestinian Mandate in 1947, Israelis naturally came to regard the ancient city of Jerusalem as the proper location of their modern political capital.

Yet, in the interest of waging peace with its neighbors in the region, and in order that the violence that, at that time, was already endangering the physical integrity of the treasured city and its holy sites, Israel reluctantly agreed in 1947 to comply with the U.N. partition plan that would have kept Jerusalem apart from Israel, as an international city.

Under the terms of a resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on November 29, 1947, Great Britain's Mandate, originally awarded by the League of Nations, would terminate in mid-1948. Palestine was to be divided into an Arab State and a Jewish State delineated by boundaries noted in the resolution. The two States would be joined in an economic union. And Jerusalem would be an international city under U.N. protection, despite its Jewish majority.

The Jewish agency, the Zionist agency which had organized much of the Jewish emigration into Palestine up to that point, and which was generally recognized internationally as the authority entitled to speak for the Jewish community in Palestine, accepted the plan so laboriously worked out at Lake Success, N.Y. in November 1974 by U.N. mediators.

The Palestinian Arabs, however, rejected it. Consequently, on May 14, 1948, when the Palestinian Mandate was terminated and Israel simultaneously declared its independence, five Arab countries invaded it with the express purpose of liquidating the newly-created Jewish State.

The intentions of the Arab invaders had been made clear by King Abdullah of the Hashemite Kingdom of Trans-Jordan, the existing country to the east of both Israel and the envisioned Arab State that was to be created in part of the Palestine Mandate. On April 22, 1948, noting Britain's intention to depart the following month, he called on—

> All Arab countries to join my armies in a movement to Palestine to return the Arab character of that country when the British end their Mandatory rule on 15 May.

In the course of the war that subsequently broke out, upon the termination of the British Mandate, Trans-Jordan seized the West Bank of the Jordan River and the eastern portion of Jerusalem. Egypt occupied the Gaza strip.

At the same time, Israeli forces also moved beyond the territories that had been earmarked in the U.N. partition plan. In order to protect the small Jewish community of Jerusalem in this war to exterminate the Jews, the Israeli Armed Forces moved into the western sectors of the city. On August 2, 1948, the Israeli Provisional Government declared western Jerusalem to be Israeli-occupied territory.

The lines so carefully drawn by the U.N. mediators were replaced by lines drawn in fierce and pitched battle. The Israel that emerged from the 9-month-long war was different—and larger—than the one its Arab neighbors had set out to destroy. Yet though Israel was not destroyed, Jerusalem was divided. Much like Berlin was soon to become, Jerusalem was a city split by barbed wire, mine fields, and cinderblock walls patrolled by hostile armies within yards of each other—while citizens on both sides tried to go about their daily business.

On April 3, 1949, Israel and Trans-Jordan signed an armistice agreement in which it was stated that the cease-fire thereby agreed would not prejudice any of either parties' claims or rights. It seem to hold open the possibility that the matter of Jerusalem's status would be settled by negotiations between Israel and its neighbors.

Article II(2) of that agreement said:

> No provision * * * shall in any way prejudice the rights, claims, and positions of either Party hereto in the ultimate peaceful settlement of the Palestine question, the provisions of this agreement being dictated exclusively by military considerations.

Three weeks later, however, on April 24, 1950, Jordan formally annexed east Jerusalem and the West Bank, the name of the Hashemite Kingdom having already been changed from Trans-Jordan to reflect the forced merger of the eastern portion of Palestine with the kingdom.

Five, ten, and then fifteen years went by during which Israel's neighbors, and Jordan most importantly, refused to negotiate a settlement in which the status of Jerusalem and access to the holy sites of the world's three great monotheistic religious could be agreed. Absent such an agreement, and because of the war launched by King Abdullah and his allies, Jerusalem's status as an independent, united, and internationalized city soon became a wish of the past.

Israel, meanwhile, had established its capital in Jerusalem. The Knesset, Israel's democratically elected Parliament, first convened in Jerusalem, in the western sector, on February 15, 1949. Government ministries were located there.

Jerusalem had already begun to assume many of the characteristics of the capital of Israel. This should not have come as a surprise. On December 13, 1949, David Ben Gurion, Israel's first Prime Minister had said:

> The State of Israel has had in the past, and will have in the future, only one capital, and as we believe, till the end of time.

On June 5, 1967, Israel faced renewed aggression from Egypt and Syria, both then close friends of, and dependent upon, the Soviet Union. As hostilities commenced, Israeli Prime Minister Levi Eshkol sent a message to King Hussein of Jordan promising that, if Jordan refrained from entering the war, Israel would not take action against it. Jordan, however, attacked Israel that same day. Within the week, Israeli forces had captured all of Jerusalem, as well as other territories west of the Jordan River.

The City of David was once again united, and has been since 1967. Another 5 and 10 and 15 years have passed in which the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, again, has evinced no desire—nor provided even evidence that it envisions a time when it might desire—to negotiate a broad settlement with Israel. Israelis have begun, reluctantly, to learn to live without the cooperation of Jordan. And they have learned to live with an undivided Jerusalem as their capital.

Under Israeli rule Jerusalem has flourished as it did not under Jordanian suzerainty. Today Jerusalem stands as a model of successful urban management. It provides a glimpse of the harmony and prosperity the whole of the Middle East might resemble, were its people able to live and work in peace. This is due in large part to the fact that Jerusalem has been blessed with an extraordinary mayor in Teddy Kolleck. Since becoming mayor in 1965, Teddy Kolleck has played a unique role in sustaining cooperation and pluralism in Jerusalem despite the seemingly insurmountable political obstacles posed by Jerusalem's mosaic of religions and peoples, in which 300,000 persons are Jews, 100,000 are Muslims and 15,000 are Christians.

Since 1967, Jerusalem—east and west now reunited—has gradually and inexorably taken on more and more the appearance and function of Israel's capital, even while protecting the religious and architectual integrity of the holy sites of the non-Jewish religions, and the civil liberties of non-Jews.

In formal acknowledgement and assertion of Jerusalem's status as Israel's capital, the Knesset on July 30, 1980, passed the "Basic Law: Jerusalem, Capital of Israel" which formalized in Israeli law what has always been true in Jerusalem is the capital of Israel.

I would emphasize that Israel's claim to Jerusalem as its capital has not been at the expense of the religious rights of access on the part of other religions. The people and Government of Israel are keenly aware of the religious meaning of Jerusalem to Christians and Muslims. And their religious prerogatives have been scrupulously observed under the terms of the June 27, 1967, "Protection of Holy Places Law". But it must be acknowledged that the claims to Jerusalem of Islam and Christianity are qualitatively different from those of Judaism. This difference was defined with insight and precision in an editorial in the London Daily Telegraph on June 25, 1967, shortly after the Six Day War that led to Israel sovereignty over the whole of the city:

> To Christians and Moslems, Jerusalem is a place where supremely important things happened long ago. To them, therefore, it is an object of pilgrimage. To Jews, on the other hand, it is the living centre of their faith, or, if they have no faith, of their identity as a people. To them, it is a place to be possessed, today and forever.
>
> There is no essential incompatibility between these differing needs. Jewish political possession of Jerusalem and absolute freedom of access to it by Christians and Moslems—these have always been twin declared principles of the State of Israel.

Jerusalem, in short, is the capital city of Israel. This is a fact. Though the U.S. Government does not acknowledge it, this is a fact acknowledged by standard American reference books.

If one turns to page 519 of the 1980 edition of the Encyclopedia Americana, and the entry there entitled "Israel," one reads the simple statement of fact: "Capital: Jerusalem."

In the 1981 edition of the World Book Encyclopedia, the section on Jerusalem begins with these two sentences:

> Jerusalem is a holy city of Jews, Christians and Muslims. It is the capital of Israel.

More completely accurate is the fifth edition, published in 1981, of the Congressional Quarterly handbook, "The Middle East." Its capsule summary of "Key Facts on Israel" includes the following:

> Capital: Jerusalem; Tel Aviv is the diplomatic capital recognized by the United States.

For it is currently the policy of the United States to treat Jerusalem as if it were a geographical and political entity altogether apart from Israel. We maintain our Embassy to Israel in Tel Aviv. In Jerusalem there is an American Consulate General which is not considered to be a part of our diplomatic mission to Israel; the Consul General, in an arrangement unique in the operation of the American Foreign Service, formally reports directly to the State Department in Washington.

Furthermore, in official U.S. Government documents of numerous kinds, Jerusalem is treated as an entity apart from Israel. A young person wanting to take the examination to enter the Foreign Service will discover in the application materials that he or she can do so at a test site in Tel Aviv for Americans who happen to be in Israel on the test date—or at another one, in another place not in Israel called Jerusalem.

In the State Department's desk-top telephone directory, under the section heading "Foreign Service Post Directory," one finds the "post" Tel Aviv listed next to "country" Jerusalem.

The publication "Key Officers of Foreign Service Posts; Guide for Business Representatives," dated January 1983, lists countries alphabetically, under each of which in subscript is enumerated the various diplomatic posts the U.S. Government maintains in that country. There is Iraq, with one post in Baghdad, followed by Ireland with the one post at Dublin.

Then comes Israel, with one diplomatic office listed; its address is in Tel Aviv.

This is followed by Italy, with several sublistings: the Embassy in Rome, Consulates General in Genoa, Milan, Naples, Palermo, Florence, and Trieste, as well as two other American offices in Rome and Milan. These are followed, in order, by Ivory Coast and Jamaica, each mission with one post, and by Japan, with its seven different offices.

Then, curiously, there is listed the American mission, a Consulate General, in a place called Jerusalem. Then come Jordan and Kenya.

More significantly, American officials on diplomatic missions to the Government of Israel are not permitted to meet with their Israeli interlocutors if the Israeli officials' offices happen to be located in the eastern portion of the city of Jerusalem. As the New York Times of June 3 noted, this practice has recently led to the disruption of important bilateral negotiations.

On June 2, Deputy Assistant Attorney General Mark Richards canceled a scheduled, long-planned meeting with Israel's Attorney General, Yitzhak Zamir, when he learned that the Justice Ministry is located in the eastern section of Jerusalem. The meeting, according to the Times account, had been arranged "to discuss the possibility of Israel's accepting for trial in Israel several former Nazis and Nazi sympathizers now living in the United States."

Yet, because of the American refusal to treat Jerusalem as Israeli, the United States has been unable to complete these important discussions.

What is the effect in the world at large of this American practice of refusing to acknowledge diplomatically that Israel's capital city is Israel's capital city?

The subtle yet pernicious effect of this policy is to undermine the prominent and vociferous protestations of friendship that American Presidents and Secretaries of State issue regularly with respect to Israel. How close a friend can Israel be, after all—other nations must wonder—when the U.S. Government publishes maps that do not indicate east Jerusalem to be a part of Israel? What kind of message do we sent to Israelis, and to Israel's hostile neighbors, when we refuse to send envoys to its capital?

Look at the manner in which the American position has permitted other governments to dictate the appointment of American officials to our missions in third countries. On August 17 of this year, the State Department found itself obliged to announce that Kuwait had refused to accept the American nominee to be Ambassador to that country, a career foreign service officer named Brandon H. Grove, Jr., because he had previously served in the American Consulate General in Jerusalem.

We have invited the contempt of Kuwait, and thus paved the way for Kuwait to treat American diplomats with disdain, by refusing to stand firmly on the side of Israel's right to choose Jerusalem as its national capital.

The sending and receiving of diplomatic envoys is a demonstration of a nation's willingness to acknowledge another's existence and to engage in political and commercial intercourse with it. Moreover, it is an American tradition that the quality of our relations with other nations are reflected in the quality of our diplomatic representation. This is widely understood in the world.

As do a number of other countries, the United States recalls its Ambassador to another country as an expression of dissatisfaction with that country's government. The dispatch, or recall, of an ambassador to another country's capital is known in the world of international politics to be a measure of our estimation of the legitimacy of that country's government.

Since the brutal murder in 1979 by Afghan Government forces of Ambassador Adolph Dubs, for instance, and

in part as a reflection of our opposition to the illegitimate Soviet-sponsored government in Kabul, we have maintained only a charge d'affaires in Afghanistan.

I would cite four other instances in which the United States has used ambassadorial appointments as expressions of diplomatic umbrage.

On July 18, 1962, the very day Peruvian military leaders staged a coup d'etat, President Kennedy suspended diplomatic relations and recalled Ambassador James I. Loeb from Lima. Only in November of that year, after the Peruvian junta had promised to hold free elections the following June—elections which were, in fact, held freely on June 9, 1963—did President Kennedy appoint J. Wesley Jones as the American envoy to Lima.

In 1969, as a sign of President Nixon's extreme displeasure with the decision by the Government of Sweden to establish diplomatic relations with North Vietnam, the President refrained from appointing an ambassador to Stockholm for 11 months.

Noteworthy in this context is that, among the reasons cited by State Department spokesman Robert J. McCloskey at the time for this minor rupture was the following:

> In addition to the opening of embassies in Hanoi and Stockholm, the National Liberation Front—the political arm of the Vietcong—has been allowed to open an information office in Stockholm. Sweden still has formal diplomatic relations with South Vietnam, but has not sought to accredit an ambassador to Saigon since 1967.

Sweden, too, had withheld its Ambassador to South Vietnam to show its displeasure with the Saigon government.

Since 1975, successive American administrations of both parties have expressed opposition to the establishment of a government in Luanda, Angola by a Cuban expeditionary force by refusing to establish diplomatic relations with that regime.

Finally, recall that among the first formal expressions of American dissatisfaction with the evil regime of Adolf Hitler in Germany was to recall Ambassador Hugh R. Wilson, in November 1938, following a savage Government-sanctioned attack on the German Jewish community.

The world community is not unaware of the fact, therefore, that a traditional measure of the quality of American relations with other countries is the nature and quality of our diplomatic representation.

Consequently, our refusal after 35 years of Israeli independence, to send an ambassador to Israel's capital city and seat of government, as we have done with virtually every other established government in the world, is necessarily understood in the world to be a sign of American distance from the Israeli Government and nation.

I do not believe we are displeased, as a matter of American national policy, with either the nature of the Israel system of government or with its leaders. Israel remains one of the small number of functioning, indeed thriving, democracies in the world today.

Yet by not recognizing Israel's inherent right as a sovereign nation to select the site of its own national capital and seat of government, the American policy raises questions about the traditional commitment of the United States to help uphold Israel's rights as a free and independent nation. It therefore encourages in Israel's enemies the false hope that the United States can be pressured and cajoled into abandoning Israel. This in turn leads them to be more intransigent than they might othewise be.

Supported by the Soviet Union and its satellites, the radical Arab States have time and again brought to the United Nations, the body which brought Israel into being, a variety of proposals designed to undermine in the eyes of the world the legitimacy of the State of Israel. An important dimension of this campaign is the effort to describe Jerusalem, in much the same terms favored by the American Government, as something other than the capital of Israel. As every nation has a captal, to label Israel as a country without a capital would render it less than a sovereign nation—an illegitimate state, an entity not deserving of the usual accoutrements of sovereignty. Indeed, the goal is to brand Jerusalem in its entirety as occupied territory not belonging to Israel at all.

Official American confusion on just what should be the treatment accorded Jerusalem has led American representatives at the United Nation to acquiesce in this habitual denigration of a friendly state. I wrote about this in an article published in Commentary magazine in February 1981:

> The U.S. abstained even when Israel's sovereignty itself was at issue. The last Security Council resolutions in this cycle of attacks on Israel were adopted in the summer of 1980 and dealt specifically with Jerusalem. Resolution 476 of June 30, 1980 warned Israel about its pending legislation on the annexation of East Jerusalem. One might well question the prudence of this Israeli law—any many have done so—but it was something else again to find that in Resolution 476 (as in its successor Resolution 477 of August 20) Israel had become the "occupying power" of its own capital. Both resolutions, in fact, seemed to include the entire city of Jerusalem within this charge. And Resolution 477 went still further: it declared the Basic Law on Jerusalem, by then passed, to be null and void. It declared in effect that Israel was not entitled to fix the location of its own capital city, and called—in a wholly unprecedented step—on member states to withdraw their embassies from this capital (which all did).

The pattern of events thus encouraged by the United States has continued through the current year in other international forums in which we are not represented. At the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which convened in New Delhi March 7 through 11, 1983, the nonalined summit devoted several lengthy passages of its final declaration to excoriating Israel and its ally the United States. Special attention was devoted to the question of Jerusalem's status. And not just east Jerusalem, as had become the practice at such forums. In fact, during the course of the summit meeting, the draft declaration that had been prepared in advance was rewritten to state that even west Jerusalem is not Israeli.

The draft resolution passage on Jerusalem read:

> Jerusalem is part of the occupied Palestinian territory and Israel should withdraw completely and unconditionally from it and restore it to Arab sovereignty.

While surely this can be read as a wildly provocative statement, when pressed on the point nonalined nation's representatives have typically said that by Jerusalem they really only mean east Jerusalem, which is to say the old city, or indeed the Arab section of it. Hence the significance of the revised, final text:

> West Jerusalem is part of the occupied Palestinian territory and Israel should withdraw completely and unconditionally from it and restore it to Arab sovereignty.

Now there can be no evading the proposition. The nonalined declared that the whole of Jerusalem—the Israeli Parliament and Government buildings, the Holocaust memorial, the whole of the new city—do not belong to Israel. The nation is not a nation. It has no capital—or so say the nonalined.

Should the United States also continue to say to the world, in effect, that Israel has no capital? And thus that Israel is less than a sovereign nation?

I believe not. I believe the United States should declare that it will hereforward treat Israel's capital as Israel's capital. As I said at the outset of my remarks, the clearest and most emphatic demonstration of a policy of friendship with Israel would be for the United States to move its Embassy from Tel Aviv. In a formal sense, this could be done in a day, the Ambassador would have simply to drive to Jerusalem and announce that the Embassy was accompanying him.

I hope that colleagues who agree will join me as cosponsors of this amendment, which I would like to note I have also prepared in the form or a joint resolution which I intend to present at an appropriate time in the near future.

For now, I would like to accommodate some concerns that have been ex-

pressed by members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations have indicated to me that they would prefer not to debate and vote on this matter at this time, as they would like to hold hearings on this subject. In particular, they would like to hear the consideration of our own Government as to why we do not do what we continually profess we intend to do. Accordingly, I have been assured by them that, if I were to withdraw the amendment at this point, I would have the understanding of the distinguished chairman and the equally distinguished ranking member that hearings will be scheduled at which the administration will be asked why it holds to the policy it does. The issue of requiring it to change that policy will be before the Foreign Relations Committee in the form of a joint resolution similar to the amendment I have offered here today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the 1980 Republican Party platform; an excerpt from the Democratic Party platform of 1980; a series of remarks on this subject made by President Reagan in the course of 1980; and an address by myself before the 1980 Democratic National Convention.

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

EXCERPT FROM THE 1980 REPUBLICAN PARTY PLATFORM

(Adopted at Detroit, Mich., July 31, 1980)

Republicans believe that Jerusalem should remain an undivided city with continued free access to all holy places by people of all faiths.

EXCERPT FROM DEMOCRATIC PARTY PLATFORM 1980

(Adopted at New York, N.Y., Aug. 13, 1980)

As stated in the 1976 platform, the Democratic Party recognizes and supports "the established status of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, with free access to all its holy places provided to all faiths. As a symbol of this stand, the U.S. Embassy should be moved from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem."

RONALD REAGAN ON JERUSALEM

ON THE RECORD

Unlike the days prior to 1967, Jerusalem is now and will continue to be one city, undivided, with continuing free access for all. That is why I disagree with the cynical actions of the Carter Administration in pledging to preserve the status of Jerusalem in its party platform and its undercutting Israel and Jerusalem by abstaining on a key U.N. vote. I believe the problem of Jerusalem can be solved by men of good will as part of a permanent settlement.—September 3, 1980. As reported in the B'nai B'rith Forum, Washington, D.C.

Jerusalem is central to religious faiths throughout the world thus, Jerusalem must remain one city, undivided and with continued free access for all faiths to its holy places. Thankfully, Jerusalem today—unlike the days prior to 1967—enjoys these freedoms.—October 28, 1980. As reported by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency.

OFF THE RECORD

I mean that the sovereignty is Israel's, Reagan said, and repeated in a way that could not be mistaken: An undivided city of Jerusalem means sovereignty for Israel over that city.—March 24, 1980. As reported in a column by William Safire in the New York Times of that date.

I believe Jerusalem should be an undivided city . . . I believe we could, recognizing the rights of people to go to their holy places of other religions there, have a sovereignty of an undivided Jerusalem be that of Israel, with a provision made for all those religious areas and the freedom of those people of those religions to go their . . . I believe in that sovereignty . . . but I mean I meant my remarks when I said a totally undivided Jerusalem.—September 15, 1980. In answer to a question following an address to a closed meeting of the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations, in Washington, D.C.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN BEFORE THE 1980 DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

The Constitution, in Article 1, Section 8 prescribes that "The Congress shall . . . provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

It does not say provide for one or the other. It does not say provide for men but not women.

Neither should any political party.

The Democratic Party will present to this convention a platform that provides for both. We will nominate a candidate who stands for both.

I am asked to speak to the issue of "the common Defense."

At no time in the long history of our party has this been so much a concern.

The source of our concern is clear enough and open. The Soviet empire has entered a new period of expansion. Through the mountain passes into Afghanistan, over the sea to the Horn of Africa, up and down that continent, where colonial troops, Cuban and East German, do the empire's bidding; in Asia where its Vietnamese ally has conquered Laos and Cambodia and threatens Thailand. Even the Caribbean and Central America feel these rising winds.

Simultaneously, the mad but relentless expansion of Soviet nuclear forces has continued, bringing to the point of instability the one area of our relations in which we have most sought restraint.

The United States gave the Soviet Union every opportunity to choose a different course.

Just four years ago our party, in its platform of that year, proposed reductions in military spending. Scarcely two months in office we proposed in Moscow to reduce nuclear weapons also, drawing down on forces we had not increased in more than a decade—a third that is, of the nuclear era.

The Soviet response is known.

So is ours.

We have increased our defense effort each of our four years in office, fixing a new direction only just begun in the final year of the previous administration. In the long history of our Republic there has never in peace time been such a reversal.

Nor would there have been without this Democratic Party. We responded as the oldest political party on earth, with a sense of the history of our time, and of what is demanded of those who would shape that history. In the iron-hard, so often hateful century it is the Democratic Party which has time and again been called upon to face the reality of totalitarianism. Let others who watched tell how they would have done better.

It was John F. Kennedy, a president of this Party who spoke in his inaugural address of the "long twilight struggle" ahead. It was he who said at the University of North Carolina "Peace and freedom do not come cheap, and we are destined all of us . . . to live out . . . our lives in uncertainty and challenge and peril." It was he who told the Congress "This nation can afford to be strong—cannot afford to be weak."

And so the Democratic platform declares: "American military strength is and must be unsurpassed." Not only have we increased defense spending in each and every one of the past four years, we have commenced a massive return to strategic weapons deployment. The Trident submarine will soon be at sea; the MX missile is in full scale engineering development; we will soon have some 3,000 cruise missiles aboard our intercontinental bombers; we have more than 9,000 nuclear warheads aimed at the Soviet Union (as they have aimed at us—almost four warheads per county); we have commenced a wrenching review of the whole doctrine of deterrence. But the very knowledge of why this must be makes us unwilling to settle for so narrow a vision of man's fate.

And how does the Republican platform describe these nuclear decisions? They are described as constituting "in effect . . . unilateral disarmament."

Must we not ask: If a party is this careless with words, can it be trusted with power?

And herein resides the most fateful issue of this election, the issue of arms control.

Those who now have seized the Republican Party, even as they invoke the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt, repudiate the legacy of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The Republican platform denounces the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty now before the Senate; it derides the very quest for nuclear peace.

SALT is a limited process. The present SALT treaty is no more than a photograph of the facts; no arms treaty with the Soviets can be otherwise. But what is more necessary than the facts; what is more needed than the truth?

From his exile in Gorky, Andrei Sakharov appeals to us with blinding clarity and undiminished courage. Do not, he pleads, fail mankind in this matter.

We shall not, if what is asked of us is the will to try. The Democratic platform calls for the SALT process to continue as the largest, not the least of concerns; but to continue with this difference. The Soviets must now understand that it is not enough for the process merely to continue to record their mad momentum. There must be cuts. The platform declares: "A Democratic administration will treat the Soviet government's readiness to negotiate verifiable, substantial and significant reductions and qualitative limits as a test of its seriousness about arms control and the compatibility of its approach to arms control with that of the United States."

Is this a doomed hope? Surely not. Not, that is, unless control of our affairs falls to men who do not share it, will not pursue it.

It is our opposition that insists on this as an issue, for which may they be forgiven—

but not until their folly fails them. As they now would have us think of them, they are not suited for this work.

Shall we not instead speak of hope? The world is a dangerous place; to be sure, but nothing is safer than freedom. The dustbin of history, to use an image from another time, is cluttered with regimes that failed to understand this simple fact of the human spirit.

Throughout this age we have stood for the defense of freedom and the extension of freedom. We still do. Our good neighbors to the north and to the south know and can depend on this. Our allies in Europe can depend on it, even if they sometimes pretend not to know it. In Asia, a great Japanese democracy has emerged, and its new confidence has helped shape for the first time in this century a convergence of interests and conduct as between China, Japan and the United States.

These are the master relations of our foreign policy. There are others, not all of which we can speak with equal confidence. We do not pretend to have better relations with many of the new nations than they would appear to want to have with us. But we wish them well. More, we wish them independent. Our help is to be had, especially for those who preserved their freedom as well as their independence. Not without thought have we made human rights a center of our concern. Let those who think us insufficiently sophisticated in such matters ask what Thomas Jefferson would think; or Abraham Lincoln would do!

To those new nations fallen away from the liberty they may have briefly known, and now rancorous with those who keep that faith, a somewhat plainer mode of address is beginning to be in order. We do not ask them to share our principles, but we would ask that they understand them. It is no doubt something to be the newest tyranny on earth, it is something else to be the oldest constitutional democracy. We did not become such because we are a soft nation, and we will not be made a victim of our decencies. This is not said in self-congratulation, but in fair warning. Those who will not listen may perhaps be encouraged to read. For, to repeat, we have a history. Our Democratic Party is the party of liberty. Where liberty lives, we reside; where democracy struggles, we are engaged.

In the Middle East, for example, this struggle grows ominous once more. The United States has made peace between the two great peoples of Israel and Egypt. There are those who will not accept this peace.

May we suggest they read the platform of the Democratic Party, for here we speak in perfect confidence for the whole of the nation. "Jerusalem," the platform declares, "should remain forever undivided. . . " Jerusalem is the "capital of Israel." We will move our Embassy there. And let those who would come in arms against the wall of Jerusalem understand that we, too, are on those walls. We are not about to commit our strength to protecting the rich societies of that region whilst permitting the destruction of the free ones.

And so to the election, the great testing of democracy.

Throughout our history, whenever free societies have been under assault, the Democratic Party has rallied the world to liberty's defense.

Prudence, principle and courage give life to our campaign. The American people know this; may they honor us with victory.

Mr. PERCY. The distinguished Senator from New York is quite right. This is a matter of considerable importance. I have maintained that you are not going to have peace in the Middle East until you have a number of things resolved, and certainly the status of Jerusalem is one of those high priority items. It is an issue that should be fully discussed.

We would not be prepared to have that discussion on the floor of the Senate now. The time element simply precludes it. To have this amendment considered with the degree of thoughtfulness that should precede it, hearings would be the proper way to go at the proper time, though, as I have explained to the Senator from New York, the Foreign Relations Committee has a very crowded schedule, crowded particularly at this time because of the sweep of events that have occurred that we are all well aware of. But at the proper time we shall have such hearings. We would encourage our distinguished colleague to testify at that time. We will give him adequate notice on that.

I would very much appreciate his withdrawing this amendment at this time. We can assure him that at the proper time the issue will be fully aired.

Mr. EXON. Will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. EXON. Will the Senator from New York kindly add me as a cosponsor before he withdraws the amendment?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I am honored to do so.

Mr. EXON. It is an excellent suggestioon. I wish we could act on it now. But I support the Senator from New York.

Mr. PELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PELL. I rise to support my chairman and look forward to those hearings.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. EXON) as cosponsors of the amendment.

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

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Before yielding the floor, might I express my appreciation for the graciousness of the Senator from Kansas (Mrs. KASSEBAUM) in allowing me this interlude.

Mr. President, I request that the amendment be withdrawn from consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank the Chair, and I thank my two friends, Senators PERCY and PELL.

AMENDMENT NO. 2199

(Purpose: To provide for grants to certain nongovernmental organizations in South Africa only on a matching basis)

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I send to the desk three unprinted amendments and ask for their consideration.

The first one, Mr. President, is a technical amendment to the State authorization bill which clarifies the intent of the committee with respect to the amendment proposed by Senator PERCY and myself during the committee consideration of the bill. The amendment has been accepted unanimously, and I think there is no trouble that the amendment will be accepted on a similar basis by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Kansas requesting that the amendments be considered en bloc?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. No, I am not. The first one is just a technical amendment with which there is no problem, and I think the committee is prepared to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is some difficulty in determining which is the technical amendment of the three.

The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas (Mrs. KASSEBAUM) proposes an amendment numbered 2199:

On page 24, line 11, insert before the period a comma and the following: "except that $100,000 of the amount allocated by this section shall be available only if such proposed recipient organization has available for its use an equal amount and that, in such case, grants may be made up to $30,000".

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I believe the committee is prepared to accept this technical amendment, is it not?

Mr. PERCY. As far as the majority is concerned, the technical amendment is acceptable. I know of no objection to it.

I ask my colleague if there is any objection from the minority side?

Mr. PELL. I do not think so. What does the amendment do again?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. We did approve in committee funding that would be granted South Africa for special humanitarian projects. This would change a cap that we had of $10,000 for each project to a more flexible level that can be determined by the project. So it does not change the overall amount. It allows a little flexibility in how much would be given to each project.

Mr. PELL. It sounds like a good amendment and I support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment (No. 2199) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2200

(Purpose: Calling for Presidential action and report relative to 1985 U.N. Conference on U.N. Decade for Women)

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, the second amendment I have at the desk is again just some clarification in language.

I ask for immediate consideration of the amendment. I believe it has received clearance from the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas (Mrs. KASSEBAUM) proposes an amendment numbered 2200:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . The President shall use every available means at his disposal to ensure that the 1985 Conference to commemorate the conclusion of the UN Decade for Women is not dominated by political issues extraneous to the goals of the 1985 Women's Conference that would jeopardize U.S. participation in and support for that Conference consistent with applicable legislation concerning U.S. contributions to the UN. Prior to the 1985 Conference, the President shall report to the Congress on the nature of the preparations, the adherence to the original goals of the Conference, and the extent of any continued U.S. participation and support for the Conference.

1. On page 2, line 11, strike out "$602,343,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$524,105,000."

2. On page 2, line 12, strike out "$645,978,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$539,240,000."

3. Add at the end of the bill:

(a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the United States payment for assessed contributions for calendar year 1984 to the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agricultural Organization, and the International Labor Organization shall not exceed its assessed contribution for calendar year 1980 and for calendar years 1985, 1986, and 1987 shall be no more than 90 percentum, 80 per centum, and 70 per centum of the amount of the assessment for calendar year 1980.

(b) No payment shall be authorized for assessed contributions to the organizations listed in section (a) unless the amount authorized to be appropriated by this section are accepted by these organizations as payment in full of the U.S. assessed contribution towards the financial support of these organizations.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. In July 1980, the United Nations conducted a U.N. Mid-Decade Conference for Women in Copenhagen, Denmark. Unfortunately, the Conference became heavily politicized and adopted resolutions equating Zionism with racism and calling for assistance to Palestinian and Arab women in their struggle against Zionism. This politicization diverted attention from the needs of women and represented a misuse of U.S. funds intended to assist in meeting the goals of the U.N. Decade for Women. The U.S. delegation to the Copenhagen Conference voted against and refused to sign the Programme of Action. Subsequently, congressional action was taken to terminate U.S. supplied funding for the entire Conference.

International and domestic preparations for the 1985 Conference in Nairobi, Kenya, to commemorate the conclusion of the U.N. Decade for Women have commenced. In recognition of the fact that in preparatory meetings held thus far—some progress has been made toward keeping the agenda free of extraneous political issues and the conference focused on its original aims and objectives—it would seem appropriate to relent somewhat from an absolute funds cutoff for fiscal year 1984. A relaxation of the earlier constraints has been requested by the administration. In addition, various Jewish and women's organizations have discussed an appropriate remedy and have come together onto a prescription for properly addressing the situation.

That consensus is represented by the amendment that I am introducing today. It calls on the President to "use every available means" to insure that the 1985 Nairobi Conference "is not dominated by political issues extraneous to the goals of the 1985 Women's Conference." The amendment also calls on the President to report to Congress on the progress toward the depoliticization of the Conference before it actually occurs in 1985.

Mr. President, I am confident that this amendment will provide the proper support and backing that the State Department requires to achieve the objective sought. I urge the amendment's adoption.

Mr. President, I say to the chairman of the committee, I believe he will be supporting this and it has been cleared by both sides.

Mr. PERCY. If I may prevail upon my distinguished colleague to wait for just a moment, the manager of the bill does not have in front of him a copy of the amendment. Without seeing the amendment, I cannot say.

I now have a copy of the amendment. I know of no objection to this amendment. As a matter of fact, we discussed this issue in some detail this morning at a meeting with Charles Wick and his colleagues from the USIA, the U.N. Decade for Women, and the celebration for that decade at the Conference in 1985. We have strong testimony that we shall not let the spirit of that decade die at that Conference. We want to be absolutely certain that the Conference is not dominated by political issues extraneous to the goals of the Conference as was the Mexican Conference.

I think the amendment is acceptable. I know it is acceptable.

From the standpoint of the minority, Senator PELL also supports the amendment.

Therefore, I think we are ready for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2200) was agreed to.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2201

(Purpose: To restrict assessed payments of the United States Government to the United Nations and certain other international organizations)

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I wish now to offer the third amendment. I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas (Mrs. KASSEBAUM) on behalf of herself, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. PRESSLER propose an amendment numbered 2201.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 24, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

RESTRICTIONS ON ASSESSED PAYMENTS TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Sec. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States assessed payments for the calendar year 1984 to the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agricultural Organization, and the International Labor Organization shall not exceed its assessed payments to each such organization for the calendar year 1980. Such payments to each such organization for the calendar years 1985, 1986, and 1987 shall be no more than 90 per centum, 80 per centum, and 70 per centum, respectively, of the amount of the assessments paid to each such organization for the calendar year 1980.

(b) No payment may be made to an organization referred to in subsection (a) for the calendar years 1985, 1986, and 1987 unless payments made pursuant to this section are accepted by the respective organization as payment in full of the United States assessment towards the financial support of such organization.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, the United States has sought unsuccessfully for some time to control the growth in spending of the various U.N. agencies. We have asked the Secretary General of the United Nations to iden-

tify marginal activities that could be eliminated to provide resources for the growing list of new programs being created. To date, only 40 employee-years of U.N. activities, out of the 16,000 employees in the U.N. Secretariat, have been so identified.

The Secretary General of the United Nations, in his annual report issued 10 days ago, noted that charges of an inflated, politicized, or extravagant staff are often, and I emphasize, often justified.

A recent article in the Economist magazine notes that the morale of employees in UNESCO has been trampled by a "mixture of nepotism, maladministration, reverse racism, and an apparently incorrigible tilt toward the hardliners of the Third World." Yet, the UNESCO draft budget now under consideration by members apparently provides for a 37-percent increase, after inflation, in the organization's budget.

I have been, and remain, a firm believer in the value of the United Nations as a forum for international communication. I believe, however, that this communication can take place at a significantly lower cost. My amendment thus rolls back our payment to the United Nations and its principal affiliates to the 1980 level and specifies that in each of the succeeding 3 years the U.S. assessed contribution will be further reduced by 10 percent. Over the 4 years, 1984 through 1987, total U.S. contributions to these organizations will be reduced by approximately one-half billion dollars.

It has been the Congress, and not the executive branch, that has always had to take the lead in reducing the American taxpayers' burden with respect to these agencies. It was the Congress that mandated 1952 that our contribution to the United Nations and its affiliates would be reduced from 46 to 33½ percent of costs, and it was Congress again in 1972, that mandated our share would be further reduced from 33½ to 25 percent.

I might say that is about $363,774,000 in this year, a 25-percent share.

I believe that it is time to act again.

Unlike previous congressional actions that have mandated a reduction in our percentage contribution, my amendment allows considerable flexibility to the executive branch and to the organizations concerned to meet the challenge of our lowered contributions. They can agree to lower the U.S. percentage share of total costs, as they have in the past, or they can lower their total budgets, or they can lower both our share and their overall budgets.

Mr. President, this amendment is not motivated by pique at the United Nations over any one vote or situation in recent years. It is not a question of our commitment to the U.N. process in our search for international peace. It is a question of the cost of that committee.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I hope that we can come to a vote on this within the next couple of minutes. I shall make my own comments very short indeed. I think the issue is a clearly drawn issue.

I strongly oppose this amendment and I believe a majority of the members on the committee will oppose it. A cumulative reduction of approximately $250 million over 4 years would cause the United States to be well on its way toward losing its vote in the United Nations because of arrearages. The rules of the United Nations are very clear indeed.

I think that for the United States to approach the point where it would not be eligible to vote in the United Nations on matters of vital interest to us, including the resolution on Korean flight 007, would put us in a humiliating position.

These formulas have been developed over a period of years. We have had our contributions reduced as other countries have been able to take up a larger share. To cut back now would sacrifice our ability to vote.

The political ramifications would be enormous if we arbitrarily reduced our financial commitment to the organization. It would alarm our allies and Third World countries regarding our continued commitment to world peace, and security, and to maintaining our leadership responsibilities on matters of global concern.

The success we have had in holding down budget growth would be reversed and U.S. credibility destroyed.

Last June, President Reagan reaffirmed U.S. financial support for the United Nations when he stated publicly to U.N. Secretary General de Cuellar that "American financial support has not and will not decline."

Reflecting the significance placed on U.S. participation in the United Nations by this administration, President Reagan will address the General Assembly on September 26, 1983.

I really could not imagine any worse step for the U.S. Senate to take, before the President goes before the United Nations, than to cast a vote that would undercut a pledge he made to the Secretary General of the United Nations. Such a step would bring us closer to the day when we would be denied a vote in the United Nations. This would be very unfortunate at the very time we, together with the rest of the world, are leading toward the point where we will have resolutions condemning the Soviet Union for infractions in connection with KAL flight 007. This amendment should not be adopted when we have successfully focused the attention of the world on the atrocities and brutality of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan and other parts of the world.

The United Nations is a controversial organization. Many of us have served as delegates there. It is not run with the efficiency we would like to see, but neither is the Senate and neither is the House.

If you did away with the United Nations tomorrow, you would have to invent something like it because of the kinds of problems we face, ranging from security and peace in the world and nuclear war, all the way through environment, and energy, and all the other issues that are discussed at the United Nations.

For us to arbitrarily reduce our contribution at this time and possibly place us in the position where we might be in arrearage, to the point where we would lose our vote on the eve of the President's address, I feel would be a great mistake.

I always regret when I have to disagree with my distinguished colleague from Kansas. She is a watchdog of the Treasury. She always is looking out for the best interests of the citizens of this country.

However, in this case, in retrospect, when we see the adverse reaction, citizens would wonder whether at this particular time we would want to look as though we are undercutting the very agency on which is helping us maintain a degree of peace and stability in the world.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I know that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, has been a strong supporter of the United Nations, as I am, and that is why I clearly pointed that out, because it is a difficult time to raise this issue, when we have had difficulties brought before the United Nations. But there are two things I should like to say.

I do not think it puts in jeopardy our position in the United Nations, nor does it put the United Nations in jeopardy. This amendment would specifically state, so that we would not be in arrears, that no payment may be made unless the authorized payment is accepted by these organizations as payment in full of our assessed contribution for that year. So we cannot be in arrears.

What it means is simply that the United Nations will have to look to its budget, just as we are struggling to look at our budget. It is as simple as that.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the distinguished author of the amendment yield for a question?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I am happy to yield.

Mr. INOUYE. Does this amendment affect voluntary contributions to U.N. projects such as UNICEF?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. No, it does not affect voluntary contributions.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank the Senator.

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

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I yield.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Kansas, with whom I have the privilege of serving on the Senate Budget Committee. She has picked out an amendment that is important and an amendment that is most appropriate.

Mr. President, on Monday, Ambassador Charles Lichenstein, deputy chief U.S. delegate to the United Nations, invited Soviet and other U.N. diplomats to consider packing their bags and moving the United Nations "Tower of Babel" on the East River to some other more hospitable location, if they are not satisfied with the kind of treatment they have been receiving in this country.

Ambassador Lichenstein was responding to complaints by Soviet delegate Igor Yaklovlev that the United States is not living up to its obligations as the host country for the world organization. Lichenstein, in effect, said that if they did not love New York they could leave it. Bluntly showing them the door, he told them the United States certainly would not try to stop them if they decided to move the U.N. to some other country. In fact, he said, "we will be at dockside bidding you a farewell as you set off into the sunset."

Although the State Department and the White House have not disavowed or disagreed with Ambassador Lichenstein's remarks, they have issued statements saying that the views he expressed reflect his personal opinion and do not necessarily represent official administration policy.

Twenty-four Democrats in the House of Representatives think that Ambassador Lichenstein was not very diplomatic, and they have called for his resignation.

But, Mr. President, I believe what he said was a breath of fresh air that was long overdue. The administration and this Congress should not only applaud his candid remarks and back him up 100 percent; we ought to give him a promotion, or at least a medal. For I am convinced that he speaks for a majority of Americans who are tired of playing to our enemies and critics abroad who abuse our hospitality by using the United Nations as a platform for insults, and propaganda, and a headquarters for espionage and subversion, while we protect and pamper their diplomats and pick up the lion's share of the financial tab.

I certainly would not shed any tears if the Soviets, their satellites, and Third World nations packed their U.N. bags or decided to move the entire organization, kit and caboodle, to some other location. I would join Ambassador Lichenstein at dockside waving a fond farewell.

I have always thought that Berlin would be a much better place than New York as headquarters for the United Nations, because it is the one place on Earth where communism and capitalism, tyranny and freedom, exist side by side. If representatives of the world's nations could personally witness and experience that contrast day in and day out, perhaps their attitudes and actions would change. They could see how wonderful it is behind the Iron Curtain. Probably an appropriate position would be to have it straddle the Berlin Wall.

But that is not the point. The point is that the Senator from Kansas is offering us a concrete way to send a message to the United Nations and to some of the countries who like to criticize us while we pay the tab. I think we have long paid more than our share of the tab, and I enthusiastically support the amendment. I should like to see a resounding vote for the amendment. I think it would send a message that could perhaps show that the United States is going to exert itself and that we no longer are going to be the doormat for every Third World country and every Communist country that wants to come in here and scuff our floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have written to the President of the United States with respect to Ambassador Lichenstein's comments at the United Nations.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
Washington, D.C., September 22, 1983.

Hon. RONALD REAGAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I heartily endorse the candid remarks made this week by Ambassador Charles Lichenstein, inviting Soviet and other UN delegates to pack their bags and consider moving the world organization to some other location if they are not satisfied with the treatment they are getting in this country.

Frankly I thought the Ambassador's remarks were a breath of fresh air, and I'm so pleased that you have also endorsed them in the face of demands by Democrats that he be fired. I'm convinced that most Americans are tired of playing host to our enemies and critics who abuse our hospitality, using the United Nations as a platform for insults and propaganda and a headquarters for espionage, while we protect their pampered diplomats and pick up the lion's share of the UN's cost.

I hope you will consider awarding Ambassador Lichenstein a Medal of Freedom. He deserves one for standing up to Soviet delegate Igor Yaklovlev and representing us so well by responding in the only language the Russians understand.

Yours for a Free Society,

STEVE SYMMS, *U.S. Senator.*

P.S.—I've always thought the UN should be moved to Berlin, the one city on earth where Capitalism and Communism, freedom and tyranny, exist side by side. In Berlin, representatives of the world's nations could personally witness and experience the dramatic contrast between our two systems, day in and day out. Maybe that would change their attitudes and actions.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senator EXON, Senator DOLE, and Senator MCCLURE be added as cosponsors of the amendment.

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

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the pending question, as I understand it, is the amendment of the Senator from Kansas to reduce the contribution to the United Nations by 10 percent. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will not interpret the amendment.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, that is correct. The first year, it would be a 21-percent reduction, and the 3 years following that it would be 10 percent.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I must oppose this amendment. I understand the aggravation and frustration we feel about the United Nations.

I am the only Member of this body who was at San Francisco and worked for it from its early days. I have always believed in the United Nations. I realize that it has not always lived up to our expectations. It has not prevented many wars, and it has not lived up to many of our other hopes for it. One reason is that the United States and the Soviet Union have never trusted it to handle the big questions. We have only given it the little questions, and it has done the best it could within these constraints.

The United Nations has taught literacy, it has contributed to major advances in global health, and it has prevented many, potentially explosive, smaller conflicts. If there were not a United Nations, we would have to invent one.

For these reasons, I am compelled to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas has offered an amendment that few of us in this Chamber have had a chance to study as it was only announced today. I understand that the Foreign Relations Committee has not had a chance to consider it and that it is opposed by the Reagan administration. It would make drastic, across-the-board cuts in our contributions to the United Nations and several of its specialized agencies. While there may be a case to be made that these organizations are inefficient, frustrating, and wasteful, an amendment proposing such drastic cuts must present that case convincingly, and that has not been done in this case. I might be willing to support cutbacks in our contributions to these organizations if it were clear that our funds are only supporting bureaucratic structures which do no good for the poor and the hungry around the world, but I am not yet convinced that that is true.

It is also important to remember that while the United Nations is often used as a forum to criticize the United States, it is also a forum where world opinion can be shaped to oppose and condemn such atrocities as the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the barbaric destruction of the Korean Air Lines 747. If we want to maintain or better still increase our influence in the community of nations, making sudden, deep cuts in our contributions to the organizations which bring all the nations of the world together to work on solutions to common problems is not the course we should follow at this time.●

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I strongly support Senator KASSEBAUM's amendment to reduce 1984 funding earmarked for certain U.N. funding to the 1980 level of funding, with further decreases in the next 3 years.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations in his latest report admits that there has often been very poor oversight of spending in the many programs of that organization. There has often been, the report suggests, an inadequate control of spending on many levels. It appears that there exist few safeguards against poor fiscal management in the United Nations.

It is often not publicized that salaries and benefits of U.N. employees dwarf United States and international earnings averages. Additionally, few questions are asked about the costs of U.N. programs and whether those costs produce the promised results. This amendment causes us to face squarely the fact that funds now paid to the United Nations could more effectively and humanely be utilized elsewhere. By reducing the 1984 funding to 1980 levels and further reducing that figure by 10 percent each year for 3 years, the United States would retain several hundred million dollars. That amount of savings is not insubstantial and could be valuably applied in any number of areas, including use in domestic programs and reduction of the Federal deficit.

This amendment does not put our position in the United Nations in jeopardy as has been charged. The reduced payments would be designated as payments in full, thus avoiding the possibility of fines by the United Nations for averages. In our Federal budget we face the necessity of spending controls. If the United States is to provide a large portion of U.N. funds, that organization must tighten its spending also.●

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Maine (Mr. COHEN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Florida (Mrs. HAWKINS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) would vote "nay."

Mr. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 266 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Abdnor	Ford	Melcher
Andrews	Garn	Murkowski
Armstrong	Gorton	Nickles
Baucus	Grassley	Nunn
Bentsen	Hatch	Packwood
Biden	Hecht	Pressler
Bingaman	Heflin	Proxmire
Boren	Heinz	Pryor
Boschwitz	Helms	Quayle
Bradley	Huddleston	Randolph
Burdick	Humphrey	Roth
Byrd	Inouye	Rudman
Chiles	Jepsen	Sasser
Cochran	Johnston	Simpson
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Stennis
DeConcini	Kasten	Symms
Denton	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Dixon	Laxalt	Trible
Dole	Leahy	Wallop
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
East	Mattingly	Wilson
Exon	McClure	Zorinsky

NAYS—23

Baker	Danforth	Evans
Bumpers	Durenberger	Hollings
Chafee	Eagleton	Kennedy
Levin	Pell	Stevens
Matsunaga	Percy	Tower
Metzenbaum	Riegle	Tsongas
Mitchell	Sarbanes	Weicker
Moynihan	Specter	

NOT VOTING—11

Cohen	Goldwater	Long
Cranston	Hart	Mathias
Dodd	Hatfield	Stafford
Glenn	Hawkins	

So Mrs. KASSEBAUM's amendment (No. 2201) was agreed to.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2202

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI) proposes amendment numbered 2202.

At the bottom of page 48, add the following:

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. (a) That it is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of State should recommend to the Attorney General that extended voluntary departure status be granted to aliens who are nationals of El Salvador and that the Attorney General should exercise his discretion and grant such status to such aliens until the situation in El Salvador has changed sufficiently to permit their safely residing in that country.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, on May 26, 1983, Senator DURENBERGER and I introduced Senate Resolution 156, a sense of the Senate resolution that the State Department should recommend to the Attorney General that extended voluntary departure status be granted to aliens who are nationals of El Salvador and that the Attorney General should exercise his discretion and grant such status to such aliens until the situation has changed sufficiently to permit their safely residing in that country.

The House of Representatives has included this language in their authorization legislation for the State Department. I rise at this time to offer this sense of the Senate resolution to S. 1342.

It has frequently been my concern as a Senator from the State of Arizona, where we have many El Salvadorans that there is a tremendous problem for these people who come to this country and fear for their life if they are in fact deported.

It has frequently been my concern as a Senator and as a student of American history, that all too often the relationship between American foreign and domestic policy in these two spheres is kept apart artificially and to the detriment of overall U.S. interests.

However, the purpose of this resolution is to help deal with a problem originating not in the artificial separation of domestic and international policy, but in this instance, in the artificial linking of these policies. The problem that I refer to is the status of refugees coming from El Salvador to this country.

We are all aware of our Nation's relationship with the Government of El Salvador and our involvement in that country. The administration has made very clear its decision to help that Government fight off leftist forces backed by Soviet, Cuban and Nicaraguan aid and institute economic reforms to help rectify years of oligarchical rule. I have supported the President in this decision, which has not always been the most popular thing, but I believe he is right and that we have an obligation to help a country that has had elections and has asked our assistance.

But we are considerably less aware of the extent to which refugees from El Salvador are coming into this country, the hardships that they have experienced prior to and in order to get here, and—what is worst of all—we do not realize the hardships that they are forced to endure here in the United States.

The State Department had advised the Immigration and Naturalization Service that at this time, it does not recommend the blanket granting of voluntary departure for illegal Salvadorans presently in the United States. A recommendation to grant voluntary departure for Salvadorans would include providing them with a safe haven in the United States until the political situation in that nation stabilizes, as well as providing other special immigration measures such as permission to work in the United States. According to the State Department, the high levels of violence in El Salvador do not warrant the granting of voluntary departure to Salvadorans presently in the United States. The State Department justifies this determination by indicating that basic public services are still being maintained in El Salvador, particularly in the major cities. I believe that the State Department's case ignores the crucial testimony of Americans who have been to El Salvador and, more importantly, the Salvadorans who have entered this Nation. Some of these people happen to be in my State where I have had an opportunity to discuss the problems and fears on a personal basis.

Who in the Chamber has not heard accounts of atrocities, random violence, deliberate sabotage, and murders committed by both sides in the conflict in El Salvador and committed against innocent civilians? It happens almost on a daily basis. The U.S. High Commissioner for Refugees determined in its September 1981 study that the large number of Salvadorans who enter the United States illegally is causally related to the internal strife in El Salvador, and comparison of INS yearly totals of Salvadorans in this country helps to confirm this determination. Yet, the State Department ignores this evidence in favor of a carefully tailored, impersonal overview of the situation in El Salvador.

At the end of the fiscal year 1982, there were 22,314 Salvadorans waiting in the United States for the claims of asylum to be decided. Since 1980, of the only 1,300 asylum requests decided, INS had granted approximately 6 percent. Through deportation, voluntary departure, or voluntary withdrawal, INS has sent over 24,000 Salvadorans back to their war torn country. This means that every month we send more than 600 people back to a situation where their lives are in imminent danger, either from random or intentional violence.

I believe that the true source of the State Department's reluctance to recommend granting Salvadorans temporary voluntary departure status is the view that this would reflect adversely on our Nation's policy of assisting the Government in El Salvador.

To me, such a judgment does the opposite of what it intends to do. To refuse to recognize the sufferings of these people implies a guilty conscience. I believe it conveys to other nations of the world the view that the Salvadoran Government, by design or impotence, is totally responsible for this suffering and that the U.S. Government, realizing the responsibility of the Salvadoran Government, is burying its head under the sand.

The lives that would be saved and the suffering that would be alleviated are reasons enough in my mind to warrant the granting of voluntary departure for Salvadorans. The opportunity to show to the world that we are cognizant of the suffering caused by the civil war in El Salvador—which I believe has as its root cause the intervention of other outside countries and sources as I mentioned before—should be appealing enough for even the State Department.

Therefore, I urge that we pass this resolution. I firmly believe, because of the experience that I have had in Arizona, Senators from other States like mine, particularly border States, will find a number of Salvadoran refugees who are, indeed, fearful for their lives. Who knows how many would actually be killed. I think it is much better to err on the side of humanitarian assistance in this case rather than to send individuals back to an uncertainty and possible death.

Mr. SYMMS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DECONCINI. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. I am fascinated by the amendment of the Senator. My question is, Would the Senator consider a modification to his amendment to include Nicaragua, or Nicaraguans?

Mr. DECONCINI. Yes, I would consider that, if the Senator would like to expound on his reasoning for it. My concern in El Salvador, is based on our direct involvement, as a Government policy, in the civil war there.

Mr. SYMMS. If the Senator would yield further, the reason I posed the question is because from my experience in visiting El Salvador, the government that we support is clearly in control of the country and I would doubt if people who returned who shared the ideals of the U.S. Government would be in any jeopardy or necessary danger down there other than the ordinary strife that is going on with the Communist guerrillas. But in Nicaragua the contrary is true where the Communists are in clear control. Those people who for whatever reason were supporters of the Western democratic principles are certainly in jeopardy if they return to Nicaragua to be shot by the Government that is there in power. That is why I asked the question.

Mr. DECONCINI. If the Senator from Idaho will yield, I do not have any objection to his amendment. The basis for my amendment is our official policy of involvement in the Salvadoran conflict. I do not know that we are involved in Nicaragua as an official policy; although I have no objection to the granting of extended voluntary departure status to those Nicaraguans that might be there.

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SIMPSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. SIMPSON. The Senator from Arizona is speaking, I know, from the best of motives, yet I would resist this sense of the Senate resolution. Here we are again in the area of immigration and refugee policy. When we are in that area, we are in the arena of emotion, guilt, fear, and racism. I said that before in this Chamber. I do not do that to be dramatic. But if there was ever an area where we are addressing an issue out of guilt or emotionalism, this is it.

Let me tell Senators that the chief counsel and staff director of the Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcommittee have just returned from El Salvador with very important information which is contained in a report which will be available to each and every one of us in a few days indicating that there is clear evidence that those who return to El Salvador are not subject to political persecution and are not harmed other than being subject to the same danger as any other citizen would be in a country that is in certain turmoil.

11-059 O-87-34 (Pt. 18)

Today it is estimated that there are over 500,000 Salvadorans in the United States in illegal immigration status—illegal, undocumented workers. There are groups in the United States, and the Senator from Arizona speaks of those, who speak for and ask for extended voluntary departure for those people until the conflict in El Salvador should subside. The United States has done that before. We did that with Ethiopia, Nicaragua, and Poland, for people who were present in the United States at the time of the conflict in their homeland.

The rationale as to why that status has never been extended to these people of El Salvador is that there is no evidence of political persecution. I want Senators to hear that carefully. It is certainly evidenced through the media that there is persecution. It is felt deeply in the heart of sincere people that there is persecution, but there is no evidence of persecution of those who are sent back. And there are other countries of first asylum in Central America who are ready to accept these people. That is a key thing of which I think we should be aware.

Most Salvadorans in the United States are economic migrants, and they come here without a valid claim to persecution in the event they should return voluntarily or be deported. There have been extensive efforts made by many private and religious groups, such as the ACLU and Amnesty International, to determine the fate of Salvadorans returning from the United States, and no evidence has been found to indicate that these returnees are harmed.

There are areas of the country, particularly in the city of San Salvador and the western provinces, where the violence is not intense. There are displaced persons camps throughout the country where food and medical assistance are available and international personnel are present. The Honduran Government—and I trust Senators will hear this—has indicated its willingness to accept all refugees who enter Honduras from El Salvador. In short then, there is a safe refuge in the region.

Here is the irony that we are addressing. A person, if truly fleeing strife or persecution in El Salvador, has an opportunity to obtain refuge in Honduras, or in other Latin American countries where there is refuge and a common language and a common heritage. They do not choose to seek safe haven in those countries, but they can come to the border of the United States of America and say, "I am a refugee." They have had opportunities to seek refuge before they got to this country. They come that extra 2,000 miles to the Unites States for one reason—to obtain an economic opportunity, to work, to obtain a job.

There are 300 to 350 Salvadorans who are currently being returned by the United States to El Salvador each month. From October 1982 to March 1983 there were 2,000 Salvadorans returned. Now, when they go back, indeed, they are subject to, as Senator SYMMS says, the same violence that every resident of that unfortunate country may face, but there is clear evidence that there is no governmentally sanctioned program to target or harass the returning Salvadorans simply because they have been in the United States of America. That is not happening.

There is no evidence of that anywhere. However, no official agency has conducted a followup study on individual Salvadorans returned by the United States. Private, nongovernmental groups cannot, without extreme difficulty, undertake such an assessment on their own without the cooperation, obviously, of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service and the U.S. Embassy. This lack of documentation has resulted in broad support for a field study to determine to the extent possible, given the existing conditions in El Salvador, the fate of those Salvadorans who are being deported or who are returning voluntarily after being apprehended by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. I feel that study should be sponsored by the United States, and I shall recommend that. I think the Senator from Arizona would recommend that. That study could be done on a random basis over a period of several months and implemented by the U.S. Embassy some voluntary group with the cooperation of the Embassy.

The ICRC, the Salvadoran Government's Commission on Human Rights, and a human rights monitoring office associated with the Archdiocese of El Salvador appear happy to accept that role if they should be asked to do that. I feel this recommendation should be implemented without delay.

But until the results of that study are available as to what is happening to those people who are returned, the INS should develop guidelines such as those used in other areas of the world which would identify certain categories of Salvadorans who are more likely subject to ham. There is some evidence that teachers and medical people, for example, may face additional risk.

Here is the final fact I want to share with you. Before the insurgents ever began to create discord in El Salvador, there were 350,000 Salvadorans in the United States. Obviously, they were not refugees when there was no insurgency. There is one thing they were. They were economic migrants—illegal, undocumented workers, 350,000 of them here before any insurgency ever took place in El Salvador.

Then this fact: The second largest flow of illegal undocumented aliens in our country, apprehended by the United States over the years, are El Salvadorans. After Mexicans, they are the second largest illegal flow—and that long before insurgency in their country.

With the refugee camps in Honduras willing to take the Salvadoran seeking a refuge or safe haven, it would be an extraordinary statement for us to say here that we are the country of refuge for the Salvadorans. They have countries of refuge in Central America before they come here. But they do not seek refuge in those countries; they come on to the United States to seek this very special status, a status which is much better than that of an illegal, undocumented worker, we can all be assured.

That is the issue, Mr. President. I was interested in the hypocrisy of a recent lawsuit brought by, I think, a hotel and restaurant workers labor organization. They claim that they, too, were seeking extended voluntary departure for the wretched of El Salvador because if they return, they will be persecuted and killed. How extraordinary a statement, and to come from a labor organization representing undocumented workers, I would assume, because a great part of their interest in the case was that they not lose those workers and those members.

That case was brought on a humanitarian stance, which is somewhat dazzling for me to perceive.

Finally, and then I shall yield to my colleague from Kentucky, there is the issue of asylum applications. The reason we are in turmoil with that particular procedure in this country is that, 3 years ago, we had about 4,000 asylum applications pending, but that system has been so gimmicked that now we have over 170,000 asylum applications pending in the United States. If anyone believes that every one of those people is truly a refugee—and there is no difference between a refugee and asylee except one is here and one is there. In their country when they seek refugee status some nameless officer of the Government just stamps the form and says "Rejected," and that is the end of their due process. Yet, when they come here and seek asylee status, they have six ways to the courthouse and when it is all finished and deportation orders are there, they can start again at "Go," like a Monopoly game.

That is what has happened to asylum applications in the United States. I earnestly hope that in the midst of an issue which is filled with fear, guilt, emotionalism, racism, all the stuff I truck around in in this baby, my colleagues will pay attention to those statistics that I gave.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming, who has done such an outstanding job as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Judiciary with responsibility for our immigration and refugee policy. I shall add further some thoughts of my own on this particular amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona. I know the intent and good will that he has put into this particular piece of legislation.

In my study of our immigration and refugee policy in the United States over a number of years, I have to come to the conclusion that this amendment would represent the very worst of our refugee policy. First, it would be an open recruitment for new refugees to come into this country.

Second, it is a policy, really, against the Government of El Salvador that we are extending considerable effort to try to preserve and protect. I cannot think of anything that would be more destabilizing to that government than for the United States to invite into this country as refugees all of the people who want to come from there. I think that would be extremely counterproductive to all of the efforts that we are making in that Central American country to try to preserve stability and create a peaceful situation.

Mr. President, we have already today, at the urging of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), provided some additional funding to help deal with whatever situation may exist in El Salvador as a result of the hostilities going on there, and dealing with it in that country, where it should be dealt with, and not in this country. I think it is interesting to note that, just today, the Immigration and Naturalization Service revealed that they had apprehended a million—already, this year—1 million illegal aliens coming into the United States.

We know from history that the apprehensions are never more than 50 percent and probably not more than one-third. So I think we can assume from that that somewhere between one-half million and 2 million aliens have come into this country from the southern borders just this year, which is not yet over.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming correctly describes what a refugee is, but there is one more thing the refugee is.

When an individual has been declared by the United States to be a refugee, he becomes a privileged person in the United States—a privileged person. He has, first of all, numerous agencies which are devoting their time, effort, and money to see that he and his family are taken care of and that he has an opportunity for a job. He has job preferences above veterans, for example. Some individuals who have come to the United States have fought against those veterans in various places in the world; yet, they have a job preference.

He is guaranteed a certain level of income for a period of at least 3 years, and generally forever.

The fact is that a person from El Salvador, if this were to become law and policy, could expect to bring his family to the United States and never work a day in his life and have a better standard of living, more income, than if he stayed in El Salvador and worked hard for the rest of his life.

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

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I just came to the floor and became aware of the discussion.

I have some familiarity with the Immigration Act as well as the Refugee Act. What provisions of the act is the Senator talking about? There are absolutely no provisions in the Refugee Act which provide that anyone who is permitted to remain in the United States under extended voluntary departure status because of the threat of violence in their home country, could bring their families to the United States. There is no provision that they could receive the social service programs which the Senator has referred to—only the refugees admitted under the Refugee Act are eligible.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. These are refugees.

Mr. KENNEDY. No; they are only given extended voluntary departure status—a kind of temporary safe haven. That is their legal classification, and it is the kind of classification that we have extended with regard to Lebanese during the 1974-75 civil war. We used it with regard to Uganda for about 100 individuals fearful of returning to Idi Amin. It has been used by Republican and Democratic Presidents. And it is being used today for Polish and Ethiopian nationals.

Those people have not been eligible for the social service or welfare programs, nor are they eligible to bring their families here, if they are not already here.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Is the Senator telling me that there are those here who are not eligible for food stamps, any legal residents of the United States?

Mr. KENNEDY. They are here only temporarily. They are not permanent residents.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Are they eligible for food stamps?

Mr. KENNEDY. No; if they are here temporarily under extended voluntary departure. They are legally here only until the condition of violence in their homelands change, then they are obligated to return.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I think the Senator will find that they are. There is nothing here about being temporary, nothing at all.

The point I make is that what we are about to do is to open a flood gate of new entrants into the United States, in a program for which we are now spending nearly $3 billion a year, in a situation where job opportunities are limited at best, and a situation that would not be in the best interest of the Government of El Salvador, which we are spending a considerable amount of money to try to protect.

I think this would be folly on our part and certainly would not be in the best interests of the citizens of the United States. I urge the defeat of this amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I am not going to belabor this.

I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. JEPSEN) be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I point out that I think the Senator from Kentucky is confused. My amendment would not classify these people as refugees. The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration has pointed out that they could easily go to Honduras, Guatemala, or Mexico. Many of them do. But this is a little different.

The U.S. Government is substantially committed, both economically and militarily, to the defense of the existing government there. To my knowledge, Mexico is giving no military assistance or economic assistance to that country, nor is Guatemala. We are there. Our policy is very definite as to what we want to see and what results we would like to see occur there.

Right now, approximately 350 Salvadorans are being deported a month. That was as high as 1,000. We are sending people back to El Salvador today and would be in the next couple of months. While the study goes on it is uncertain what is going to happen to them.

We read in the papers—and those who have visited the country know for themselves—that in El Salvador there are right-wing death squads, abuses by the Government, and by the guerrilla movement. There may also be other revolutionary movements.

When these people go back there it is emotional. Why should it not be emotional? It is emotional if you think you will get your head blown off when you go back home because you are in the province with the guerrillas, or if you happened to have angered some-

one and the right-wing death squad has you on their hit list.

Mr. President, I ask this as the sense of the Senate. It is not mandatory and I really believe that it should be mandatory. But in deference to the Senator from Wyoming, it seems to me that a sense of the Senate is appropriate while we wait for the results of a study. We are doing what is right in El Salvador now by assisting the existing government and we should do right by the people who are fearful of going back.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the word "Senate" in the first line of my amendment be changed to "Congress."

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBERGER) be added as cosponsors.

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

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I am delighted that once again the Senator from Arizona is giving us the opportunity to take a step which I believe is needed. As he has already pointed out, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has already adopted language expressing the sense of the Congress that extended voluntary departure satus be granted to those Salvadorans now resident in this country. I hope that we will follow the lead of the Senator from Arizona and make our bill conform to that of the House.

The real issue here is not immigration policy; instead, it concerns the events now going on in El Salvador and throughout Central America. The unfortunate fact is that in a region torn by civil war, many people must fear for their lives if they should return home. Our own Government has recognized that various individuals might become targets of the insurgents. It is therefore simply not consistent to state that events in El Salvador do not merit EVD status.

Many of those who have entered the country have done so since the rebels' "final offensive" of January 1981, and therefore do not qualify for the amnesty provisions of the Simpson-Mazzoli bill. It is therefore important that we address their status in a special manner.

My deep concern about the plight of the Salvadorans whose lives have been profoundly affected by the violence in their war-torn country has prompted me to contact the State Department numerous times. I have spoken personally with many people during the past several years about the rampant cases of torture and murder carried out against the civilian population by the military, the death squads, and the guerrillas. I believe that the United States bears a certain responsibility for the noncombatant deaths because of our support for the Salvadoran Government and military. This prompted me to meet with then-Secretary of State Alexander Haig over a year ago. I presented him with a letter which outlined my concerns about the refugees who are in this country. I urged him to grant political asylum status to those who had lost family members in the violence and who had a justifiable fear of returning to El Salvador. I wanted to insure that those who truly deserved such status would be assured of receiving it.

When I could see no change in our policies regarding asylum requests, I wrote to Secretary of State George Shultz. Again, I outlined my grave concerns about the plight of the Salvadorans who were in this country and who feared for their safety should they be unwillingly returned to El Salvador. I urged that every opportunity be given to the Salvadorans during the deportation hearings to explain their reasons for fearing a return to their country. I urged that those with a well-grounded fear of persecution or those who presented evidence of torture or repression against their families and coworkers would be granted the opportunity to remain in the United States until it was safe for them to return.

Last month, I had the opportunity to meet with two leaders of a small peasant organization who told me gruesome and horrifying stories of the violence that has been committed against members of their cooperative. The violence they described is typical of the terror that the extremists in El Salvador have carried out for decades. In this instance, however, the army was involved, which makes the point even more telling.

A land dispute between the cooperative and the former landowner was being resolved in the courts. Not satisfied with the way the proceedings were going, the landowner contacted his son's godfather, who was a colonel in the army. The landowner donned a mask to conceal his identity and joined the army patrol in visiting the village and pulling out selected co-op members for revenge. At least 20 people were killed, some by machete slashes in the shape of a cross.

There can be no justification for this type of vicious murder, but unfortunately for the people of El Salvador, this type of wanton violence is far too common. These incidents point up the randomness of the violence and confirm in vivid terms how much the common man and woman have to fear.

While random violence in El Salvador is horrifying because of its arbitrariness and the perpetrators' fascination with perverse methods of torture, the acts of calculated and premeditated violence are even more despicable. Amnesty International has amassed countless testimonies of violence and terror in El Salvador and the rest of Central America. Their investigations have shown repeatedly that those individuals who are relatives of victims, or who have condemned the abuses, face a special threat to their well-being. Additionally, those who have entered the U.S. illegally, been apprehended by the INS, and deported may well risk their lives by returning to El Salvador. This was precisely the case for Santana Chirino Amaya who was found tortured, murdered, and decapitated after he had been deported and returned to El Salvador. A companion, Bernardo Antonio Rivas, 14 years of age, suffered the same fate. In an interview with a former career military officer of the Salvadoran Army, Amnesty International learned that deportees faced a special threat upon their return to El Salvador and were frequently tortured before they were murdered.

The civil war is now more protracted than ever, with no end to the violence in sight. The number of refugees residing in the United States is unknown, but estimated to be at least 60,000. In 1982, the INS granted only 65 Salvadorans political asylum and deported 2,118 to El Salvador. I find it difficult to believe that the INS can support so few asylum petitions, given the kind of evidence that has been presented to me. It is because I believe the evidence is so compelling that I support granting extended voluntary departure status to the Salvadorans who are in this country without proper documentation.

This is not the first time that extended voluntary departure has been granted to the citizens of an entire nation. More importantly, however, if implemented this policy would be a signal that the refugees would eventually return to their country and not become permanent residents of the United States or a burden on our public assistance system.

My support of the granting of extended voluntary departure stems from my firm conviction that refugees who return unwillingly to El Salvador face a special threat that the general population does not face, whether from the right or the left. The evidence that has been presented to me from a variety of sources indicates that this fear is well founded and that it justifies the same special status that was granted to oppressed people in the past, most notably the Ethiopians, Poles, and Afghans. It is a humanitarian approach for dealing with a serious problem that exceeds the bounds of human decency. It is a humane approach to an inhumane problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my two letters to the Secretary of State and a response from the Department of State.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1982.

Hon. ALEXANDER M. HAIG, Jr.,
The Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY HAIG: I am writing to you regarding the granting of asylum to Salvadorans in this country.

The United States must continue to be a haven for those who are true political refugees. I recognize that the United States cannot be the only source of asylum for those who flee political persecution. International refugees are an international responsibility. However, I am greatly concerned about the Salvadorans who are in the United States and who seek refugee status.

The United States bears a special responsibility in this instance because of its support for the Duarte government. The Duarte government is being harassed by both the extreme right and the extreme left. As a result, public officials, businessmen, educators, agrarian workers, trade unionists, and peasants face a double threat from those who would bring about leftist repression and those who would return El Salvador to its brutal post.

In recent months that Salvadoran military has been implicated in a number of serious and disturbing incidents involving violence against the unarmed civilian population. The incidence of political persecution, whether from the right or the left, is rising as political factions become increasingly polarized and desperate.

At one time, prominent and wealthy Salvadorans feared kidnapping and random attacks of violence by armed extremists. The activities of the leftist guerrillas are now far more sophisticated and intimidating. The threats to mayors and citizens who participate in the upcoming elections are a case in point. Likewise, on the right, the torture and molestations are ever more gruesome. One no longer needs to be intimately involved in political activity to be a target for repression. Now one can be victimized for merely living in the same village, working on the same farm, or having the same last name as an activist.

Those Salvadorans who have been in this country since the early days of the violence may possibly not qualify for refugee status or asylum under our laws. However, Salvadorans in the United States who have lost family members to the current violence justifiably fear a return to El Salvador. It is my opinion that they properly qualify as political refugees, and should be treated as such.

I want to reiterate that I do not believe that all expatriate Salvadorans merit refugee status. I do, however, urge that you extend every consideration to the requests of Salvadorans for political asylum so that those who truly deserve such status will be assured of receiving it.

Sincerely,

DAVE DURENBERGER.
U.S. Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 7, 1982.

Hon. DAVID DURENBERGER,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DURENBERGER: I refer to your letter of March 26, 1982 about the granting of asylum to Salvadorans in this country.

You correctly point out in that violence is an enormous problem in El Salvador and that hardly any segment of the population is immune from this threat. The upshot of this is the fear shared by many Salvadorans of a return to their country. Salvadorans and others in this country may, and frequently do, apply for political asylum status. The granting of asylum in this country is governed by the United Nations Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees and U.S. law. Such treaty and law provide sanctuary for persons fleeing persecution.

Under the U.N. Convention and Protocol on Refugees, the United States is prohibited from undertaking the forced expulsion (refoulement) of a refugee to a country or frontier where persecution is likely to occur. In addition, the Refugee Act of 1980 provides for the granting of asylum status to those who establish a well-founded fear of persecution upon return to their country of nationality for reasons of race, religion, nationality membership of a particular social group, or political opinion. The responsibility for establishing a well-founded fear of persecution rests with each applicant.

As a signatory to the United Nations Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, the United States is well aware of its obligations and responsibilities, including the prohibition against the refoulement of refugees. We have a long-standing record of support for relief activities on behalf of refugees and a generous resettlement policy. No other country has provided as much assistance or resettlement opportunities to refugees as the United States.

Matters regarding exclusion or deportation proceedings or voluntary departure are, of course, under the jurisdiction of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) does not classify Salvadorans or members of any other nationality in the United States as refugees unless they individually establish that their fear of being persecuted is a well-founded one.

A request for asylum should be reasonably related in point of time and circumstances to the flight from the country of nationality. It is our view that the majority of Salvadorans in the United States did not depart their country solely to seek safe haven in this country. Most traveled through third countries before entering the United States, and many of them entered quite some time ago. Other countries closer to El Salvador—Honduras, for example—have been generous in offering safe haven to Salvadorans who have fled. Thus, the United States is not the only possible refuge, nor can it in most cases be considered the country of first refuge.

The INS has informed us that no Salvadoran asylum-seeker is sent back until a determination has been made that the claimant has not established a well-founded fear of persecution. It is not necessary "formally" to request asylum. If a positive indication of unwillingness to return to the homeland is made, and if the unwillingness is based on a fear of being persecuted, that is sufficient to have the case processed through asylum procedures. For those who establish a well-founded fear of persecution upon return to their country, the Department, in its advisory opinion, will so inform the appropriate INS District Office. Those who do not are not eligible for asylum.

In view of the available remedies to refugees from El Salvador under the asylum provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, and the U.N. Convention and Protocol on Refugees, we do not consider blanket voluntary departure status as an appropriate alternative in the circumstances. The Department of State and our Embassy in San Salvador will continue to monitor the situation carefully. It should go without saying that this is not an easy task. However the procedures for a considered and just determination are in place and are being used by our officers.

I trust that the foregoing views will be helpful in understanding our position on the granting of asylum and on voluntary departure status for Salvadorans in this country.

Sincerely;

ALVIN PAUL DRISCHLER,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1983.

Hon. GEORGE SHULTZ,
Secretary of State.
Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am contacting you regarding my ongoing concern about Salvadorans who have requested political asylum.

Last year, I met with Secretary of State Haig to discuss our policies in Central America, and I brought up the problem of the refugees. During our meeting, I said that I believed these Salvadorans had left their country for a variety of reasons during the last several years. While I realize that strict criteria exist for granting political asylum. I believe that many of these people justifiably fear returning to their homeland. Although some may have fled originally because of economic reasons, the level of violence and the uncontrolled acts of terrorism that have been committed in their villages since they left have put their very lives in jeopardy. I urged the Secretary to reconsider the criteria for accepting and denying applicants for political asylum so that those who expressed a reasonable fear of reprisal would be allowed to remain in the United States until it is safe to return.

I continue to be very disturbed by the incidents of violence that have been reported to me by many sources. Several weeks ago, I met with two Indians who told me about atrocities committed in their village by the army. I believe the wanton violence they described is not rare in El Salvador. In this instance the army entered a village in Sonsonate where the people had been apolitical and had shown no particular allegiance to either the government forces or the guerrillas. The atrocities committed there in late February were described as a case of harassment by the landowners of the peasant-run cooperative, and could not be attributed to any security threat. I was told that the commander was godfather to the son of one of the large landowners and was asked to interfere because of a business dispute.

As you know so well, Mr. Secretary, the violence in El Salvador knows no boundaries and is not carried out on the battlefield alone. Innocent noncombatants have suffered extraordinary losses because of it. These incidents, which are foreign to us, are unfortunately too routine in El Salvador. They underscore the fear that people have about returning to their villages.

The U.S. agencies responsible for implementing refugee policy have outlined for me the distinction between immigrants and refugees and have stated that many of these applicants do not meet the criteria for political asylum. Many of the Salvadorans, who

are not cognizant of the distinctions between these two categories and who fear for their lives, may not immediately say so when first questioned. I believe every effort should be made by INS officers and State Department officials to determine whether violence perpetrated by rightist death squads, the security forces, and leftist guerrillas has created a bona fide reason for these Salvadorans to fear a return to their country.

A number of American churches around the country have been so concerned about the plight of these Salvadorans that they have opened their churches to those who fear for their safety should they return to their homes. While I do not countenance these acts of civil disobedience, I recognize why these groups have chosen to lend their support to these people. They share with me a sense of frustration that the very real threat the Salvadoran refugees face is being underestimated or disregarded.

As I pointed out in my letter to Secretary Haig, the United States bears a special responsibility for events in El Salvador because of our support for the Duarte and Magana governments and the armed forces. Therefore, it is particularly important that we display as much understanding as possible when evaluating the asylum petitions.

I am particularly concerned about our policies because asylum seems to be more easily granted to highly-visible or well-known persons who present far less criteria for fear of persecution than have the thousands of Salvadoran applicants.

I appreciate your assistance in this matter and look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

DAVE DURENBERGER,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, let me add a concluding remark, and I share this with my colleague from Arizona.

The extended volunary departure status may well have the effect—I think we should all be aware of that—of drawing additional Salvadorans to this country to obtain the advantage of that status. We had that debate on the immigration bill.

The State Department has advised us that it believes this indeed occurred when the status was granted to Nicaraguans. Thousands came to the United States to obtain that status. It is not unreasonable to expect that this would happen with the Salvadorans. I share that with my fellow Senators.

Yesterday, the INS testified, as we prepared for the refugee consultation, that they had no way, with their present existing equipment and procedures, to document or know the whereabouts of persons who have been granted extended voluntary departure status in the United States. There is no way they have been able to identify where they are or who they are. They would not be able to see to it that the Salvadorans would leave the country, which is the purpose of extended voluntary departure, after the conditions in their country have changed.

If the conditions in El Salvador changed, there would be no way to determine who then would have been in the status of extended voluntary departure or whether or not they left the country.

I share that with Senators, I am fully aware of the difference between extended voluntary departees and refugees. But next step for extended voluntary departees, those who receive the status, is perhaps refugee status. They do not return, because the historic flow of El Salvadorans to this country consists of economic migrants, not refugees.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a clarification? I will be brief.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield.

(Mr. HECHT assumed the chair.)

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, earlier in the debate I asked a question about Nicaragua. I want to be sure that it is clearly understood that any person who would be sent from this country back to Nicaragua that would be in danger by the Communist government in Nicaragua, under our present law, is protected.

Mr. SIMPSON. That would be a refugee or in extended voluntary departure status.

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the Senator.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I will be prepared to vote in 1 minute. I think it is important to note that the Nicaraguan people were granted temporary extended voluntary departure status in the United States right before Somoza fell. I think it is very important that we also grant it now. I think it is the right thing to do because we are committed in support of the government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI).

All in favor, say "aye." Opposed, "no."

The noes appear to have it.

The amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, if the Senator really wants a rollcall vote on a motion to reconsider—it is late and Senators need to get away—if he insists on that, it would be better if we went back and tried to have a rollcall on the amendment itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to vacate the result of the voice vote and to recognize the Senator from Arizona for the purpose of asking for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I agree with the procedure. I have consulted with my colleague, Senator PELL, and we think it would be probably in the best interest for us to stay here tonight and clean up all the amendments that can be done by voice vote that are noncontroversial and assure Senators there will be no further rollcall votes. We would even try to take up a few of those that would require rollcall votes tomorrow. The rollcall votes would occur possibly early in the afternoon. We have a commitment that we will certainly be leaving early afternoon. We will try to accommodate Senators that way so they will not have to stay around all night.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, if this amendment is defeated, there will be no more record votes tonight. Tomorrow we will go on, or attempt to go on, the export-import bill at 10 a.m.

Mr. DECONCINI. Will the majority leader yield? Did the majority leader say "if this amendment is defeated"?

Mr. BAKER. Yes, Mr. President. If there is another motion—to reconsider, for instance, and there might be—I cannot assure there will not be a rollcall vote on that.

Let me withdraw the statement and say that I do not anticipate another rollcall vote after the disposition of this amendment unless it is a vote to reconsider.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

Mr. DECONCINI. Regardless of how this vote comes out, I do not intend to ask for another rollcall vote tonight on this or any other amendment. I want to make that clear.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, after the disposition of this amendment—let me put it that—there will be no more record votes. Members should understand that there is still a technical possibility we could have another vote. But let us get on with the vote and see how that goes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the majority leader is agreed to.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I move to table the sense of the Senate resolution of the Senator from Arizona. That would be the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to table.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. 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 Wyoming (Mr. SIMPSON) to table the amendment of

the Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI). The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Maine (Mr. COHEN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Florida (Mrs. HAWKINS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD), and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. WALLOP) are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. WALLOP) is paired with the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD).

If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

Mr. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. STENNIS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 267 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Abdnor	Garn	Percy
Andrews	Gorton	Pressler
Armstrong	Hatch	Proxmire
Baker	Hecht	Pryor
Biden	Heflin	Quayle
Boren	Heinz	Randolph
Bumpers	Helms	Roth
Burdick	Huddleston	Rudman
Byrd	Humphrey	Sasser
Chiles	Johnston	Simpson
Cochran	Kassebaum	Stevens
D'Amato	Kasten	Symms
Danforth	Laxalt	Thurmond
Dixon	Lugar	Tower
Dole	Matsunaga	Trible
Domenici	Mattingly	Warner
East	McClure	Weicker
Evans	Murkowski	Wilson
Exon	Nickles	Zorinsky
Ford	Nunn	

NAYS—26

Baucus	Grassley	Metzenbaum
Bingaman	Hollings	Mitchell
Boschwitz	Inouye	Moynihan
Bradley	Jepsen	Pell
Chafee	Kennedy	Riegle
DeConcini	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Denton	Leahy	Specter
Durenberger	Levin	Tsongas
Glenn	Melcher	

NOT VOTING—15

Bentsen	Goldwater	Mathias
Cohen	Hart	Packwood
Cranston	Hatfield	Stafford
Dodd	Hawkins	Stennis
Eagleton	Long	Wallop

So the motion to lay on the table amendment No. 2202, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2203

(Purpose: To limit the participation of sitting ambassadors in domestic political campaigns)

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I have an amendment I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI) proposes amendment numbered 2203.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 24, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following new section:

"DOMESTIC POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF AMBASSADORS

"Sec. 122. Paragraph (3) of Section 7324 (d) of such title is amended by inserting '(other than an ambassador or minister, except when taking part in activity described in subsection (a) on behalf of a Presidential political campaign) of after in its relations with foreign power or'."

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, the amendment I am proposing would amend the Hatch Act to prohibit amabassadors from making political contributions and taking part in political campaigns.

Currently, ambassadors and Cabinet members are exempt from the limitations on political activity which the Hatch Act applies to the vast majority of Government employees. I am not a supporter of the Hatch Act in terms of its broad implications—in my view, Federal workers—except in the case of sensitive Justice Department, intelligence agency, and Internal Revenue Service positions—should have the same political rights as other citizens. However, if the intent of the Hatch Act is to prevent partisan politics from interfering in the way Federal workers do their jobs, it seems particularly important that this proviso be applied to the position of ambassador. Our ambassadors' main function is to convey a certain image of the United States—an image that is as consistent and clear as possible. Professionalism is a highly prized attribute of an ambassador. Unfortunately, when an ambassador engages in partisan politics, campaign rhetoric combined with the expediency of the moment tends to lead to the distortion of American foreign policy.

The State Department's official policy frowns upon such partisan activity by ambassadors, but this does not seem to deter some ambassadors who are willing to sacrifice professionalism for the sake of grinding a particular political ax for the sake of pleasing political superiors. An ambassador to a foreign country serves as a vital link between our country and the government of a country to which he or she is accredited. Statements the ambassador may make are carefully scrutinized by the government of the host country as reflections of the policies of the government the ambassador represents. An ambassador becomes an almost totally public personna who cannot afford to make offhand comments or to engage in partisan politics.

During my recent reelection campaign, one particular individual accredited as an American ambassador to a Latin American country came to Arizona and interjected himself in the campaign. He made commercials endorsing my opponent on the basis of a series of statements about Central America that ran counter to official American policy. Frankly, I found the behavior startling and terribly damaging to our Central American policy.

I was equally amazed to discover that while a lowly clerk in the bureaucracy, whose participation in politics carries with it absolutely no implications about government policy, is forbidden to do so by the Hatch Act, an ambassador whose every work and action conveys to foreigners the views and attitudes of the American Government is under no such stricture. Surely, this must be an oversight resulting from the simple fact that the situation has never arisen. I believe that most of us, Mr. President, assume that ambassadors would have better sense than to embroil themselves in a political campaign. It certainly requires an incredible lack of judgment to do so.

The amendment I am introducing will eliminate the loophole which presently allows ambassadors to engage in overt political activity. I believe that the amendment not only is in keeping with the orginal intent of the Hatch Act, but it makes good foreign policy sense.

Mr. President, this amendment is quite simple. It is proposed to amend the Hatch Act to place some prohibition on ambassadors political activities but still permit them to be involved in the Presidential political campaign.

I believe the amendment has been cleared on both sides.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I trust that Members of the majority side are familiar with the amendment.

It had not been well known that Senator DECONCINI would be offering this. I have not heard of any objections. I do not have any objections myself.

Without then hearing any other objections, I propose that we vote on the amendment.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I think this amendment as modified by the Senator from Arizona is a good amendment. While restricting an ambassador's political activity in non-Presidential campaigns, it recognizes the fact that an ambassador is the representative of the chief of state and if that ambassador wishes to campaign for or against the Presidential candidate in a Presidential election he should have the complete freedom to do it. He should not be subject to the restrictions of a civil servant.

I think that this gives an ambassador that political freedom which he should have.

I speak personally in this regard because I have in my possession a letter from President Franklin Roosevelt requesting my father who was then a chief of mission abroad to come over and campaign for him. This amendment would not prohibit an ambassador from assisting in such a campaign and I think this exception is very reasonable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment (No. 2203) was agreed to.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Now, Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished managers of this measure to let me put a unanimous-consent request that will create a brief period of the transaction of routine morning business so that calendar items and certain other things can be taken care of before we resume the consideration of those matters on the State authorization bill which will not require a rollcall vote tonight.

Mr. PERCY. I have no objection whatsoever. I would like to inquire of the majority leader about how long he feels that will take.

Mr. BAKER. I feel it will take 5 minutes.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business to extend not past 8:40 p.m. in which Senators may speak.

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

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, first let me say that there will be no more record votes tonight. When we come back tomorrow, it is the intention of the leadership to ask the Senate to turn first to the consideration of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 rather than resume consideration of the State authorization bill.

The reason for it, frankly, is because both the chairman and ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee will be occupied in an executive session of the Foreign Relations Committee in the morning and not available on the floor.

After the Export-Import Bank matter is disposed of, we will go back to the State authorization bill.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

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

ORDER FOR PERIOD FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business to extend from that moment until 10 a.m. in which Senators may speak for not more than 1 minute each.

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

REPORT OF SENATE DELEGATION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, in late May of this year, at my request, Senator RICHARD LUGAR headed a bipartisan delegation of U.S. Senators to the United Kingdom, The Netherlands, Belgium, and the Federal Republic of Germany to discuss items of mutual concern and interest with our NATO allies.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of the delegation be printed as a Senate document.

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

EXTENSION OF REPORTING DEADLINE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, it is clear I think that we are not going to be able to comply with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 91 on the date specified. I believe this request has been cleared on both sides.

I ask unanimous consent that Senate committees instructed pursuant to that resolution, that is to say, House Concurrent Resolution 91, be given until October 17, 1983, to report their recommendations to the Senate Committee on the Budget.

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

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have three calendar items that appear to be cleared on this, I would say to the minority leader. First is Calendar Order No. 382, then 393, and last 395.

May I inquire of the minority leader if he is prepared to consider all or any part of those items at this time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, those matters have been cleared on this side of the aisle.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader.

PROMOTING TRAVEL TO THE UNITED STATES DURING THE 1984 OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, first, then, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate, Senate Resolution 167, Calendar Order No. 382.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 167) expressing the sense of the Senate that the Federal Government take all necessary steps to promote travel to the United States by foreign visitors during the 1984 summer Olympics and the 1984 Louisiana World Exposition, to inform such visitors of recreational and commercial opportunities throughout the United States, and to facilitate their entry into and travel within this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I am glad the full Senate is considering this important resolution. The United States will have an opportunity in 1984 to make great strides in improving its image and marketability as an international travel destination. The 1984 summer Olympics, which will be in Los Angeles, and the Louisiana World Exposition in New Orleans are two events which will undoubtedly attract thousands of foreign visitors. The benefits to the United States from this increase in foreign visitorship are numerous. The financial gains are staggering by themselves, but they are not the only positive result. The benefits in terms of international understanding and goodwill will be huge. The people who return home across the globe will pass along stories of their adventures and their impressions of the United States. Obviously, it is to our benefit to make sure that all these

foreign visitors are accommodated and made to feel welcome.

Unfortunately, it is all too likely that many of these travelers will begin their visits with an unpleasant encounter at one of our international airports. I am referring to the fact that the Customs Service and the Immigration and Naturalization Service are not prepared to handle the large increase in foreign arrivals which will be experienced next year. If only certain ports were affected the problem would not be so severe. However, foreign visitors will be arriving at various spots all over the country, and we simply do not have adequate Customs and INS personnel at all locations to deal with this influx.

The problem this creates goes beyond simple delays at the passenger's point of arrival. Flight connections and other plans could be disrupted as well. And, perhaps most significantly, these visitors are sure to take back home with them horror stories about the long delays and possibly rude treatment by tired, overworked inspection personnel. This could obviously have a major negative impact on our image as an attractive international destination and could cost us future tourism business. And we know very well that every lost visitor reduces our tourism trade income and costs the American economy thousands of dollars.

Someone may well ask why a Senator from South Dakota cares about international tourism business which is going to primarily benefit the west coast and the gulf coast. I am concerned because of two reasons. First, tourism is my State's second largest industry, and while the international share of the total is relatively small, the fact remains that foreign visitors spend more than domestic tourists, and it is also true that they generate future business through word of mouth advertising. Anything which is good for travel and tourism in general is good for my State.

It is also true that many of the visitors to Los Angeles and New Orleans will visit other areas of the country. I am certain that some will come to South Dakota to hunt, fish, or tour the Black Hills and Mount Rushmore. In simple terms, I want to increase the number of foreign visitors to the United States because it is bound to help both the economy of South Dakota and the national economy; and that will create new jobs.

In any event, we cannot maximize these benefits unless we develop a system for processing arriving visitors which will assure them of prompt, friendly service. If we treat them as potential lawbreakers instead of guests we are doing ourselves a disservice by discouraging future travel.

As a way of dealing with this situation I introduced Senate Resolution 167. It encourages the Secretary of Commerce to do all he can to promote and expedite the entry of foreign visitors and goods and to promote a full range of commercial opportunities as well.

In addition, it requests the Secretary to work with the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury to develop a plan for the consolidation of the inspection services under their jurisdiction. Studies have shown that a consolidation of the functions of Customs and INS would result in an agency which could handle a larger workload in less time, and probably with fewer people than are currently employed by the two agencies separately.

As a supporter of the travel and tourism industry and as one who is anxious to see its job creation potential be maximized, I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting Senate Resolution 167.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 167) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 157

Whereas in 1982 some twenty-two million foreign tourists visited the United States;

Whereas, in addition to promoting international trade and friendly relations among nations, these foreign visitors spent $12,000,000,000 on goods and services while in the United States;

Whereas a substantial increase in the number of foreign visitors to the United States is expected in 1984 in conjunction with the holding of the Olympic games in Los Angeles, California, and the Louisiana World Exposition in New Orleans, Louisiana; and

Whereas it is in the interest of the United States to encourage as many foreign visitors to the United States as possible, to inform such visitors of recreational and commercial opportunities throughout the United States, and to facilitate their entry into and travel within the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that:

(1) The Secretary of Commerce should undertake all necessary steps to encourage foreign nationals to attend the 1984 Olympic games and the Louisiana World Exposition.

(2) In conjunction with these efforts, the Secretary of Commerce should implement a systematic plan to interest such foreign nationals in other recreational and commercial activities throughout the United States.

(3) The Secretary of Commerce should consult with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General of the United States to develop and implement, before the 1984 Louisiana World Exposition, a national plan to consolidate the inspection functions pertaining to international travelers and cargo carried out by the Cabinet departments listed above. In order to reduce and eliminate any unwarranted delays and inconvenience to passengers and shippers at United States gateway and preclearance airports, such plan should include, but not be limited to, the increased use of automated and advanced screening techniques that enhance both law enforcement and the expeditious flow of passengers and cargo, expansion of simplified passenger and cargo inspection procedures, and more cost effective use of combined Federal manpower resources.

(4) The Secretary of Commerce should, pursuant to section 202 of the International Travel Act of 1961, assist State and local governments, and other private and public entities, to facilitate and encourage travel throughout the United States by residents of foreign countries visiting the United States for the 1984 Olympic games and the 1984 Louisiana World Exposition.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

APPRECIATION OF JAPANESE GOVERNMENT IN CONNECTION WITH THE KOREAN AIR LINES TRAGEDY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, next I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate, Senate Resolution 223.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 223) to express the appreciation of the American people for the efforts of the Japanese Government in connection with the Korean Air Lines tragedy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) the Senators from South Dakota (Mr. ABDNOR and Mr. PRESSLER) the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. BOSCHWITZ), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), and the Senators from Washington (Mr. EVANS and Mr. GORTON) for cosponsoring this resolution. I hope that all my colleagues will join us in supporting this expression of gratitude to the Japanese people for their contribution to helping the world understand the facts surrounding the Korean airliner tragedy.

The Japanese Government has made two unique contributions. First, the Government of Japan decided to release the intelligence tape which recorded the Soviet pilot's communication with the ground command post. Without that tape, Soviet evasion and disinformation might have been more convincing and the world would have had a much more difficult time judging the truth. The Japanese have also played an invaluable role in assisting international efforts to search the seas

in the area where the plane is believed to have gone down. We all hope that the so-called black box, the in-flight recorder, can soon be found so that we may have all the available facts at our disposal.

Japan has also demonstrated a reaction to the tragedy which is similar to our own:

On behalf of its people, the Japanese Government has strongly demanded from the Soviet Union a full explanation and formal apology.

Both Houses of the Japanese Parliament, the National Diet, have adopted resolutions unanimously denouncing the Soviet Union.

The Government of Japan has decided to suspend Aeroflot flights and Japan Airline flights between Japan and the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, as the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, I am aware that the United States-Japan relationship is not without friction. But the unity of outlook and purpose that we have demonstrated in the aftermath of this tragic event has once again proven the fundamental strength of our partnership. Our sense of outrage at Soviet brutality, our bereavement for the victims, and our determined search for the truth are shared by our Japanese friends.

Mr. President, I hope that this resolution will receive the unanimous support of my colleagues.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I commend Mr. MURKOWSKI for his leadership in putting forth this resolution. Also, I wish to emphasize the thanks that we are extending to the Japanese Government. Their efforts have not gone unnoticed and will be remembered by the United States and the rest of the international community. Their part in the investigation of the Korean Air Lines flight 007 tragedy was essential and further demonstrates the strong ties that bind our two countries together. The downing of the Korean Air Lines flight 007 will not be soon forgotten by this country. The Japanese Government should be remembered for their conscious attention to assist our country in finding the answers to this deplorable act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 223) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 223

Whereas, the United States and Japan have both condemned the Soviet action against Korean Air Lines flight 7 resulting in the loss of two hundred and sixty-nine lives;

Whereas, the Japanese Government made the decision to release the transcript of the Soviet pilot's transmission to the ground control post;

Whereas, that transcript has provided a basis for international efforts to obtain the truth regarding this tragedy;

Whereas, the Japanese Government has joined with the United States in taking action against Aeroflot;

Whereas, the Japanese Government has facilitated international efforts to search the seas in the area near the crash site; and

Whereas, the Japanese Diet has considered and already passed resolutions condemning the Soviet action: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States owes the Japanese a debt of gratitude for their full and complete cooperation, which reflects the strong ties between our two peoples and Governments.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President with the request that he further transmit such copy to the Government of Japan.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CHALLENGE GRANT AMENDMENTS OF 1983

Mr. BAKER. Last, Mr. President, in this sequence, I ask now that the Chair lay before the Senate S. 1872, Calendar Order No. 395.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1872) to increase endowment funds for eligible individuals under part C of title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

● Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, the legislation before us today would complete a task begun by the Education Subcommittee during the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in 1980. At that time, our Members were concerned about the lack of direction and purpose for the developing institutions program, or title III of the Higher Education Act.

After many long months of debate, we voted to dramatically change the program so that its purpose would be to improve the educational opportunities and management at those schools which serve large numbers of low income students. As we all well know, it is these institutions which were hardest hit by the inflation of the last decade, because they were unable and unwilling to pass onto their students from disadvantaged families their dramatically increasing costs.

I am pleased by the reports I have received from my Vermont constituents, as well as those from all over the Nation that the new title III program is working. Institutions are required to raise matching money for some of the grants, and the emphasis on improving management practices at our colleges has begun to pay off. Title III has enabled institutions with few resources to improve the quality of their academic program, thereby directly touching the lives of many students.

I want to commend the leadership of Secretary Bell in this area and also note the hard work of my colleague PAUL SIMON, who is chairman of the House Postsecondary Education Subcommittee on this issue. Without their enthusiastic support of the title III program, many small institutions in this Nation, particularly those enrolling large numbers of minority students, might not be functioning today. Mr. President, I ask that this bill's letter of transmittal from Secretary Bell to Vice President Bush be included in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

Mr. President, I also want to commend President Reagan for his very active support for this bill and his efforts to assure prompt consideration of this matter. Over 20 percent of this Nation's black students are enrolled in minority institutions, the majority of which would be provided additional assistance under the provisions of this bill. This Senator greatly appreciates the administration's interest in promoting the independence and self-sufficiency of these schools as well as improving educational opportunities for disadvantaged and minority students through this legislation.

Mr. President, one issue left undone in 1980 would be addressed by the legislation before us today. This is a program of endowment grants to eligible title III institutions which would promote the independence and self-sufficiency of these schools. This legislation would expand the current challenge grants program of title III to establish a Federal-institutional partnership designed to enhance the long-term financial stability of participating institutions. Without increasing the amount spent on title III by the Federal Government, a total of nearly $7 million would be available for the program for fiscal year 1984.

Competition for these funds would occur in the usual manner, with higher educational institutions applying as part of an annual competition.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this important measure at this time so the Secretary can begin this program as soon as possible.

The letter follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., September 19, 1983.

Hon. GEORGE P. BUSH,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BUSH: Enclosed for consideration of the Congress is a bill entitled the "Challenge Grant Amendments of 1983."

The purpose of this bill is to amend Parts C and D of Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize a program of matching endowment grants to eligible institutions. These grants would promote the independence and self-sufficiency of these institutions by aiding and encouraging them to develop endowment funds, and by providing them with incentives to promote fundraising activities.

Since its beginning, Title III has changed from a program with no defined institutional matching requirements to the current three-part configuration under which two of the three parts (Parts B and C) require significant institutional matching. This bill would continue this trend and would expand the scope of the Challenge Grant program to establish a Federal/institutional partnership designed to enhance the long-term financial stability of participating institutions.

As you know, this Administration is on record as supporting the general concept of Federal assistance in building endowments for institutions under the Title III program. Our proposal meets the following important criteria: (1) provides budget authority of a meaningful size without being an open door to Federal exposure to unlimited program costs; (2) clearly constructs endowment support as a separate program rather than just an "add-on" activity; (3) clarifies the funding eligibility period; (4) liberalizes the type of investment permitted; (5) improves financial incentives for endowment growth by establishing limitations on use of income generated; and (6) establishes penalties for using grant funds improperly.

I believe that enactment of this legislation would be most effective in assisting current and future participating institutions in achieving independence, self-sufficiency, economic viability and long-run financial stability. Without this legislation, the educational potential of all these institutions may remain in jeopardy and the promise of many may never be realized.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that the enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

T. H. BELL,
Secretary.●

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1872

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Challenge Grant Amendments of 1983".

SEC. 2. Part C of title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (hereinafter in this Act referred to as "the Act") is amended by adding after section 332 the following new section:

"ENDOWMENT GRANTS

"SEC. 333. (a)(1) The purpose of this section is to establish a program to provide matching grants to eligible institutions of higher education in order to establish or increase endowment funds at such institutions, to provide additional incentives to promote fundraising activities by such institutions, and to foster increased independence and self-sufficiency at such institutions.

"(2) For purposes of this section:

"(A) The term 'endowment fund' means a fund established by State law, by an institution of higher education, or by a foundation which is exempt from taxation and is maintained for the purpose of generating income for the support of the institution, but which shall not include real estate.

"(B) The term 'endowment fund corpus' means an amount equal to the grant or grants awarded under this section plus an amount equal to such grant or grants provided by the institution.

"(C) The term 'endowment fund income' means an amount equal to the total value of the endowment fund established under this section minus the endowment fund corpus.

"(b)(1) From sums available for this section under section 347, the Secretary is authorized to award endowment grants to eligible institutions of higher education to establish or increase an endowment fund at such institution. Such grants shall be made only to eligible institutions described in paragraph (4) whose applications have been approved pursuant to subsection (g).

"(2) No institution shall receive a grant under this section, unless such institution has deposited in its endowment fund established under this section an amount equal to the amount of such grant. The source of funds for this institutional match shall not include Federal funds or funds from an existing endowment fund.

"(3)(A) The period of a grant under this section shall be not more than twenty years.

"(B) During the grant period, an institution may not withdraw or expend any of the endowment fund corpus.

"(C) After the termination of the grant period, an institution may use the endowment fund corpus plus any endowment fund income for any educational purpose.

"(4)(A) An institution of higher education is eligible to receive a grant under this section if it is an eligible institution as described in section 331(a)(1).

"(B) No institution shall be ineligible for an endowment grant for a fiscal year by reason of the previous receipt of such a grant, but no institution shall be eligible to receive such a grant for more than two fiscal years out of any period of five consecutive fiscal years.

"(5) An endowment grant under this section to an eligible institution year shall—

"(A) not be less than $50,000 for any fiscal year; and

"(B) not be more than (i) $250,000 for fiscal year 1984; or (ii) $500,000 for fiscal year 1985 or any succeeding fiscal year.

"(6)(A) An eligible institution may designate a foundation, which was established for the purpose of raising money for the institution, as the recipient of the grant awarded under this section.

"(B) The Secretary shall not award a grant to a foundation on behalf of an institution unless—

"(i) the institution assures the Secretary that the foundation is legally authorized to receive the endowment fund corpus and is legally authorized to administer the fund in accordance with this section and any implementing regulations;

"(ii) the foundation agrees to administer the fund in accordance with the requirements of this section and any implementing regulations; and

"(iii) the institution agrees to be liable for any violation by the foundation of the provisions of this section and any implementing regulations, including any monetary liability that may arise as a result of such violation.

"(c)(1) An institution awarded a grant under this section shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary containing satisfactory assurances that it will (A) immediately comply with the matching requirements of subsection (b)(2), (B) establish an endowment fund independent of any other such fund of the institution, (C) invest the endowment fund corpus, and (D) meet the other requirements of this section.

"(2)(A) An institution shall invest the endowment fund corpus and endowment fund income in low-risk securities in which a regulated insurance company may invest under the law of the State in which the institution is located such as a federally insured bank savings account or comparable interest bearing account, certificate of deposit, money market fund, mutual fund, or obligations of the United States.

"(B) The institution, in investing the endowment fund established under this section, shall exercise the judgment and care, under the circumstances then prevailing, which a person of prudence, discretion, and intelligence would exercise in the management of his own affairs.

"(3)(A) An institution may withdraw and expend the endowment fund income to defray any expenses necessary to the operation of such college, including expenses of operations and maintenance, administration, academic and support personnel, construction and renovation, community and student services programs, and technical assistance.

"(B)(i) Except as provided in clause (ii), an institution may not spend more than 50 per centum of the total aggregate endowment fund income earned prior to the time of expenditure.

"(ii) The Secretary may permit an institution to spend more than 50 per centum of the endowment fund income notwithstanding clause (i) if the institution demonstrates such an expenditure is necessary because of (I) a financial emergency, such as a pending insolvency or temporary liquidity problem; (II) a life-threatening situation occasioned by a natural disaster or arson; or (III) another unusual occurrence or exigent circumstance.

"(d)(1) If at any time an institution withdraws part of the endowment fund corpus, it shall repay to the Secretary an amount equal to 50 per centum of the withdrawn amount, which represents the Federal share, plus income earned thereon. The Secretary may use such repaid funds to make additional endowment grants, or to increase existing endowment grants, to other eligible institutions.

"(2) If an institution expends more of the endowment fund income than is permitted under subsection (c), the grantee shall repay the Secretary an amount equal to 50 per centum of the amount improperly expended (representing the Federal share thereof). The Secretary may use such repaid fund to make additional endowment grants, or to increase existing endowment grants, to other eligible institutions.

"(e) An institution receiving a grant under this section shall provide to the Secretary (or his designee) such information (or access thereto) as may be necessary to audit or ex-

amine expenditures made from the endowment fund corpus or income in order to determine compliance with this section.

"(f) In selecting eligible institutions for grants under this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall—

"(1) give priority to an applicant which is a recipient of a grant made under part A or B of this title during the academic year in which the applicant is applying for a grant under this section; and

"(2) give priority to an applicant with a greater need for such a grant, based on the current market value of the applicant's existing endowment in relation to the number of full-time equivalent students enrolled at such institution;

"(3) consider—

"(A) the effort made by the applicant to build or maintain its existing endowment fund; and

"(B) the degree to which an applicant proposes to match the grant with nongovernmental funds.

"(g) Any institution which is eligible for assistance under this section may submit to the Secretary a grant application at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary may prescribe. Subject to the availability of appropriations to carry out this section and consistent with the requirement of subsection (f), the Secretary may approve an application for a grant if an institution, in its application, provides adequate assurances that it will comply with the requirements of this section.

"(h)(1) After notice and an opportunity for a hearing, the Secretary may terminate and recover a grant awarded under this section if the grantee institution—

"(A) expends portions of the endowment fund corpus or expends more than the permissible amount of the endowment funds income as prescribed in subsection (c)(3);

"(B) fails to invest the endowment fund in accordance with the investment standards set forth in subsection (c)(2); or

"(C) fails to properly account to the Secretary concerning the investment and expenditures of the endowment funds.

"(2) If the Secretary terminates a grant under paragraph (1), the grantee shall return to the Secretary an amount equal to the sum of the original grant or grants under this section plus income earned thereon. The Secretary may use such repaid funds to make additional endowment grants, or to increase existing endowment grants, to other eligible institutions.".

SEC. 3. Section 347 of the Act is amended—

(1) by inserting after the period at the end of subsection (a)(2) the following: "Of the amount appropriated for such part for fiscal year 1984, 20 per centum shall be available for grants under section 333 of such part, and of the amount appropriated for such part for fiscal year 1985, 100 per centum shall be available for grants under such section"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) For each fiscal year, the Secretary may reserve from the appropriation for part B not more than an amount equal to the aggregate amount grantees receiving grants under part B would contribute under section 324 to the cost of the grants in that fiscal year, assuming the grant amounts remain the same as those received in the prior fiscal year, and may use those funds to award grants to eligible institutions under section 333. In reserving and awarding such funds, the Secretary shall assure that funds that would have been reserved under part B for the institutions described in subsection (c) or (e) shall continue to be set aside under section 333 for those institutions.".

SEC. 4. (a) Section 516(c) of the Omnibus Education Reconciliation Act of 1981 is amended by striking out paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The total amount of appropriations to carry out title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 shall not exceed $134,416,000 for fiscal year 1984.".

(b) Section 503 of such Act is amended by striking out "1982, 1983, and 1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1982 and 1983 and $159,700,000 for fiscal year 1984".

(c) Notwithstanding section 516(g) of such Act, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out parts A and B of title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

(d) Subsections (a)(2), (b), and (c) of section 721 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 shall not apply to funds appropriated by Public Law 98-63 for part B of title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Such funds shall be used in accordance with section 713(g) of such Act and distributed in accordance with the statement of the managers pertaining to the appropriation of such funds, as contained in the conference report on Public Law 98-63 (H. Rep. 98-308, p. 53).

Mr. BAKER, Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

INTERVENTION OF SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, next I send to the desk a Senate resolution for myself and the distinguished minority leader, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 227) to direct the Senate Legal Counsel to intervene in the name of the Select Committee on Intelligence in Maryann Paisley v. Central Intelligence Agency, et al.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BAKER. The oversight of intelligence agencies is a vital function of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. In furtherance of that responsibility, the committee from time to time will make certain congressional documents available to those agencies for limited purposes. To facilitate this interchange it is important to recognize the continuing congressional control of these documents, and their confidentiality until released by the committee which created them. A recent decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, in the case of Maryann Paisley against Central Intelligence Agency, presents serious difficulties to this necessary exchange of information. At the request of the leadership of the Intelligence Committee, the following resolution will direct the Senate legal counsel to intervene in that case in the name of the committee to seek review of critical portions of the court's ruling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 227) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 227

Whereas, in the case of Maryann Paisley v. Central Intelligence Agency, et al., No. 82-1799, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit held that documents created by the Select Committee on Intelligence are not exempt congressional records under the Freedom of Information Act;

Whereas, the Court's decision threatens the ability of the Select Committee on Intelligence to fulfill its oversight responsibilities through the exchange of documents with the executive branch;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(c), 706(a), and 713(a) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (2 U.S.C. §§288b(c), 288e(a), 288l(a) (Supp. V 1981)), the Senate may direct its Counsel to intervene in the name of a committee of the Senate in any legal action in which the powers and responsibilities of Congress under the Constitution are placed in issue;

Whereas, the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence have requested that the Senate Legal Counsel be authorized to intervene in this case in the name of the Committee for the purposes of petitioning for rehearing and participating in any further proceedings; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is directed to intervene in the name of the Select Committee on Intelligence in the case of Maryann Paisley v. Central Intelligence Agency, et al.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution 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 EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, finally, I say to the minority leader that there are certain items on today's Executive Calendar that have been cleared on this side. I specifically invite his attention to those nominations under New Reports, beginning with Department of State on page 1; all of the nominations on page 1 following New Reports,

and all of the nominations on page 2 and page 3.

May I inquire of the minority leader if he is prepared to consider all or any part of these nominations?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, all of the nominees so named have been cleared on this side of the aisle, with the exception of Calendar No. 312 on page 3.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now go into executive session for the purpose of considering the nominations just identified, excluding nomination No. 312 as identified by the minority leader.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Peter Jon de Vos, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Republic of Mozambique.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. BAKER. I move to reconsider the vote by which the nomination was considered and confirmed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMBASSADOR

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Millicent Fenwick, of New Jersey, for the rank of Ambassador during the tenure of her service as U.S. Representative to the Food and Agriculture Organizations in Rome.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to serve with Millicent Fenwick for 4 years as a member of the New Jersey delegation to Congress. I can say without reservation that the President could not have selected someone who will bring greater dedication and more energy to the task of resolving the staggering problem of world hunger.

Millicent's life for the last two decades has been testament to her commitment to improving the lives of those around her—starting as a member of her local borough council, then as chairman of the Governor's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, as cochairman of New Jersey's bipartisan conference on civil rights, as director of the New Jersey Division of Consumer Affairs, and finally, in her 8-year career as a Member of Congress.

Millicent also has the remarkable ability to get people to like her and admire her. Combined with her determination and dedication, I am sure we will have a potent force for action when we confirm Millicent Fenwick and start her on yet another exemplary career in public service.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is set to approve the nomination of Millicent Fenwick to be Ambassador and U.S. Representative to the Food and Agriculture Organizations of the United Nations in Rome. While in the Congress, Mrs. Fenwick was a strong force for the poor and disadvantaged in countries throughout the world. I know she will bring the same compassion and experience to bear in this often neglected, yet vital part of our international relations.

The United States traditionally has played a key role in world food and agricultural problem solving, including food and agricultural research and development, the furtherance of food security in the Third World, and in general economic development. Our contributions go far beyond emergency relief to assistance in providing a safe, nutritious, and reliable food supply for every person in every country.

Still, there may be as many as 600-million people each day in developing countries who do not have access to enough food to meet their nutritional needs. According to food and agriculture organizations and World Health Organization figures, that is about 46 percent of the total population in those developing countries.

Whether the problem is one simply of insufficient food supply or one of inadequate access or distribution of food, there is a need for the United States to provide bold leadership in the international effort to find solutions. We need an Ambassador-level appointee to focus our efforts in this regard. Our country will be well served by an experienced and committed individual like Mrs. Fenwick to press forward these programs, both in Rome and here in Washington, D.C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. BAKER. I move to reconsider the vote by which the nomination was considered and confirmed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

The assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of:

Chester A. Crocker, an Assistant Secretary of State, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation.

Francis Stephen Ruddy, an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation.

Patsy Baker Blackshear, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation.

Charles G. Wells, of Illinois, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation.

William F. Pickard, of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc and confirmed.

Mr. BAKER. I move to reconsider the vote by which the nominations were considered and confirmed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING

The assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of:

Joseph Lane Kirkland, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board for International Broadcasting;

Arch L. Madsen, of Utah, to be a member of the Board for International Broadcasting;

James Albert Michener, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Board for International Broadcasting;

Clair W. Burgener, of California, to be a member of the Board for International Broadcasting; and

Malcolm Forbes, Jr., of New Jersey, to be a member of the Board for International Broadcasting;

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations were considered en bloc and confirmed.

Mr. BAKER. I move to reconsider the vote by which the nominations were considered and confirmed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry F. Schickling, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. BAKER. I move to reconsider the vote by which the nomination was considered and confirmed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Katherine D. Ortega, of New Mexico, to be Treasurer of the United States.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am very pleased to report the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on Finance that the Senate give its advice and consent to the nomination of Ms. Katherine D. Ortega, whom President Reagan has nominated to be Treasurer of the United States. I believe that Senator DOMENICI, who is well acquainted with Ms. Ortega and who introduced her to our committee, along with Representative LUJAN, will concur in my judgment that Ms. Ortega brings outstanding credentials to this important position. Her nomination continues the pattern of outstanding nominees the committee has recently considered for various Government posts.

A recent commercial for the American Express Co. features a former Treasurer asking, "Do you know me?"—an ironic query, because the Treasurer's signature appears on millions of pieces of U.S. currency. In view of her qualifications, I suspect Ms. Ortega's face as well as her name will become well known to all of us in the years to come.

The low profile of Treasurers in the past perhaps resulted from the relatively narrow range of responsibilites entrusted to them. That has changed in the Reagan administration. Secretary Regan has assigned the Treasurer management responsibilities for the Bureau of the Mint, the Bureau of Printing and Engraving, and the U.S. savings bond program. Thus, if confirmed, Ms. Ortega will be responsible, among other things, for producing the Nation's coins, including special coins such as ones for the Olympics; protecting the integrity of its currency; processing and safeguarding its bullion; supporting the management of its debt; and convincing its citizens to invest in the Nation's bonds. Over 5,000 employees will assist her in these endeavors, and she will administer budgets totalling $280 million.

Fortunately, Ms. Ortega brings excellent qualifications to this position of increased responsibility. After completing an economics and business degree in 2½ years, Ms. Ortega commenced a distinguished career as an accountant and banker. Along the way she has been a tax supervisor with Peat, Marwick, Mitchell, & Co.; vice president and cashier of Pan American National Bank; president and director of Santa Ana State Bank in California; and commissioner of the Copyright Royalty Tribunal. She was the first woman to serve as president of a bank in the State of California, a distinction that particularly qualified her for her recent service on President Reagan's Advisory Committee on Small and Minority Business Ownership.

Ms. Ortega, a native of New Mexico, posseses the finest traits of integrity and industry characteristic of her native State—and, I should add, of its elected representatives. She will make a fine Treasurer, and I urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, it is my distinct pleasure to be here on the floor of the U.S. Senate today for a very important occasion. Today marks another step in the confirmation process of Katherine D. Ortega to serve as the 38th Treasurer of the United States.

I am very pleased to recommend confirmation of Katherine Ortega to be U.S. Treasurer. Katherine was born and educated in New Mexico, and I am proud of the accomplishments of this fine and outstanding woman.

New Mexico is a State with a reasonably small population. Everybody knows everybody. We keep track of the children that grow up and leave and make significant contributions to society. We have all watched Katherine's development and have all kept track of her achievements over the years. New Mexico was proud of her when she graduated with honors. She completed her B.A. degree in business and economics at Eastern New Mexico University in just 2½ years. Her hometown of Alamogordo smiled approvingly when she passed her C.P.A. exam and joined the family-owned accounting firm. Folks were not too surprised, though, because her eight older brothers and sisters had already established the family as business leaders in the community. In fact, she was the third C.P.A. in the family.

Her friends in New Mexico encouraged her when, in the late 1960's, she became a tax supervisor with a "big eight" public accounting firm. Her aunts and sisters were particularly proud because, in 1969, Katherine was one of a rare number of female accountants employed at a top national accounting firm. It was not long until Katherine achieved the honor of being the first woman bank president in the history of the State of California. Justifiable pride was bolstered again 7 years later, in 1982, when Katherine was appointed by President Reagan and confirmed by the Senate to be a Commissioner for the Copyright Royalty Tribunal, in Washington, D.C.

People in New Mexico have watched Katherine Ortega move through progessively more responsible positions. Even though she moved away, strong family ties to New Mexico remain strong. She has served as consultant to Otero Savings & Loan Association in Alamogordo, N. Mex. This is a family-owned institution, and Katherine's sister is on its board of directors.

This brief outline of her career is evidence of her success and ability, but up until now, as far as I know, no one has asked for Katherine's autograph. However, with her appointment to serve as the U.S. Treasurer her signature will be well-known and appreciated since it will appear on all new U.S. currency. In addition to this special honor, her responsibilities will include managing the Bureau of the Mint, the Bureau of Engraving, and the U.S. Savings Bond program. She will have 5,000 employees and a budget of $280 million.

I heard Katherine speak at the White House ceremony for Hispanic Heritage Week earlier this week. I was inspired by her remarks. She talked about how her Hispanic tradition gave her a strong devotion to her family. She talked about a heritage of hard work, patience, determination, and perserverance. She acknowledged that our social, economic, and political systems make upward mobility and success possible. Katherine has worked hard, been patient but determined. By anybody's measure, she achieved success in her community, in the financial world and in the Reagan administration and I am confident she will serve well as the next Treasurer of the United States.

I am very pleased that once again, a New Mexican is being selected to serve as the U.S. Treasurer. Francine Erving Neff was the last New Mexican to mind the mint. That was in 1974.

I believe that the President has nominated a remarkably qualified and capable person. I was pleased that the Finance Committee acted with such expeditious speed on her nomination and I hope that the Senate will vote favorably on her nomination.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. BAKER. I move to reconsider the vote by which the nomination was considered and confirmed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the United States be immediately notified that the Senate has given its consent to these nominations.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now return to legislative session.

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

BILL HELD AT THE DESK—H.R.3871

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have a request that H.R. 3871, which has reached us from the other body, be held at the desk until the close of business tomorrow.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there are two rule XIV matters, I believe, to be taken up. I notice the Senator from West Virginia, the minority leader, has one. I believe the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) has another. I yield so the minority leader may seek recognition.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the majority leader.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT AREAS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I understand that a message from the House is at the desk with reference to H.R. 1036.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1036) to provide employment opportunities to long-term unemployed individuals in high unemployment areas in projects to repair and renovate vitally needed community facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD. Now, Mr. President, I ask for second reading.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I object to further consideration of the bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been received and read the first time today, and objection having been made to the second reading, it will be held at the desk pending its second reading on the third legislative day.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I understand Senator HELMS will not pursue the rule 14 matter he was interested in. I shall withdraw that request.

I have a second remaining in morning business. I thank all Senators for giving us the opportunity to intervene at this time. I repeat there will be no more rollcall votes tonight. I invite the managers of the bill to proceed as they can on amendments without rollcall.

NATIONAL BUSINESSWOMEN'S DAY

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, in noting this day as National Businesswomen's Day many persons will rightfully applaud the tremendous inroads American women have made in the business world during the last decade. Statistics will be cited, indicating that not only do women comprise more than half of the labor force as a whole, but they are increasingly visible as executives and managers. Such achievement will be underscored by the fact that women are also branching out into fields and careers heretofore dominated by men. Clearly this represents great progress from which we all derive not only many benefits, but great pride as well. And certainly this overall achievement for women as a group cannot be noted without extending the highest praise to the pioneers among them who reached the top of their professions—along a road, which, I might add, they often had to forego alone.

I rise today not only to join in the commemoration of these advances and recognize how pivotal the contributions of American businesswomen have been to our Nation's success, but to rally support for an even greater presence of women at all levels of business. For while 40 percent of the largest U.S. corporations have at least one woman on the board of directors, a fourfold increase over the last decade, and there are currently 527 directorships held by women, this represents only 3 percent of the total seats on these major boards. What these numbers can be translated to read is that the unique perception, experience, and expertise of women is, to a great extent, absent in many areas of American business. This can only be viewed as a detriment to national progress—particularly at a time when we are seeking ways to revitalize American industry. To achieve this we require determination, stamina, and the courage to present new options and initiatives. American businesswomen at all levels have demonstrated, often in the face of great obstacles, just these characteristics. And it is for this reason that in our collective effort to strengthen the American economy and provide greater opportunity for all of our citizens, we must make exhaustive efforts to insure that the insights of more than half our population become increasingly decisive.

As we all know, American business wields a tremendous amount of power in this country, which is why a statement made by Frederick Douglass on Government seems applicable to me about business:

A government by man alone is at best only a half supplied government. It is like a bird with one wing * * * unable to soar * * * to the highest and best.

In marking National Businesswomen's Day, let us not, in celebrating the achievement of the past, forget that in order to reach our full potential, we need even more women in places of power.

Honoring American businesswomen today reminds me that women in the work force have created some situations that require congressional attention. Breaks in service rules, pensions, child care are three areas that need legislative updating because so many women work. Equal pay for equal work is still an ideal, but one that this Congress is very much committed to. I am very pleased with some of the initiatives that are working their way through the legislative process of the Congress. At least three very important committees, the Finance Committee, the Judiciary Committee, and the Labor and Human Resources Committee are addressing issues that focus on the working woman. Last week the Judiciary Committee marked up S. 501 which is a bill which will eliminate more than 150 discriminatory references in the United States Code. Those statutes comprise the Federal laws of our land.

The Finance Committee has had a full agenda regarding economic equity. S. 19 deals with pension reform; S. 1691 addresses the problem of delinquent child support. There are bills to increase the child care tax credit and to make it refundable so as to be more beneficial to lower income earners. I anticipate that several of these bills will be passed by this Congress.

The increased employment participation of women is one of the most important employment trends in this century. The contributions that American businesswomen make to our economy and society deserve our attention, not only today but throughout the years.

HENRY M. JACKSON

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this eulogy of Senator Henry M. Jackson printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Wiesel was a friend and admirer of Senator Jackson as noted by his touching statement.

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

HENRY M. JACKSON

It was a moment that stood on the other side of time, on the other side of existence. On the heels of the American liberators, a Congressional delegation arrived in Buchenwald on April 12, 1945. Our eyes met in a unique encounter, one that left an indelible imprint on the consciousness of both. In that moment of grace, I could not have pos-

sibly foreseen that this fateful meeting between the representative of the free world, Henry M. Jackson, and the emaciated young boy would be just the first of many. What Jackson saw then colored his philosophical and political life. In his persistence to remind the world that only by the collective effort of free humanity can the future of liberty be safeguarded, Jackson became a witness to the past he had seen in Buchenwald. For Jackson, true to his beliefs, a sentiment turned into thought, and thought yielded action.

AMERICAN BUSINESS WOMEN'S DAY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise to call attention to the fact that today, September 22, 1983, has been designated by Congress as "American Business Women's Day."

Each day, millions of women in our country enter the business world to face the demands and challenges of their occupations, taking on great responsibilities and making difficult decisions that affect virtually every American. Businesses, large and small, depend on their expertise and skillful execution of their respective tasks.

We have seen the growing working force of American women change the dynamics of our society. Their countless contributions are significant, and their influence continues to make a positive impact on our country.

Mr. President, it is altogether appropriate that this day is officially set apart as "American Business Women's Day." I am pleased that Congress has made this designation, and it is my hope that all Americans will appreciate and recognize, not only today, but every day, the valuable role of American business women.

SENATOR NUNN

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, over the years, SAM NUNN has built up a reputation as an exceptionally talented, hard working, and articulate Senator—and a leader on matters relating to defense. On the Senate Armed Services Commitee, where SAM and I serve together, he commands the respect of Republicans as well as Democrats.

Bernard Weintraub, of the New York Times recently wrote a profile of our colleague and Georgia's senior Senator which appeared on September 20. Mr. Weintraub described SAM'S rapid rise within our ranks—and how, at the relatively young age of 45, he has become the ranking Democrat on the Armed Services Committee.

We all know that nobody can fill the shoes of Scoop Jackson. But nobody that I know can come closer to doing that than my friend, SAM NUNN.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Weintraub's profile of SAM be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Sept. 20, 1983]

IF THE QUESTION IS MILITARY, ASK NUNN

(By Bernard Weintraub)

WASHINGTON, Sept. 19—On the Senate floor the older men cluster around the slight, dapper figure with oversize spectacles, a pinstripe suit, glistening loafers and a soft Georgia drawl.

"When I came here in 1972 it wasn't very popular for new Senators to be involved in military issues; there was the residue of Vietnam," said Senator Nunn. "I wanted to get involved. For me, personally, I guess I was born and bred into it."

At the age of 45, Sam Nunn, who has emerged in recent years as one of the most formidable and influential military specialists in Congress, is set to replace his mentor, the late Henry M. Jackson, as ranking Democrat on the Armed Services Committee.

The new job, and the possibility that, at a relatively young age, Mr. Nunn may one day take over as chairman of the powerful committee, should the Democrats regain control of the Senate, places Sam Nunn deep inside the fabric of power in the Washington establishment and makes him a dominant figure in Congress.

He speaks with a trace of mixed feelings about his new role and his voice shakes a bit when he is talking about "Scoop" Jackson. "From the day I got into the Senate I looked to Scoop for friendship and leadership," said Senator Nunn, seated in his office, staring at the window. "What I'll miss is being able to talk to him on a day to day basis about everything. He was one of those people you sort of took for granted, he was always available. The impact of his loss is not easy to comprehend."

HARD TO PLACE IDEOLOGICALLY

Even before Mr. Jackson's death, however, Senator Nunn was wielding considerable power in the Senate on military issues, a man whose rapid climb was attributed to his grasp of military data no matter how complicated, a prodigious appetite for work and a streak of independence that made him difficult to place ideologically. He speaks carefully, for example, about the Soviet downing of a Korean airliner and voices concern about the way the Reagan Administration has handled the details of what took place over Soviet territory.

"We would have been much better had we ascertained the facts and put out the worst side of our case first, rather than having it creep out incrementally," said Mr. Nunn, alluding to the disclosure several days after the fact that there had been an American reconnaissance plane in the area. "There's a real obligation of leadership in a crisis, in spite of the huge pressures, to try and get as complete a picture as possible before going to the world with charges, particularly in a nuclear age."

Mr. Nunn said quietly: "For the first time you've got a country that can, even by accident, destroy a huge segment of this country. Mistakes in the past, false charges, have never been that serious. Now they are. The public, the Congress, the news media, the Administration has got to realize that in the future, as we have other crises, it's enormously important to hold your tongue unless you really know all the facts."

Samuel Augustus Nunn grew up on a large pecan farm in Perry, Ga. After graduating from Emory University Law School in 1962, he went to Washington and took a job with the House Armed Services Committee.

Six years later he was selected to the state Legislature, and in 1972, when one of the Senate's titans. Richard Russell of Georgia, died, Mr. Nunn successfully ran for the vacant Senate seat.

Mr. Russell, who had made his name on military issues was, in fact, one of Mr. Nunn's models. So was Mr. Nunn's great-uncle, Carl Vinson, who for 51 years was a member of the House and the first chairman of its Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Nunn immediately sought a seat on the Senate Armed Services panel, partly because Georgia has numerous Army and Air Force bases, as well as a large retired military population. Under the tutelege of two senior committee members, Senators Jackson and John C. Stennis, Democrat of Mississippi, Mr. Nunn quickly emerged as a forceful debater and analyst in the fields of nuclear weapons, the Atlantic alliance and manpower.

What made Mr. Nunn somewhat unusual, too, was that he shunned the kind of publicity that some of his colleagues craved. He once turned down a staff suggestion to subpoena Meyer Lansky to a narcotics hearing "because he wasn't relevant."

Mr. Nunn describes himself as a "common-sense conservative." A liberal group, Americans for Democratic Action, gave him a rating last year, based on stands on 20 key issues, of 45 percent.

HUGE BUILDUP IN HARDWARE

Mr. Nunn speaks with mild approval of President Reagan's military policies. "They've made defense their No. 1 priority, and I think that's appropriate and overdue," he said. "I would say manpower quality has improved significantly, both in terms of recruitment and retention, although this is due to high youth unemployment. That's the upside of the economic downside."

He expressed worry, however, that there is no "real soul searching" on the part of the Administration about priorities, that the "huge buildup" in military hardware will be accomplished at the expense of certain programs viewed as essential by Mr. Nunn. These include "readiness" measures such as purchases of spare parts and ammunition, better training, more flying time for pilots. These relatively mundane programs, while crucial, have rarely held top priority within the military and Congressional establishment.

Mr. Nunn said there was "an overload in the strategic budget," with two missile programs and two bomber projects that he said would "squeeze readiness."

"I don't think they've thought through their overall military strategy," said the Senator. "I don't think there's an adequate sense of what we really expect our military forces to do."

Mr. Nunn said he had not yet decided who to support in the Democratic Presidential race, but would probably make up his mind before the Georgia primary next March. "I'll make my decision on the basis of who is strong on defense and foreign policy and who I think can carry the South," he said.

Mr. Nunn said he was still somewhat concerned that elements of the Democratic Party who support a nuclear freeze would seek to take over. "I hope not," he said with a slow smile. "I'll do my best to prevent that."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:32 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks,

announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1036. An act to provide employment opportunities to long-term unemployed individuals in high unemployment areas in projects to repair and renovate vitally needed community facilities, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

H.R. 3914. An act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make an earlier announcement of the 1984 crop feed grain program and of the 1985 crop wheat and feed grain programs; and

H.J. Res. 229. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating April 22 through April 28, 1984, as "National Organ Donation Awareness Week."

The enrolled bill and joint resolution were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

At 6:22 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3363) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes; it agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. YATES, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. DICKS, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. LOEFFLER, and Mr. CONTE as managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2972) to authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1984, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1850. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend for 1 year the authority of the Veterans' Administration to provide certain contract medical services in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution to correct the enrollment of S. 602.

HOUSE MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill received from the House of Representatives was read the first time:

H.R. 1036. An act to provide employment opportunities to long-term unemployed individuals in high unemployment areas in projects to repair and renovate vitally needed community facilities, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DURENBERGER, from the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

A report to accompany the bill (S. 1510) to establish uniform single financial audit requirements for State and local governments and nonprofit organizations and other recipients of Federal assistance, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 1873. A bill to require the President to report to Congress by July 1, 1987, concerning the need for a new educational assistance program for service members to assist in the recruitment and retention of qualified personnel in the Armed Forces, and to provide for the expeditious consideration of proposed legislation establishing such a program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRANSTON:

S. 1874. A bill to provide for the restoration of the fish and wildlife in the Trinity River basin, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. GARN (for himself and Mr. PROXMIRE) (by request):

S. 1875. A bill to permit the payment of interest on demand deposits held by depository institutions; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LAXALT (for himself and Mr. HECHT):

S. 1876. A bill to allow advertising of any State sponsored lottery, gift enterprise, or similar scheme; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFLIN:

S. 1877. A bill to provide for braille imprinting of U.S. currency; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE:

S. 1878. A bill to provide for seabed boundary agreements between the United States and any coastal State and the immobilization of the seabed boundary of any State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. TRIBLE):

S. 1879. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to revise the authority to reimburse Federal employees for certain moving expenses incurred by such employees in connection with a transfer or reassignment in the interest of the Government from one official station or agency to another for permanent duty; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1880. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to include chiropractic care in the health care that may be provided to members and certain former members of the uniformed services their dependents and to authorize chiropractors to be appointed as commissioned officers in the Armed Forces to provide such chiropractic care; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRANSTON (for himself and Mr. TSONGAS):

S.J. Res. 169. Joint resolution concerning the assassination of Benigno Aquino; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. WALLOP, Mr. BOSCHWITZ and Mr. MELCHER):

S. Res. 225. Resolution relating to the dismantling of nontariff trade barriers of the Japanese to the import of beef; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAKER:

S. Res. 226. Resolution relative to committee assignments for Senator DANIEL J. EVANS; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. Res. 227. Resolution to direct the Senate legal counsel to intervene in the name of the Select Committee on Intelligence in Maryann Paisley v. Central Intelligence Agency, et al.; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 1873. A bill to require the President to report to Congress by July 1, 1987, concerning the need for a new educational assistance program for service members to assist in the recruitment and retention of qualified personnel in the Armed Forces, and to provide for the expeditious consideration of proposed legislation establishing such a program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION READINESS ACT OF 1983

● Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today which is designed to address a concern which I share with many of my colleagues, regarding problems that may arise in the future in the recruitment and retention of qualified personnel in the Armed Forces. This legislation, the proposed Recruitment and Retention Readiness Act of 1983, would require the President to report to the Congress on a date no later than July 1, 1987, or such earlier time as the need may arise, concerning the need for new incentives, including a new educational assistance program for service members, in order to assist in the recruitment and retention of qualified

personnel in the Armed Forces, and would provide for the expeditious consideration of such legislation as the President may propose in order to accomplish that goal.

Mr. President, in a letter of August 3 of this year, addressed to me as chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I was requested to schedule a markup of peacetime GI bill legislation some time during this month or the next. The letter was signed by six members of the committee, including all minority members and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER). The letter expressed support for the GI bill legislation which has been introduced by the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ARMSTRONG) as S. 1747, and expressed the feeling that such a measure should proceed through the committee process.

Mr. President, as my colleagues will recall, when S. 1747 came before the Senate 2 months ago, on July 13, 1983, in its earlier incarnation as an amendment to S. 675, the Defense Authorization Act, I raised my voice in what I hope was reasoned opposition to such an amendment—and a spirited and very thorough and enlightening debate ensued. Ultimately, the amendment failed by a vote of 52 to 46 on a point of order raised under sections 303 and 311 of the Budget Act.

Nevertheless, the continuing level of interest in this legislation, which is reflected in the letter which I have mentioned as being received from my colleagues on the committee, has persuaded me that it is appropriate to provide a current full and fair forum to facilitate and encourage discussion on the type of issues which are raised by S. 1747.

In order to insure that such a forum will be available, and in recognition of the fact that S. 1747 in its present form contains certain new features—most notably, the 1987 effective date which was the source of the Budget Act problems—I have directed that the Veterans' Affairs Committee will conduct hearings to explore the need for GI bill legislation now and in the foreseeable future, and to consider how best to deal with such needs as may arise.

I trust that the bill which I am introducing today will contribute constructively to that discussion.

Mr. President, my bill—the proposed Recruitment and Retention Readiness Act of 1983—would require the President to submit to Congress a thorough report on the status of recruitment and retention in the Armed Forces during the next 4 years, including an assessment of possible solutions, if problems have arisen, and such draft legislation as may be necessary. The report would be required to be submitted no later than July 1, 1987—or on such earlier date as the President might determine that recruitment and retention difficulties exist and that the establishment of a new program of educational assistance for service members is necessary in the national interest of the United States. Any draft legislation proposed by the President in connection with the report would then be required to be considered by Congress according to a strictly established and expedited 90-day schedule: as specified in the bill, the committee or committees to which the President's proposed legislation had been referred would be required to report it within 45 days, or be automatically discharged from further consideration of it; a vote on final passage of the legislation would be required in both Houses 15 days thereafter; and an additional 30 days would be provided for conference on the possible differences between the House and Senate versions, and then final passage of the conference report.

I do emphasize, Mr. President, that my bill would permit us to accomplish all the purposes of S. 1747 and would permit us to respond just as swiftly in the event that a need appears for GI bill-type legislation—but it has certain added advantages. Like S. 1747, it would require that the President inform the Congress of any serious recruitment and retention problems that may arise between now and 1987. And like S. 1747, there is a 90-day period for congressional action before any legislation would take effect. And where S. 1747 would require that the education programs set forth in it must automatically take effect no later than October 1, 1987, my bill would require the President to submit the recruitment-and-retention report described in the bill at a time 90 days earlier, in order that such legislation as may be necessary at that time could be enacted by October 1, 1987.

The significant advantages of my bill, as designed, are twofold: First, after there has been a Presidential determination that a need for legislation exists, both the President—in submitting the proposed legislation—and the Congress—in considering it—would have a full opportunity to tailor the legislation specifically to meet the needs that have been identified, unencumbered by the presumption of validity and the sense of legislative inertia which attaches to legislation which has already been enacted and which is simply waiting to take effect. The end result would be legislation which is fully responsive to the needs at that time. I would note that such uncertainty as may presently exist regarding our military situation in Central America and the Middle East, and about the manpower needs which might flow from that situation, would certainly lend an added importance to this consideration.

Second, my bill would not permit the curious result of enacting a major program which is designed to meet certain recruitment and retention needs, in the absence of any present determination that such a need exists. My bill reflects what I believe to be a very reasonable congressional policy that multibillion-dollar entitlement programs should not be enacted in the absence of some concurrent demonstration of a need for them. I should note that to the extent that it can be argued on the basis of information available today that a need will indeed exist in 1987, it is just as bizzare a congressional policy to enact legislation now based on that information which is to take effect at that time 4 years in the future, as it would be for us to enact legislation to take effect today based on some determination of need that was made 4 years ago—that is, through facts and figures and hearing records that were compiled in the summer of 1979. I believe that there is a much better way for Congress to do its business, and my bill suggests that way.

Mr. President, the Recruitment and Retention Readiness Act of 1983 would give Congress the opportunity, before enacting some very significant and costly entitlement legislation, to have an awareness of exactly where the problem lies and what it is, or whether it even exists at all, before crafting a legislative solution. Sounds like sense to me. I offer it as a constructive alternative to the various other pending legislative initiatives in the nature of a GI bill, and it is my hope that it will assist in sharpening the real issues, and ultimately will advance the goals which all of us share—which is to maintain a strong recruitment and retention effort, a strong Armed Forces, and a strong America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of S. 1873 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

S. 1873

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Recruitment and Retention Readiness Act of 1983".

SEC. 2. (a) The President, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to the Congress, at a time determined in accordance with the requirements of subsection (c), a report containing—

(1) information concerning the Armed Forces' recruitment and retention experiences in the preceding fiscal year and projected recruitment and retention performances for each of the five subsequent fiscal years, set forth according to branch of service, occupational specialty, and category of educational qualifications applicable in such branch of service in the case of a high school diploma graduate;

(2) an assessment of the additional marginal effectiveness of a new program of educational assistance for service members

(taking into consideration the projected costs thereof) in recruiting and retaining qualified personnel, in comparison with the effectiveness of the recruitment and retention capabilities of the Armed Forces under laws and regulations in effect at the time that the report is submitted, together with an assessment of other alternatives and their projected costs to enhance such recruitment and retention capabilities; and

(3) such proposed legislation (hereinafter referred to as the "bill") or proposals for administrative action as the President considers necessary and appropriate to address the recruitment and retention needs specified in such report.

(b) Prior to making a recommendation under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and obtain and review the recommendations of the Secretaries of the military departments in terms of the considerations specified in such subsection.

(c) The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than the earlier of—

(1) July 1, 1987; or

(2) such time as the President determines, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, that the Armed Forces are experiencing difficulties in recruiting and retaining qualified personnel, and that the establishment of a new program of educational assistance for service members is necessary in the national interest of the United States.

SEC. 3. (a) On the day on which the bill is submitted to the House of Representatives and the Senate under the first section, such bill shall be introduced (by request) in the House by the majority leader of the House, for himself and the minority leader of the House, or by Members of the House designated by the majority leader and minority leader of the House, and shall be introduced (by request) in the Senate by the majority leader of the Senate, for himself and the minority leader of the Senate, or by Members of the Senate designated by the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate. If either House is not in session on the day on which such bill is submitted, introduction in that House shall take place, as provided in the preceding sentence, on the first day thereafter on which that House is in session.

(b) If the committee or committees of either House to which the bill has been referred have not reported it at the end of the 45-day period beginning on the date of its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the bill and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. A vote on final passage of the bill shall be taken in each House on or before the close of the day which is 15 days after the date on which the bill is reported by the committee or committees of that House to which it was referred or such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the bill. If there are differences between the bill as passed by the two Houses, such differences shall be resolved in a committee of conference, and a vote on final passage of the conference report on the bill shall be taken in each House on or before the close of the day which is 30 days after the date of final passage of the bill in both Houses.●

By Mr. CRANSTON:

S. 1874. A bill to provide for the restoration of the fish and wildlife in the Trinity River Basin, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

RESTORATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE IN THE TRINITY RIVER BASIN

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the restoration of the fish and wildlife in the Trinity River Basin in California.

The Trinity River was once one of California's most bountiful salmon and steelhead streams. Thousands of people flocked to the Trinity annually, attracted by its fishery resource. However, since the completion of the Trinity River division of the Central Valley project in 1963, there has been a serious decline in the Trinity fishery.

The Trinity and Lewiston dams store and divert approximately 85 percent of the natural runoff of the upper Trinity River. Below Lewiston, the Trinity has been transformed from a highly fluctuating natural stream to one with consistently reduced flow. Natural spawning, holding, and food producing areas below Lewiston Dam have become strangled with willows, cattails, and alders. Anadromous fish are prevented from migrating to the once-productive upper watershed. Changed characteristics along with poor management practices in the watershed below Trinity Dam, overfishing of the river and fishery management problems have contributed to the dramatic decline in fish numbers. Annual runs of salmon and steelhead returning to the Trinity River fish hatchery have declined by as much as 90 percent.

Prompted by the urgent need for cooperative action on these problems, local, State, and Federal agencies formed the Trinity River Fish and Wildlife task force in 1974. Moneys to define and correct the fish and wildlife problems in the Trinity River Basin were provided to the task force through State and Federal appropriations from 1976–82. In March 1982, the task force unanimously approved and published the "Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Management Program." This report is a program for corrective action in the Trinity River Basin.

The bill I am introducing today would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to implement the management program developed by the task force. The ratio of costs to the fish and wildlife benefits expected from this program is estimated at 1 to 5. The bill also would reestablish the Trinity River task force to assist and advise the Secretary in implementing the program. Finally, this legislation would authorize $33 million for construction called for by the management program and $2.2 million annually for 10 years for operation, maintenance and monitoring purposes.

Mr. President, I want to point out that this legislation is identical to a bill, H.R. 1438, being sponsored in the House by Congressmen EUGENE CHAPPIE, DOUG BOSCO, and NORMAN SHUMWAY of California. It is supported by all of the members of the Trinity River task force, by the California north coast counties of Trinity, Humboldt, Mendocino, and Del Norte, by fisheries organizations, the local timber industry, and the California Water Commission.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

S. 1873

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDINGS

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that—

(1) the construction of the Trinity River division of the Central Valley project in California, authorized by the Act of August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 719), has substantially reduced the streamflow in the Trinity River Basin and badly damaged pools, spawning gravels, and rearing areas causing a drastic reduction in the anadromous fish populations and a decline in the scenic and recreational qualities of such river system;

(2) the loss of land areas inundated by two reservoirs constructed in connection with such project has caused substantial reductions in the populations of deer and other wildlife historically found in the Trinity River Basin;

(3) the Act referred to in paragraph (1) of this section directed the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") to take appropriate actions to insure the preservation and propagation of such fish and wildlife and additional authority was conferred on the Secretary under the Act approved September 4, 1980 (94 Stat. 1062), to take certain actions to mitigate the impact on fish and wildlife of the construction and operation of the Trinity River division;

(4) activities other than those related to the project have also had an effect on fish and wildlife populations in the Trinity River Basin and are of such a nature that the cause of any detrimental impact on such populations cannot be attributed solely to such activities or to the project;

(5) a fish and wildlife management program has been developed by an existing interagency advisory group called the Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Task Force; and

(6) the Secretary requires additional authority to implement a basin-wide fish and wildlife management program in order to achieve the long-term goal of restoring fish and wildlife populations in the Trinity River Basin at the level existing immediately before the start of the construction of the Trinity River division.

TRINITY RIVER BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 2. (a) Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary shall formulate and implement a fish and wildlife management program for the Trinity River Basin designed to restore the fish and wildlife populations in such basin to the levels existing immediately prior to the start of the construction re-

ferred to in section 1(1) and to maintain such levels. The program shall include the following activities:

(1) The design, construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities to—

(A) rehabilitate fish habitats in the Trinity River between Lewiston Dam and Weitchpec;

(B) rehabilitate fish habitats in tributaries of such river below Lewiston Dam and in the south fork of such river; and

(C) modernize and otherwise increase the effectiveness of the Trinity River Fish Hatchery.

(2) The establishment of a procedure to monitor (A) the fish and wildlife stock on a continuing basis, and (B) the effectiveness of the rehabilitation work.

(3) Such other activities as the Secretary determines to be necessary to achieve the long-term goal of the program.

(b)(1) The Secretary shall use the program described in section 1(5) of this Act as a basis for the management program to be formulated under subsection (a) of this section. In formulating and implementing such management program, the Secretary shall be assisted by an advisory group called the Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Task Force established under section 3.

(2) The Secretary shall coordinate the activities undertaken under such management program with the activities of State and local agencies, and the activities of other Federal agencies, which have responsibilities for managing public lands and natural resources within the Trinity River Basin.

TRINITY RIVER BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE TASK FORCE

SEC. 3. (a) There is established the Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Task Force (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Task Force") which shall be composed of fourteen members as follows:

(1) One officer or employee of the California Department of Fish and Game to be appointed by the administrative head of such department.

(2) One officer or employee of the California Department of Water Resources to be appointed by the administrative head of such department.

(3) One member or employee of the California Water Resources Control Board to be appointed by such board.

(4) One officer or employee of the California Department of Forestry to be appointed by the administrative head of such department.

(5) One officer or employee of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to be appointed by the Secretary.

(6) One officer or employee of the United States Bureau of Reclamation to be appointed by the Secretary.

(7) One officer or employee of the United States Bureau of Land Management to be appointed by the Secretary.

(8) One officer or employee of the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs to be appointed by the Secretary.

(9) One officer or employee of the United States Forest Service to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(10) One officer or employee of the United States Soil Conservation Service to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(11) One officer or employee of the United States National Marine Fisheries Service to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce.

(12) One individual to be appointed by the board of supervisors of Humboldt County, California.

(13) One individual to be appointed by the board of supervisors of Trinity County, California.

(14) One individual to be appointed by the Hoopa Tribe of the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation, California.

Any vacancy on the Task Force shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(b) If any member of the Task Force who was appointed to the Task Force as an officer or employee of a United States department or agency or as an officer or employee of a California State department or board leaves such office or employment, he may continue as a member of the Task Force for not longer than the end of the fourteen-day period beginning on the date he leaves such office or employment.

(c)(1) Members of the Task Force who are full-time officers or employees of the United States shall receive no additonal pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the Task Force.

(2) No moneys authorized to be appropriated under this Act may be used to pay any member of the Task Force for service on the Task Force or to reimburse any agency or governmental unit for the pay of any such member for such service.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated—

(1) for the construction authorized in this Act, beginning on October 1, 1984, and to remain available thereafter until expended, the sum of $33,000,000, or, if there is an increase or decrease in the engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved between the month of May 1982, and the date of enactment of any appropriation for such construction, such sum adjusted by such increase or decrease; and

(2) for the cost of the operations, maintenance, and monitoring authorized by this Act, the sum of $2,200,000 annually for a ten-year period beginning on October 1, 1984.

All costs incurred pursuant to this Act shall be nonreimbursable and nonrefundable.

By Mr. GARN (for himself and Mr. PROXMIRE) (by request):

S. 1875. A bill to permit the payment of interest on demand deposits held by depository institutions; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

DEMAND DEPOSIT DEREGULATION ACT

● Mr. GARN. Mr. President, at the request of the Depository Institutions Deregulation Committee, the distinguished ranking member of the Banking Committee, Senator PROXMIRE, and I are introducing today the Demand Deposit Deregulation Act, a bill to remove the statutory prohibition against the payment of interest on demand deposits.

The gradual removal of deposit interest rate ceilings was mandated in 1980 in the Depository Institutions Deregulation and Monetary Control Act. While that act authorized nationwide NOW accounts for individuals and established the Depository Institutions Deregulation Committee to implement the phaseout of deposit rate ceilings, the act did not affect the prohibition against interest on checking accounts.

During the past 3 years, the DIDC has removed ceilings on all deposits with terms of 31 days or more. The DIDC's work was greatly aided last year by the enactment of the Garn-St Germain Depository Institutions Act which established a money market deposit account with no rate ceiling and limited checking privileges.

Although much has been done to accomplish the objective of deregulating deposit rate controls, the interest on checking prohibition has been retained. With NOW accounts providing individuals with interest on a transaction account, and the money market deposit account providing limited checking privileges to both individual and business depositors, the only effect of the prohibition against interest on checking accounts is that businesses cannot have a fully transactionable, interest bearing account.

Small businesses have been especially disadvantaged by the prohibition because, unlike large corporations, they do not have direct access to the money markets or to sophisticated cash management techniques which minimize the amount of noninvested funds in large corporation's demand deposits. To achieve economies, small businesses have utilized money market funds and the new money market deposit account, but they still must rely on indirect or implicit means to overcome the disadvantages attached to noninterest checking accounts.

This bill has the support of all of the members of DIDC and they testified to that effect before the Banking Committee during the committee's hearings on pending banking bills last week. The only qualifications was how the proposal would be implemented. Specifically, support was expressed for interest on checking to be coupled with additional powers for banks in order for the institutions to be better able to cover the added costs associated with interest-bearing checking accounts.

I agree with those who want to insure that the removal of the prohibition be accomplished in a manner not detrimental to the financial institutions involved. The problem is that larger banks could cope with interest-bearing accounts better than smaller banks because the latter depend upon small business checking accounts more than the former. DIDC staff believes that the removal of the prohibition would cause short-term problems, perhaps a 5- to 10-percent reduction in bank earnings. To increase bank costs means increasing interest rates and squeezing earnings. Thus, during consideration of this proposal, ample attention must be given to the close interdependency of small banks and

small business in order that neither be inadvertently disadvantaged.

As chairman of the Banking Committee, I can assure my colleagues that this issue will continue to be focused on during the continuation of committee legislative hearings next month.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the bill, the section-by-section summary, and the transmittal letter from Secretary Regan be printed in full in the RECORD.

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

S. 1875

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 101. This Act may be cited as the "Demand Deposit Deregulation Act".

PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON DEMAND DEPOSITS

SEC. 102(a). The first and second sentences of section 19(i) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371a) are hereby repealed.

(b). The third sentence of section 19(i) of the Federal Reserve Act is amended by striking out "Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a" and inserting in lieu thereof "A".

SEC. 103. The first sentence of section 18(g)(1) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)(1)) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 104. The second sentence of section 5(b)(1)(B) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 1464(b)(1)(B)) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 105. Section 19(b) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461(b)) is amended by striking the last sentence in subparagraph (8)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "This subparagraph does not apply to (1) any category of deposits or accounts which are first authorized pursuant to Federal law in any State after April 1, 1980; nor (2) an amount equal to the amount by which current total demand deposits exceeds the amount of demand deposits held by the institution on a daily average basis during the 14-day period preceding the date of enactment of this Act, held by each depository institution located outside of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont, except as permitted by order or regulation of the Board.".

SEC. 106. Section 204 of Public Law 96-221 (12 U.S.C. 3503) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) The Deregulation Committee shall not later than six months from the effective date of this Act establish rules permitting the payment of interest on demand deposits at the same rates that are permitted for accounts subject to withdrawal by negotiable or transferable instrument for the purpose of making transfers to third parties authorized under section 2(a) of Public Law 93-100 (12 U.S.C. 1832(a)). Interest may not be paid by a depository institution on any demand deposit until such rules are issued by the Deregulation Committee.".

SEC. 107(a). Section 207(b)(2) of Public Law 96-221 (12 U.S.C. 3506(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows: "The first sentence of section 18(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)) is amended by striking out "payment and" and by striking out ", including limitations on the rates of interest and dividends that may be paid";".

(b). Section 207(b)(3) of Public Law 96-221 (12 U.S.C. 3506(b)(3)) is amended to read as follows: "The second, fourth and seventh sentences of section 18(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)) are hereby repealed;".

SEC. 108. The second sentence of section 203(b) of the Depository Institutions Deregulation Act of 1980 (12 U.S.C. 3502(b)) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 109. This Act shall take effect 180 days from the date of enactment, except that section 108 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SEC. 101. The title of the Act is the Demand Deposit Deregulation Act.

SEC. 102. This section repeals the prohibition in the Federal Reserve Act against payment of interest on demand deposits by member banks.

SEC. 103. This section repeals the provision in the Federal Deposit Insurance Act prohibiting the payment of interest on demand deposits held by insured nonmember banks and insured branches of foreign banks.

SEC. 104. This section repeals the provision in the Home Owners Loan Act prohibiting a federal savings and loan association or federal savings bank from paying interest on demand deposits.

SEC. 105. This section amends the transitional provisions for the phase-in of reserve requirements. When reserve requirements were instituted for all depository institutions, a transitional period of eight years was adopted to allow nonmember institutions to build up gradually to the required reserve level. (Member banks were given a shorter transitional period to adjust their reserves downward to the new level.) This transitional provision was adopted for two reasons: (1) to avoid an undue burden on nonmember institutions putting up reserves for the first time; and (2) to prevent disruption in the conduct of monetary policy through a sudden decrease in the amount of reserve balances held. NOW accounts were first authorized for all depository institutions (except those in New England, New York, and New Jersey where they had been authorized previously) effective after the implementation of the new reserve requirements. These accounts were exempted from the phase-in of reserve requirements because it would not be burdensome to depository institutions to hold full reserves against them since they were newly authorized accounts. However, when interest on demand deposits is permissible, nonmember depository institutions may attempt to avoid the full reserve requirement on NOW accounts by converting the accounts to demand deposits which are subject to the phase-in. Section 105 reduces the potential for avoidance of reserve requirements by requiring a nonmember depository institution to continue to hold full reserves against the amount by which an institution's total demand deposits exceeds the base of total demand deposits during a period immediately prior to the enactment of this bill. Nonmember depository institutions in New England, New York and New Jersey however would continue to receive the full phase-in of reserve requirements on NOW accounts and demand deposits. The Federal Reserve is given authority to make exceptions to this requirement.

SEC. 106. This section authorizes the DIDC to establish rules concerning the payment of interest on demand deposits. Such rules shall authorize interest to be paid on demand deposits under the same rate limitations as for NOW accounts. Therefore the Committee would be required to establish the same rate ceiling on demand depoits of under $2,500 as is established for NOW accounts of under $2,500. These regulations shall be implemented not later than six months from the effective date of the Act (one year from day of enactment).

SEC. 107. This section makes technical conforming changes to the Depository Institutions Deregulation Act of 1980.

SEC. 108. This provision removes the requirement that the DIDC meet in public at least quarterly.

SEC. 109. This section delays the effective date of the Act to allow depository institutions an opportunity to prepare for the operational changes made by the Act. The effective date for removing the requirement that the DIDC meet quarterly is effective immediately.

AUGUST 4, 1983.

Hon. JAKE GARN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Depository Institutions Deregulation Committee recently considered the question of whether and to what extent interest-bearing transaction accounts should be made available by depository institutions to members of the public not eligible to hold NOW accounts. In connection with this discussion, the Committee considered whether (1) it should authorize a fully transactional money market deposit account ("MMDA"), and (2) there should continue to be a statutory prohibition against paying interest on demand deposits by Federally-insured depository institutions. While the Committee is of the view that it can authorize a fully transactional MMDA, others question the Committee's authority in light of the statutory prohibition against paying interest on demand deposits. In order to eliminate the potential for protracted litigation, the Committee determined to present the issue of paying interest on demand deposits to Congress.

The Committee concluded that this statutory prohibition is no longer justified and recommends that depository institutions be permitted to pay interest on demand deposits. An extensive analysis of the issue of payment of interest on demand deposits was undertaken by the Committee's staff. A copy of this study is enclosed for your information. The study concludes that the arguments for prohibiting the payment of interest on demand deposits in the 1930s appear to have little validity today. In this regard, certain developments have weakened significantly the economic effect of the prohibition, such as (1) implicit interest payments on demand deposits through the provision of customer services either free or at fees below cost, (2) market development of close demand deposit substitutes that earn interest (e.g., money market mutual funds and sweep accounts), and (3) legislative and regulatory changes to permit explicit interest-bearing transaction accounts that are legally distinct from demand deposits.

Since many transactions balances earn close to a market return either implicitly or explicitly, we believe that the cost implications for depository institutions of the removal of the prohibition against the pay-

ment of interest on demand deposits would be of manageable size and largely temporary. Although some depositors with active accounts might be disadvantaged, depositors on average would tend to benefit from permitting the payment of interest on demand deposits. On balance, it seems that interest bearing demand deposits would result in a more efficient allocation of the economy's resources.

The removal of the prohibition of payment of interest on demand deposits without authority to limit rates paid prior to March 31, 1986, would diminish the effectiveness of the present ceiling on NOW accounts of less than $2,500 as well as on passbook savings accounts since depositors could keep their savings balances in ceiling free demand deposits. Therefore, if the prohibition against payment of interest on demand deposits is removed, the Congress may wish to give the DIDC authority to apply ceilings to demand deposits of less than $2,500 until March 31, 1986, at the same ceiling rates permitted for NOW accounts and ATS accounts in order to assure competitive equity for these accounts.

The Committee is also of the view that the current statutory requirement that it hold quarterly meetings should be removed. The actions of the Committee to date, including the creation of the Money Market Deposit Account, have gone a long way toward achieving the Committee's objective of providing for "the orderly phaseout and ultimate elimination of" all interest rate ceilings. In fact, by October 1, 1983, there will be no ceilings on all new or renewed time deposits with maturities of more than 31 days.

The Committee believes that the remaining actions to complete the deregulation process may be accomplished without mandatory quarterly meetings; rather, the Committee can schedule meetings as required by events. This would provide the Committee additional flexibility in completing its work. Therefore, the Committee requests Congress to repeal the requirement that it hold public meetings at least quarterly.

A draft bill that would accomplish these objectives is enclosed.

Sincerely,

DONALD T. REGAN,
Chairman.●

By Mr. LAXALT (for himself and Mr. HECHT):

S. 1876. A bill to allow advertising of any State sponsored lottery, gift enterprise, or similar scheme; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADVERTISING OF STATE LOTTERIES

Mr. LAXALT. Mr. President, the legislation that I introduce today seeks to modernize extremely antiquated Federal law. Current Federal statutes restricting the advertising of lotteries and gaming activities had their origin in the 19th century, when lotteries were banned by every State in the Union. Today, despite the vast changes of the past 100 years, despite the advent of legal casino gambling and of lawful parimutuel wagering on horseracing, and despite even the phenomenon of State-run lotteries, Federal statute continues to make the mailing or broadcasting of information about perfectly legal gaming activity a criminal offense. Reasons of basic federalism and of Constitutional law compel us to rectify these outmoded strictures.

The only exception to the Federal prohibition against gaming advertising is made by a loophole created in 1974 to aid State-conducted lotteries; such events can be advertised in the State holding the game and in adjacent States that themselves run lotteries. I stress that even this limited exception does not apply to any sort of privately run, wholly lawful gaming enterprise. Thus, the Federal Government, imposing its overbearing nationwide policy, is severely hampering legitimate industries that provide jobs and revenue for the States in which they are located. This overregulation not only puts private wagering enterprises at a disadvantage relative to State-operated games, but works to favor certain convention areas and leisure-time resorts over others. The situation is such that State and private organizations cannot even use the U.S. mails to respond to inquiries as to what sorts of gaming facilities are available in a given locale.

Such restrictions no doubt made sense a century ago, but they are anachronisms in today's world. As the Congress' bipartisan Commission on the Review of the National Policy Toward Gambling reported in 1976:

Federal law should not prohibit the mailing, interstate carriage, or broadcasting of advertisements concerning gambling activity that takes place within the confines of a State where is it legal. The operators of gambling businesses should be able to publish information about participation in their games, provided that it is legal to participate in those games while the player is physically present in the State; the Federal Government has no proper role in preventing the dissemination of such information.

Not only is this almost total ban on gaming advertising unfair and ill-advised Federal policy, it also raises significant constitutional problems. Now that the Supreme Court has recognized that commercial speech is in fact protected under the first amendment, it is hard to understand how a content-based Federal ban on advertising by absolutely legal gambling enterprises can be justified.

The bill that I propose addresses the defects in current law by expanding the exception to the no-advertising rule that is now allowed State-conducted lotteries. Under my bill, wagering enterprises that are authorized, licensed, and regulated by a State could be advertised. The bill covers only lawful, State-supervised or State-conducted activities; the ban of advertising by illegal or unregulated lotteries would, of course, remain in effect. It should be noted, too, that the bill is concerned only with the free flow of speech and information; it does not amend present law with respect to actual gambling through the mails or with respect to the shipment of gaming equipment.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join in support of this long overdue piece of Federal deregulation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1876

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1307 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1307. STATE-CONDUCTED AND STATE-AUTHORIZED LOTTERIES

"(a) The provisions of section 1301, 1302, 1303, and 1304 shall not apply to an advertisement, list of prizes, or information concerning a lottery conducted by a State acting under authority of State law, or concerning a lottery, gift enterprise, or similar scheme authorized, licensed, and regulated by a State acting under authority of State law.

"(b)(1) The provisions of section 1301, 1302, and 1303 shall not apply to the transportation or mailing—

"(A) to addresses within a State of equipment, tickets, or material concerning a lottery which is conducted by that State acting under the authority of State law; or

"(B) to an addressee within a foreign country of equipment, tickets, or material designed to be used within that foreign country in a lottery which is authorized by the law of that foreign country.

"(2) For the purposes of this subsection the term 'lottery' means the pooling of proceeds derived from the sale of tickets or chances and allotting those proceeds or parts thereof by chance to one or more chance takers or ticket purchasers. The term 'lottery' does not include the placing or accepting of bets or wagers on sporting events or contests.

"(c) For the purposes of this section (1) 'State' means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any territory or possession of the United States; and (2) 'foreign country' means any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision thereof (other than the United States, its territories or possessions).".

SEC. 2. The item for section 1307 in the table of sections for chapter 61 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"1307. State-conducted and State-authorized lotteries.".

SEC. 3. Section 3005(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Nothing in this section shall prohibit the mailing of (1) an advertisement, list of prizes, or information concerning a lottery conducted by a State acting under authority of State law, or concerning a lottery, gift enterprise, or similar scheme authorized, licensed, and regulated by a State acting under authority of State law, or (2) tickets or other materials concerning a lottery conducted by a State acting under authority of State law to addresses within that State.".●

By Mr. HEFLIN:

S. 1877. A bill to provide for braille imprinting of U.S. currency; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

BRAILLE IMPRINTING OF CURRENCY

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill which provides that Federal Reserve notes must be printed in a manner which enables an individual who is blind to determine the denomination of each such note through a pressure imprint in braille.

As a Nation, we place the unsighted in the needless position of dependence in dealing with what most of us regard as an important area of our life—money management. Identifying money can be a frustrating experience for a visually handicapped person because all U.S. bills are the same size, thereby making it impossible to distinguish their denomination except by visual inspection. One solution to this problem would be to require all U.S. currency to be embossed with braille or braillelike symbols as identifiable markings for the blind. Braille imprinting would only require that the money be pressure marked as it rolls off the printing press. No additional ink or paper would be required.

Braille imprinting has been used successfully in many countries. The Dutch have been using a system of braille money marking for years as have Israel and Switzerland.

If U.S. currency were marked in such a way that it could be identified tactually, blind persons would be placed on a more equal footing with sighted people in money matters. Today, more and more blind people are going on to college or receiving advanced vocational or technical training, and they are working directly with the public more than ever before. However, many blind persons hesitate to accept employment involving money transactions because of the need, and sometimes the risk, in being dependent upon sighted customers or coworkers to identify currency. I believe tactually identifiable money will increase job opportunities for persons who are blind.

The conversion to braille imprinting of American paper currencies is not only a technological possibility, but also a sociological necessity. Mr. President, the time to act is now. I urge my colleagues to act favorably and expeditiously on this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

By Mr. DOLE:

S. 1878. A bill to provide for Seabed Boundary Agreements between the United States and any other coastal State and the immobilization of the seabed boundary of any State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SEABED BOUNDARY ACT

● Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am introducing today the Seabed Boundary Act. This legislation would facilitate the process of delineating boundaries between Federal and State seabed areas for purposes of utilizing natural resources.

In 1953, Congress passed the Submerged Lands Act, which granted to the States jurisdiction over seabed areas and natural resources extending approximately 3 miles from the coastline. At the same time, Congress reaffirmed the Federal claim to the continental shelf seaward of the States' lands. Because of the evolutionary nature of the coastline, which is subject to erosion, corrosion, and other natural changes, the boundary separating the State and Federal seabed areas is ambulatory. The shifting shoreline has made it difficult to define precisely the lines of demarcation between State and Federal subaqueous lands and numerous disputes have arisen over these territorial ambiguities. In fact, since the passage of the Submerged Lands Act, the Justice Department has been involved in major litigation with most of the coastal States in an effort to delimit the seabed boundaries.

The Attorney General possesses the authority to resolve these disputes by demarcating the contested boundary lines. Apart from this litigious process, however, there exists no means by which a seabed boundary originally fixed under the terms of the 1953 act can be reestablished. Clearly, there ought to be some way of determining and setting boundary lines between Federal and State resources, when there is no substantial disagreement between the two parties. Title I would invest this authority in the Attorney General who, in consultation with the Secretaries of State, Commerce, the Interior, and other concerned departments and agencies, would be able to reach an agreement with the State on the location of the boundary.

Title II makes provisions for permanently fixing Federal and State seabed boundaries. This provision will help to alleviate the concerns of those individuals who possess titles to the natural resources located at or near the boundary. The ambulatory nature of these boundaries has generated a feeling of uncertainity among the leaseholders, resulting in a decline in the value of the leased property.

In addition, the ambulatory boundary has created a situation that encourages endless and expensive litigation since, due to rapid changes in the coastline, the determination of the boundary may be relitigated shortly after the resolution of a dispute. This provision would help to put an end to the submerged land litigation which has persisted over a 25-year span. Title II also provides a means for a State and the Federal Government to agree that a final decreee of the Supreme Court establishing a boundary is permanent.

Title III establishes a procedure by which States may waive any rights accruing from changes in the coastline. Under present law, Federal approval is required when a State seeks to proceed with the construction of an artifical structure that will extend from the natural coastline beyond the area of State jurisdiction. When this occurs, States usually waive their rights to this land in order to secure Federal approval for the construction. Title III merely preserves this process and establishes a procedure for handling such waivers. It is important to recognize that this provision will only be necessary until that time when the States and Federal Government agree to freeze the boundary in accordance with title II of this act.

Title IV makes clear that boundaries determined under this act shall not affect the location of the territorial sea of the United States of its baseline.

Mr. President, this legislation will facilitate the process of establishing seabed boundaries between Federal and State subaqueous lands. Even more importantly, this bill would implement a means of rendering these boundaries permanent, thus eliminating the confusion that derives from the ambulatory state of current boundaries. The newly fixed boundaries will aid in the development of the petroleum resources on the outer continental shelf: Petroleum lessee companies will be able to move more expeditiously to develop these energy sources than if they were required to wend their way through the litigious maze.

Not only members of the petroleum industry, but the Federal Government and States would also benefit from this legislation, which aims at removing the air of uncertainty surrounding our national seabed boundaries. I look forward to the expeditious consideration of this bill and urge my colleagues to join me by lending their support.

Mr. President, I would like to request unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

S. 1878

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Seabed Boundary Act."

TITLE I

BOUNDARY AGREEMENTS

SEC. 101. The Attorney General, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary or other head of any Federal department or agency having administrative responsibility or jurisdiction over any areas of the seabed and subsoil involved, is authorized to agree with similarly authorized officials of any State, as to the specific description of all or part of the boundary between the areas of the seabed

and subsoil in which the United States and the State are respectively entitled, on the date of agreement, to control the exploration for and exploitation of the living and/or non-living natural resources. Whenever such an agreement has become binding on the State, either by virtue of the authority vested in the officials negotiating on behalf of the State or by virtue of subsequent ratification by the State in the manner provided by the law of the State, the Governor and Attorney General of the State shall so certify and shall cause the agreement to be deposited, with their certificate in the National Archives and to be published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 102. An agreement entered into under this Title shall determine the location of the boundary until modified by a subsequent agreement or the decree of a court of competent jurisdiction. It is recognized that changes in the coastline may justify changes in the boundary. In such case either party may seek such changes through a subsequent agreement or judicial decree. However, such subsequent agreement or decree shall have no retroactive effect.

TITLE II

IMMOBILIZATION OF BOUNDARIES

SEC. 201. Whenever the entire boundary between the areas of the seabed and subsoil in which the United States and a state are respectively entitled to control the exploration for and exploitation of the natural resources has been specifically described by one or more final decrees and agreements, and if no legal proceeding is pending to revise the description of any part of such boundary, the United States or the State may propose to immobilize the entire boundary as so described.

SEC. 202. The proposal may be initiated by the Attorney General or by an authorized official of the State. When such action is initiated by the State it may be taken in any way authorized by the constitution and laws of the State, provided that the Governor and Attorney General of the State shall furnish to the Attorney General of the United States a copy of the statute or other document embodying the state action, together with their certification that it is in compliance with and effective under the constitution and laws of the State.

SEC. 203. The Attorney General of the United States shall consult with the Secretary of State, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary or other head of any Federal department or agency having administrative responsibility or jurisdiction over any areas of the seabed or subsoil involved as to whether the proposed immobilization is in the best interest of the United States. If any Secretary, the Attorney General or other head of any Federal department or agency beleives it is not, the Attorney General shall notify the Governor and Attorney General of the State that the proposal is rejected. If all concur that the proposed immobilization is in the best interests of the United States, the Attorney General shall notify the Governor and Attorney General of the State that the proposal is accepted, and shall deposit in the National Archives and cause to be published in the Federal Register the documents received from the State and his certificate of acceptance, together with a complete description of the boundary referred to if the other documents do not contain such a description. Upon such publication, the boundary so described shall become an immovable boundary for the purposes of delimiting the areas of the seabed or subsoil in which the United States and the State are respectively entitled to control exploration for and exploitation of the living and/or nonliving natural resources as provided in the agreement and regulation and taxation thereof; but such boundary shall have no other legal effect.

SEC. 204. Whenever the extent of the rights acquired by a state under the Submerged Lands Act has been determined by a final decree of the United States Supreme Court and fixed by coordinates, the line so fixed shall be immobilized as described in said decree and shall not be ambulatory in determing the seaward extent of the rights acquired by said State under the Submerged Lands Act, unless within two years of the date of the final decree either party formally objects to the immobilization of such line. Any such objection shall be deposited in the National Archives and published in the Federal Register.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. If any State waives its right to the living and/or nonliving natural resources of the seabed or subsoil which would accrue to it as a result of changes in any portion of its coastline by either serving on the Attorney General a waiver of those rights duly signed by authorized officials of that State, or by entering into an agreement signed by the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Interior with the concurrence of the Secretary or head of any Federal department or agency having administrative cognizance or jurisdiction over any areas of the seabed and subsoils involved and similarly authorized officials of that State, the Attorney General shall, when that agreement or waiver becomes binding, cause it to be deposited in the National Archives and a copy be published in the Federal Register.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. No boundary established pursuant to this Act shall be deemed to affect, determine, or prejudice the location of the territorial sea of the United States or the baseline from which the breadth of the territorial sea of the United States is measured. Nor shall any such agreement be determinative of State boundaries or any purpose except exploration for and exploitation of the natural resources of the seabed and subsoil, including the regulation and taxation thereof.●

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. TRIBLE):

S. 1879. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to revise the authority to reimburse Federal employees for certain moving expenses incurred by such employees in connection with a transfer or reassignment in the interest of the Government from one official duty station or agency to another for permanent duty; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN MOVING EXPENSES

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, today, my colleague from Virginia (Mr. TRIBLE) and I are introducing legislation that will correct several inequities that presently exist when Federal employees are relocated from one geographic area to another to meet the needs of their Federal agency. These relocations are most often directed by the agency-employer.

According to statistics furnished by the Internal Revenue Service, Federal employees who must move as an obligation of their Federal careers incur, on the average, $8,000 worth of moving expenses that are over and above what their agency-employer is allowed by law to provide. The employees must pay this added cost out of their own pockets.

The Department of Defense Agencies, the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Secret Service, the IRS, and the Bureau of Customs all must move many of their middle- and high-level employees back and forth from the field and headquarters to insure orderly rotation, better service, and the many other management services.

In addition, many activities—such as Department of Defense R&D laboratories—are hampered in recruiting qualified professionals because of existing restrictions on reimbursing the expenses an individual incurs when moving from one location to another to accept a Federal position. The private sector has no restriction, thereby putting the Federal Government at a disadvantage.

Everyone is losing in the current situation. Well qualified Federal employees are faced with the choices of leaving Government service or paying out of their pocket thousands of dollars in moving expenses. Government agencies are at a disadvantage recruiting and retaining high quality professionals, managers, and executives. The taxpayers are losing when these practices are adversely affecting the Government's ability to employ the best.

The bill I am introducing will go a long way toward relieving these problems, and a companion measure, H.R. 3852, has been introduced by my colleague in the House, Congressman FRANK WOLF. This legislation will apply only to moves that are certified by each agency to be in the best interest of the Government. I believe this bill will result in fewer, better and more equitable moves. It will provide for the fair treatment of our employees and will put the Government on an equal footing with the private sector.

For these reasons, I urge support for this legislation.

Also, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

S. 1879

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 5723(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(A)" after "travel expenses";

(2) by striking out "manpower shortage or" and inserting in lieu thereof "manpower shortage, (B)"; and

(3) by inserting ", or (B) of any person appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to a position the rate of pay for which is equal to or higher than the minimum rate of pay prescribed for GS-16" after "Senior Executive Service".

(b) Sections 5724(a)(2) and 5726(b) of title 5, United States Code, are each amended by striking out "11,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "18,000".

(c) Section 5724(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "not in excess of 20 cents a mile".

(d) Section 5724 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) The regulations prescribed under this section shall provide that the reassignment or transfer of any employee, for permanent duty, from one official station or agency to another which is outside the employee's commuting area shall take effect only after the employee has been given advance notice for a reasonable period. Emergency circumstances shall be taken into account in determining whether the period of advance notice is reasonable.".

(e) Section 5724a(a)(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence thereof, by striking out "30 days" and inserting in lieu thereof "60 days"; and

(2) by striking out the second and fourth sentences thereof and inserting after the first sentence the following: "The period of residence in temporary quarters may be extended for an additional 60 days if the head of the agency concerned or his designee determines that there are compelling reasons for the continued occupancy of temporary quarters.".

(f) Section 5724(a)(4) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(A)" after "(4)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(B)(i) In connection with the sale of the residence at the old official station, reimbursement under this paragraph shall not exceed 10 percent of the sale price or $15,000, whichever is the lesser amount.

"(ii) In connection with the purchase of a residence at the new official station, reimbursement under this paragraph shall not exceed 5 percent of the purchase price or $7,500, whichever is the lesser amount.

"(iii) Effective October 1 of each year, the respective maximum dollar amounts applicable under clauses (i) and (ii) shall be increased by the percent change, if any, in the Consumer Price Index published for December of the preceding year over that published for December of the second preceding year, adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent. For the purpose of this clause, 'Consumer Price Index' means the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, United States City Average, Housing Component (1967=100), prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.".

(g)(1)(A) Subchapter II of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 5724a the following new section:

"§ 5724b. Taxes on reimbursements for travel, transportation, and relocation expenses of employees transferred

"(a) Under such regulations as the President may prescribe and to the extent considered necessary and appropriate, as provided therein, appropriations or other funds available to an agency for administrative expenses are available for the reimbursement of all or part of the Federal, State, and city income taxes incurred by an employee, or by an employee and such employee's spouse (if filing jointly), for any moving or storage expenses furnished in kind, or for which reimbursement or an allowance is provided (but only to the extent of the expenses paid or incurred). Reimbursements under this subsection shall also include an amount equal to all income taxes for which the employee, or the employee and spouse, as the case may be, would be liable due to the reimbursement for the taxes referred to in the first sentence of this subsection.

"(b) For the purpose of this section, 'moving or storage expenses' means travel and transportation expenses (including storage of household goods and personal effects under section 5724 of this title) and other relocation expenses under sections 5724a and 5726(c) of this title.".

(B) The chapter analysis at the beginning of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5724a the following new item:

"5724b. Taxes on reimbursements for travel, transportation, and relocation expenses of employees transferred.".

(2) Section 5724(i) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "5724a" and inserting in lieu thereof "5724a, 5724b,".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be carried out by agencies by the use of funds appropriated or otherwise available for the administrative expenses of each of such respective agencies. The amendments made by this Act do not authorize the appropriation of funds in amounts exceeding the sums already authorized to be appropriated for such agencies.

SEC. 3. (a) The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Not later than thirty days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall prescribe the regulations required under the amendments made by this Act. Such regulations shall take effect as of such date of enactment.●

By Mr. CRANSTON (for himself and Mr. TSONGAS):

S.J. Res. 169. Joint resolution concerning the assassination of Benigno Aquino; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ASSASSINATION OF BENIGNO AQUINO

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senator TSONGAS in introducing a joint resolution that expresses the grief and outrage of U.S. citizens over the murder of Senator Benigno Aquino of the Philippines.

Benigno Aquino was a man of great courage and conviction. He spent his career working for the betterment of his fellow citizens. He willingly faced death for his beliefs in freedom and democracy for the people of the Philippines. He suffered years of imprisonment and exile for his convictions. I am proud that I was one of many Americans who worked on his behalf to persuade the Marcos government to free Senator Aquino from jail and permit him to leave the Philippines to come to the United States. While in this country, he continued to work for greater political freedom and social justice in his own nation. He concluded that he could not participate fully in the Filipino efforts to achieve these goals while living in exile abroad. So despite the death threats against him, Benigno Aquino returned to Manila. He has paid for his convictions the ultimate price—his life.

The world must once again mourn the loss of a man of peace who has died because of a brutal, cowardly act of violence. It is especially incumbent upon the United States to voice its sorrow and distress at the loss of a man who has been such an articulate spokesman for peaceful change. The United States has had a long and close relationship with the Philippine people. The United States maintains strategically critical bases at Subic Bay and Clark Airfield. It is in our national interest to support the cause of greater human rights and democratization that Benigno Aquino strove for during his life. The United States must make clear to the Marcos government that the lack of progress toward real democracy in the Philippines is unacceptable. We must insure that the Marcos government understands our abhorrence of the murder of Senator Aquino while he was in the custody of Philippine security forces. We must make clear to the Marcos government that U.S. support is not unconditional.

Time and again we have seen that unlimited backing for right-wing dictatorships serves to radicalize many patriots who believe in democracy but oppose the repressive government in power. If we support any government, no matter how brutal, as long as it is not Marxist, when the inevitable social change occurs, those who bring it about and who come to power as a result are not favorably disposed to us. Past experiences in countries like Iran should teach us much about the situation in the Philippines today.

The Marcos government must provide adequate answers to the many questions regarding the circumstances surrounding the Aquino assassination. He was killed while in the custody of Philippine security guards. The Government's inability to protect Senator Aqunio raises serious question about the safety of President Reagan should he proceed with his plans to visit the Philippines in November. His proposed visit also raises a serious question of propriety; should the President of the United States provide official sanction of the Marcos regime while that government remains under cloud due to the circumstances surrounding Aquino's assassination? I firmly believe that it is not in the interest of the United States for the President to visit the Philippines until there has

been a full and accurate accounting of all the facts relating to the murder.

Mr. President, the resolution that I am offering with Senator TSONGAS clarifies the U.S. position regarding the events surrounding the death of Aquino and states once again U.S. commitment to the restoration of democracy and human rights in the Philippines through peaceful change. I hope that my colleagues will support this resolution.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 71

At the request of Mr. RANDOLPH, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 71, a bill to redesignate the days on which Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, and Columbus Day are celebrated and to make each day a legal public holiday.

S. 128

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. GARN), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI) were added as cosponsors of S. 128, a bill entitled "The Equal Opportunity Retirement Act of 1983."

S. 497

At the request of Mr. HUMPHREY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to provide that drug abuse oriented advertisements and shipments of drugs in response to drug abuse oriented advertisements shall be nonmailable matter.

S. 503

At the request of Mr. HUMPHREY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 503, a bill to make it unlawful to manufacture, distribute, or possess with intent to distribute, a drug which is an imitation of a controlled substance or a drug which purports to act like a controlled substance.

S. 699

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 699, a bill to provide for Federal support and encouragement of State, local, and community activities to prevent domestic violence and assist victims of domestic violence, to provide for coordination of Federal programs and activities relating to domestic violence, and for other purposes.

S. 1144

At the request of Mr. HEINZ, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1144, a bill to suspend periodic reviews of disability beneficiaries having mental impairments pending regulatory reform of the disability determination process.

S. 1432

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1432, a bill to amend the provisions of title 31, United States Code, relating to the President's budget, to require information regarding major capital investment programs of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1621

At the request of Mr. HUMPHREY, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. BOSCHWITZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1621, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require commercial passenger carrying aircraft to be equipped with smoke detectors and automatic fire extinguishers in all aircraft lavatories and galley areas.

S. 1644

At the request of Mr. NUNN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1644, a bill to improve Federal criminal sentencing by imprisoning dangerous and violent offenders and by diverting nonviolent offenders from imprisonment to restitution or community service programs.

S. 1844

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABDNOR), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. PRESSLER), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1844, a bill entitled the "Aviation Tax-Reduction Act of 1983."

S. 1865

At the request of Mr. HUDDLESTON, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1865, a bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make an earlier announcement of the 1984 crop feed grain program and of the 1985 crop wheat and feed grain programs.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 114

At the request of Mr. NUNN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. SASSER), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 114, a joint resolution to request the President to proclaim September 1983, as "National Professional Security Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 147

At the request of Mr. WEICKER, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 147, a joint resolution to designate the week of September 25, 1983, through October 1, 1983, as "National Rehabilitation Facilities Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 157

At the request of Mr. MELCHER, the name of the Senator from Alabama Mr. HEFLIN) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 157, a joint resolution designating November 13, 1983, as "National Retired Teachers' Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 161

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. EXON), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BRADLEY) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 161, a joint resolution to designate the week of April 15, 1984, through April 21, 1984, as "National Child Abuse Prevention Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 163

At the request of Mr. BYRD, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. MELCHER) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 163, a joint resolution finding that section 4(a) (1) of the war powers resolution applies to the present circumstances in Lebanon.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 62

At the request of Mr. MATTINGLY, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. NUNN), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 62, a concurrent resolution to direct the Commissioner of Social Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a plan outlining the steps which might be taken to correct the social security benefit disparity known as the notch problem.

SENATE RESOLUTION 180

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 180, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate in support of affordable and decent health care for older Americans.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION, 1984

HEINZ (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2187

Mr. HEINZ (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. PERCY) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1342) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Board for International Broadcasting, and for other purposes, as follows:

On page 32, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following new section:

"FUNDS FOR UNITED STATES-GERMAN TEENAGE EXCHANGE

"SEC. 210. There are authorized to be appropriated for the United States Information Agency, $2,500,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and $2,500,000 for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out a United States-German teenage exchange sponsored by the Members of the United States Congress and the West German Bundestag.".

McCLURE (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2188

Mr. McCLURE (for himself, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DENTON, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. HELMS, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. HUMPHREY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1342, supra, as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

The President shall prepare and transmit to the Congress a report on the record of Soviet compliance or non-compliance with the letter and spirit of all existing arms control agreements to which the Soviet Union is a party.

LUGAR (AND DENTON) AMENDMENT NO. 2189

Mr. LUGAR (for himself and Mr. DENTON) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1342, supra, as follows:

On page 24, line 20, immediately following section 121, insert the following new section:

"UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH THE VATICAN

"SEC. 122. In order to provide for the establishment of United States diplomatic relations with the Vatican, the Act entitled "An Act Making Appropriations for the Consular and Diplomatic Expenses of the Government for the year ending thirtieth June, eighteen hundred and sixty-eight, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1867, is amended by repealing the following sentence (14 Stat. 413): "And no money hereby or otherwise appropriated shall be paid for the support of an American legation at Rome, from and after the thirtieth day of June, eighteen hundred and sixty-seven."

BIDEN AMENDMENT NO. 2190

Mr. BIDEN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1342, supra, as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following new section:

UNITED STATES-EUROPEAN COMMUNITY INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

SEC. 122. (a)(1) Congress hereby resolves that not to exceed twenty-four Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly and at least annually with representatives of the European Parliament to constitute a United States-European Community Interparliamentary Group for a discussion of common problems in the interest of sound relations between the United States and the nations of the European Community. Of the Members of the Congress to be appointed for this purpose (hereafter designated as the United States Group), half shall be appointed by the President of the Senate from Members of the Senate (not fewer than four of whom shall be from the Foreign Relations Committee), and half shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House (not fewer than four of whom shall be from the International Relations Committee).

(2) Such appointments shall be made for the period of each meeting of the United States-European Community Interparliamentary Group.

(3) The Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Senate delegation shall be a member from the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the House delegation shall be a Member from the House International Relations Committee.

(b)(1) To provide for participation of the United States Group, not to exceed $50,000 shall be appropriated for each fiscal year (subject to the annual authorization and appropriation process), with $25,000 to be available for the Senate delegation and $25,000 for the House delegation, or so much thereof as may be necessary to assist in meeting the expenses of the United States Group. The Senate and House portions of such appropriation shall be disbursed on vouchers to be approved by the Chairman of the Senate delegation and Chairman of the House delegation, respectively.

(2) The United States Group of the United States-European Community Interparliamentary Group shall submit to the Congress a report for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made including its expenditures under such appropriation.

(3) The certificate of the Chairman of the respective delegation shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers in the auditing of all accounts of the Senate and House delegations to the United States-European Community Interparliamentary Group.

HELMS (AND DENTON) AMENDMENT NO. 2191

Mr. HELMS (for himself and Mr. DENTON) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1342, supra, as follows:

On page 26, strike lines 16 through 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"FUNDS FOR ENHANCEMENT OF TRANSMITTER FACILITIES

"Sec. 205. (a) Of the amounts appropriated for the United States Information Agendy for fiscal year 1984, not less than $52,900,000 shall be available only for the engineering, site preparation, and enhancement of radio transmitter facilities.

"(b) Of the amounts appropriated for the United States Information Agency for fiscal year 1985, not less than $95,286,000 shall be available only for the engineering, site preparation, and enhancement of radio transmitter facilities."

On page 27, line 1, strike "$100,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$78,900,000".

On page 27, line 10, strike "$123,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof $80,800,000".

One page 33-43, strike entire title IV.

MITCHELL (AND STAFFORD) AMENDMENT NO. 2192

Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. STAFFORD) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1342, supra, as follows:

On page 24, after line 19, add the following new section to title I of the bill:

"SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available under this Act for "International Commissions" for fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985, shall be available for the use, by such commissions or their agents, of herbicides containing dioxin compounds.

(b) Unless the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and the Governors of the affected border states are notified forty-five days in advance of the use of a herbicide by an international commission, funds appropriated for such use shall not be available for obligation or expenditure. Such notification shall include—

(1) the name of the herbicide;

(2) an estimate of the quantity of herbicide planned for use;

(3) an identification of the area on which the herbicide will be used;

(4) a description of the herbicide's chemical composition."

MITCHELL AMENDMENT NO. 2193

Mr. MITCHELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1342, supra, as follows:

On Page 5, line 7, after the term "agricultural commodities," insert "fisheries commodities," and

On Page 6, line 9, after the word "agricultural", insert ", fisheries,".

MITCHELL (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2194

Mr. MITCHELL (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, and Mr. KENNEDY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1342, supra, as follows:

On page 2, line 17, strike "$344,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof, "$369,500,000";

On page 24, after line 19, add the following new section to title I of the bill:

"SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1984 under Section 102(4) of this act, $25 million shall be available only for Lebanon for relief and rehabilitation assistance to benefit refugees and displaced persons."

KENNEDY (AND SIMPSON) AMENDMENT NO. 2195

Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 2194 proposed by Mr. MITCHELL to the bill S. 1342, supra, as follows:

On line 2 of the Mitchell amendment, strike "$369,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "354,500,000".

On line 10 of the Mitchell amendment, strike "." and insert in lieu thereof "and $10 million shall be available only for El Salvador for relief assistance to displaced persons.".

ZORINSKY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2196

Mr. ZORINSKY (for himself, Mr. HELMS, Mr. WALLOP, and Mr. DENTON) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1342, supra, as follows:

Beginning on page 33, line 21, strike all through page 43, line 3.

On page 26, line 16, strike all through the period on line 22, and renumber all subsequent sections accordingly.

At the end of title II, insert the following: None of the funds appropriated for the use of the United States Information Agency shall be used for the National Endowment for Democracy.

On page 25, line 4, strike "$636,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$604,700,000".

On page 25, line 5, strike "$636,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$604,700,000".

HUDDLESTON (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2197

Mr. HUDDLESTON (for himself, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. HELMS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BOREN, Mr. EXON, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. JEPSEN, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. GARN, Mr. FORD, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. DENTON, Mr. CHILES, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. MATTINGLY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1342, supra, as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following new section:

PRINCIPLES OF EQUIVALENCE

SEC. . (a) It is the sense of the Congress that the President should, consistent with the interests of the United States and as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act, take the necessary steps—

(1) To insure substantial equivalence between the number of officers of employees or the Government of the Soviet Union in the United States (other than members of the news media and those assigned at the United Nations) and the number of officers or employees of the United States Government in the Soviet Union, and

(2) To insure that the restrictions and conditions imposed on the travel, accommodations, and facilities of officers or employees of the Government of the Soviet Union in the United States are not less than those imposed by the Government of the Soviet Union on the travel, accommodations, and facilities of officers or employees of the United States Government in the Soviet Union.

(b) The Congress requests the President to report to the Congress on actions taken to carry out this section, together with recommendations for any additional legislation that may be necessary to carry out this section.

MOYNIHAN AMENDMENT NO. 2198

Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. EXON) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1342, supra, as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following new Section:

"SEC. . The United States shall maintain no embassy in Israel that is not located in the City of Jerusalem."

KASSEBAUM AMENDMENTS NOS. 2199 AND 2200

Mrs. KASSEBAUM proposed two amendments to the bill S. 1342, supra, as follows:

On page 24, line 11, insert before the period a comma and the following: "except that $100,000 of the amount allocated by this section shall be available only if such proposed recipient organization has available for its use an equal amount and that, in such case, grants may be made up to $30,000".

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . The President shall use every available means at his disposal to ensure that the 1985 Conference to commemorate the conclusion of the United Nations Decade for Women is not dominated by political issues extraneous to the goals of the 1985 Women's Conference that would jeopardize United States participation in and support for that Conference consistent with applicable legislation concerning U.S. contributions to the United Nations. Prior to the 1985 Conference, the President shall report to the Congress on the nature of the preparations, the adherence to the original goals of the Conference, and the extent of any continued United States participation and support for the Conference.

On page 2, line 11, strike out "$602,343,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$524,165,000".

On page 2, line 12, strike out "$645,978,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$539,240,000".

Add at the end of the bill:

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States payment for assessed contributions for calendar year 1984 to the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agricultural Organization, and the International Labor Organization shall not exceed its assessed contribution for calendar year 1980 and for calendar years 1985, 1986, and 1987 shall be no more than 90 per centum, 80 per centum, and 70 per centum of the amount of the assessment for calendar year 1980.

(b) No payment shall be authorized for assessed contributions to the organizations listed in section a unless the amount authorized to be appropriated by this section are accepted by these organizations as payment in full of the U.S. assessed contribution towards the financial support of these organizations.

KASSEBAUM (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2201

Mrs. KASSEBAUM (for herself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. EXON, Mr. DOLE, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. MATTINGLY, and Mr. NICKLES) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1342, supra, as follows:

On page 24, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

RESTRICTIONS ON ASSESSED PAYMENTS TO THE UNITED NATIONS

SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States assessed payments for the calendar year 1984 to the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agricultural Organization, and the International Labor Organization shall not exceed its assessed payments to each such organization for the calendar year 1980. Such payments to each such organization for the calendar years 1985, 1986, and 1987 shall be no more than 90 per centum, 80 per centum, and 70 per centum, respectively, of the amount of the assessments paid to each such organization for the calendar year 1980.

(b) No payment may be made to an organization referred to in subsection (a) for the calendar years 1985, 1986, and 1987 unless payments made pursuant to this section are accepted by the respective organization as payment in full of the United States assessment towards the financial support of such organization.

DECONCINI (AND JEPSEN) AMENDMENT NO. 2202

Mr. DECONCINI (for himself and Mr. JEPSEN) proposed an amendment (which was subsequently modified) to the bill, S. 1342, supra, as follows:

At the bottom of page 48, add the following:

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. (a) That it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of State should recommend to the Attorney General that extended voluntary departure status be granted to aliens who are nationals of El Salvador and that the Attorney General should exercise his discretion and grant such status to such aliens until the situation in El Salvador has changed sufficiently to permit their safely residing in that country.

DECONCINI AMENDMENT NO. 2203

Mr. DECONCINI proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1342, supra, as follows:

On page 24, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following new section:

"DOMESTIC POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF AMBASSADORS

"SEC. 122. Paragraph (3) of section 7324(d) of such title is amended by inserting '(other than an ambassador or minister, except when taking part in activity described in subsection (a) or behalf of a Presidential political campaign)' after in its relations with foreign powers or'."

HUMPHREY AMENDMENT NO. 2204

Mr. HUMPHREY proposed two amendments to the bill S. 1342, supra, as follows:

At the bottom of page 48, add the following:

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

POLICY ON THE JAMMING BY THE SOVIET UNION OF BROADCASTS OF VOICE OF AMERICA AND RFE/RL, INCORPORATED

SEC. 701. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the permanent unrestrained flow of accurate information would greatly facilitate mutual understanding and world peace;

(2) the Soviet Union and its allies are at present electronically jamming the broadcasts of Voice of America and RFE/RL, Incorporated (also known as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty); and

(3) electronic jamming of international broadcasts violates at least four international agreements: Article 35(1) of the International Telecommunications Union Convention, Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 19 of the International Convenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (also known as the Helsinki Accords).

(b) It is the sense of the Congress that the President should urge the Government of the Soviet Union to terminate its jamming of the broadcasts of Voice of America and RFE/RL, Incorporated (also known as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty).

HUMPHREY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2205

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. D'AMATO, and Mr. PERCY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1342, supra; as as follows:

On page 33, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

POLICY ON BROADCASTS OF RFE/RL, INCORPORATED AND VOICE OF AMERICA CONCERNING SOVIET RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

SEC. 303. It is the sense of the Congress that RFE/RL, Incorporated (commonly referred to as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty) and the Voice of America (VOA) are to be commended for their news and editorial coverage of the increasing religious persecution in the Soviet Union, including the declining levels of Jewish emigration, and are encouraged to intensify their efforts in this regard.

PERCY AMENDMENT NO. 2206

Mr. PERCY proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1342, supra, as follows:

On page 24, after line 19, insert the following new section:

SEC. 122. The Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended, is further amended by adding a new section 11 thereto as follows:

(A) Contracts, including lease-back or other agreements the purposes of which is to obtain the construction, alteration or repair of buildings and grounds abroad, when estimated to or as awarded exceed $2,000,000, (including contract alternatives and contingencies)

(1) Shall be limited to (a) American-owned bidders and (b) bidders from countries which permit or agree to permit equal access to American bidders for comparable projects;

(2) For purposes of determining competitive status, bids qualifying under subsection (1)(a) shall be reduced by ten per centum thereof.

(B) Bidder qualification under this Section shall be determined on the basis of nationality of ownership, the burden of which shall be on any prospective bidder; qualification under Subsection (1)(a) shall require ownership in excess of fifty percent by United States citizens or permanent residents or have been incorporated in the United States for more than three years and employ United States citizens in more than half its permanent full-time positions in the United States. Determinations under this Section shall be committed to the discretion of the Secretary.

(C) Contracts for construction, alteration or repair in the United States for or on behalf of any Foreign Mission as defined in the Foreign Missions Act of 1982 may, pursuant to the authority of that Act, only be awarded to or performed by a company qualifying under section A(1) above: *Provided*, That nothing therein shall preclude work to be performed by nationals of the Sending State otherwise granted the right of entry for that purpose by the Secretary.

PERCY AMENDMENT NO. 2207

Mr. PERCY proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1342, supra, as follows:

On page 33, after line 20, add the following new section:

BALTIC DIVISION

SEC. 304. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 301 may be used unless—

(1) the Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian radio services of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty are organized and a separate division within Radio Liberty; and

(2) that they begin broadcasts under a name which would accurately reflect United States policy of not recognizing the illegal incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

PERCY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2208

Mr. PERCY (for himself, Mr. PELL and Mr. MOYNIHAN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1342, supra, as follows:

Page 48, after line 17, insert the following new title:

TITLE VII—UNITED STATES-INDIA ENDOWMENT FOR CULTURAL, EDUCATIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 701. This title may be cited as the "United States-India Endowment for Cultural, Educational, and Scientific Cooperation Act".

THE ENDOWMENT

SEC. 702. The President is authorized to enter into an agreement with the Government of India providing for the establishment of a United States-India Endowment for Cultural, Educational, and Scientific Cooperation (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Endowment") which would provide grants and other assistance for exchanges of persons for cultural, educational, and scientific purposes and for programs for joint scientific cooperation.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, will hold a hearing during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 29, 1983, on S. 1197, a bill to admit certain vessels to the coastwise trade.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION, FORESTRY, AND ENVIRONMENT

Mr. JEPSEN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Soil and Water Conservation, Forestry, and Environment of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will hold a hearing on two conservation payment-in-kind bills on Tuesday, September 27. The bills to be considered are S. 998 and S. 1053.

The hearing will begin at 10 a.m. in room SR 328-A.

Anyone wishing further information should contact the Agriculture Committee staff at 224-0014 or 224-0017.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that S. 1590, to clarify the contractual authority of the Secretary of the Interior to deliver water to the North Platte irrigation district project, has been added to the agenda of the hearing scheduled before the Subcommittee on Water and Power for Thursday, September 29, at 10 a.m. in room SD-366.

For further information regarding this hearing you may wish to contact Mr. Russ Brown of the subcommittee staff at 224-2366.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 22, at 2 p.m., to hold a hearing to consider alternative funding plans for the Clinch River breeder reactor.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 29, 1983, to hold a hearing on S. 1197, a bill to admit certain vessels to the coastwise trade.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 22, to consider and mark up the unemployment compensation bill.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND RESERVED WATER

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Reserved Water, of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Friday, September 23, at 9 a.m. to hold a hearing to consider S. 1090, a bill to establish a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study and recommend appropriate policies and activities for government agencies at the Federal, State, and local levels and for the private sector, to assure the continued availability of quality outdoor recreation experiences in America to the year 2000, and for other purposes.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

JOHN AYER: A MAN OF COURAGE

● Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I would like to share with the Members of the Senate the story of a man of courage whose heroic action is earning him richly deserved attention and gratitude from the people of his city, Miami, and from others around the country who happen to hear of him.

Last Saturday night, a young Miamian, Angela Vivier, was headed home from her job in a shopping center when she ran into a car that pulled into the street in front of her. From a local nightspot nearby a crowd of men, many drunken, quickly surrounded her car. When she rolled down her window to ask someone to phone her father, a bracelet was yanked from her arm, her purse was stolen and a man tried to come through the window after her.

Fortunately, an unusual man came along. John Ayer, driving past, quickly sized up the menacing situation and realized the terror-stricken woman desperately needed help. Though alone and unarmed, he stopped his van, walked straight into the crowd, forced open the damaged car door and told her to come with him to his van. A short distance away, they were attacked and knocked to the ground. John came up fighting and single-handedly took on the mob. Soon a second motorist came along and drove at the crowd and while they were distracted, the two victims escaped to the van and raced off.

John Ayer—aged 34, 5 feet 8 inches tall, and 160 pounds—waded into a situation that most people would have run away from. As a result, he lost some teeth, had his jaw fractured in two places, suffered cuts and wound up in the hospital. By anyone's definition he is a hero, but he was quoted in the Miami Herald: "I didn't do much. I just stopped and drove her away. I fall pretty far short of a hero."

Angela Vivier credits him with saving her from certain rape and probably death. She said it was like having "a guardian angel." Her father summed it up this way: "He's got guts and a genuine, selfless courage."

In these times when we are more likely to hear of people turning their backs or docilely looking on as someone is abused or killed, I am pleased to hold up John Ayer as a lesson to us all regarding our responsibility toward those who are in danger or in need. I strongly commend him and hope that I will have the privilege of meeting him and shaking his hand sometime soon.

What makes a hero? That is a question that has always been difficult to answer, but Charles Whited, a longtime columnist for the Miami Herald, provided some definition at least in regard to what has made John Ayer the man that he is. That tremendous credit is due his parents is apparent in their comments following the traumatic incident. His father said, "He did what a gentleman should do. That's how a gentleman behaves." And his mother added, "We tried to teach him ethics and morality." They obviously did fine work as parents and they can be justifiably proud.

I ask that the Whited column be reprinted in its entirety in the RECORD at this point.

The column follows:

HEROIC ACTIONS STIR PRIDE AND GRATITUDE

(By Charles Whited)

A city sick of criminal violance continued Tuesday to heap him with praise. But John Holbrook Ayer, 34, could not respond out loud. His jaw, broken in two places and surgically repaired, was shut.

He sat up in bed in blue pajamas, a handsome, dark-haired man. Floral arrangements blazed in the small private room at Baptist Hospital. Cards expressed best wishes from family and friends.

What makes heroes tick? Why did he, John Ayer, wade into that drunken mob alone and unarmed to rescue a 19-year-old woman being abused and terrorized after her car had been wrecked?

"Look, John," I said, "nine out of 10 people would have driven past without stopping. Why did you do what you did?"

He borrowed my notebook and pen. In neat block letters, he began printing his reply: "It was mostly instinct. Plus it was the way I was brought up. . . ."

"What a fantastic thing for Miami a nurse said. "It's so great, knowing there are people like him around."

Everybody agreed. This city of wounds and angers was electrified. The fact that the mob beat Ayer, knocked him down and broke his jaw before he could get young Angela Vivier to his van and escape, make the drama what it was. A high personal risk of life and limb.

But what makes heroes? What makes John Ayer different?

I put the question Tuesday to the people who know his personal background best, Holbrook E. (Hobe) Ayer, the 61-year-old owner of a hardware store, and his wife, Margaret. They are John's parents.

The elder Ayer replied, in part: "He did what a gentleman should do. That's how a gentleman behaves."

From his parents came a description of their bachelor son as an only child, very independent, but the product of a close-knit family and conservative middle-class values. Ayer's father speaks of his son as methodical, self-reliant. (Example: John could have gone into the family hardware business, established in the 1940s by his grandfather. But he chose to strike out on his own instead as a kind of commercial handyman, maintaining business properties for clients.)

"We are very proud of him," Margaret Ayer said. "We tried to teach him ethics and morality."

John Ayer was born in Miami, a third-generation Dade Countian. As a boy, he was an acolyte in the Episcopal Church and a Boy Scout (rank: first class). He graduated from Palmetto Senior High, attended Miami-Dade Community College and the University of Florida.

The family traces its roots back to New England seafaring men of the early 1600s. His great-grandfather, Capt. Aaron Holbrook, was an owner and master of clipper ships in the 19th Century. John, an avid yachtsman, still has Capt. Holbrook's logbooks and navigational sextant. John's father and grandfather, the late Holbrook E. Ayer Sr., also have been yachtsmen. The senior Ayer came to Miami in the early 1920s as a millwork expert and builder. Hobe Ayer, John's father, is a master mariner who served as a merchant marine officer on the bloody North Atlantic convoys of World War II. John Ayer sailed his first pram alone on Biscayne Bay at age 10 and now owns a 28-foot vessel.

"He always went to the help of a boat in trouble," Hobe Ayer told me. "It is part of the sailor's tradition."

On the night of the assault, father and son waited together in the emergency room of Baptist Hospital. Hobe Ayer fretted about the time it was taking to get treatment for John. "He is stoic about pain, but I knew he was suffering. I said something about it. He said, 'Dad, think of the guys in Vietnam who had to sit in the mud and wait for a chopper.' "

What makes a man risk his life for another person? John Ayer's motivation was simple and basic. He printed it in my notebook Tuesday:

". . . She was in trouble. I was the only one who could help.

"I had to try my best."●

CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF PARENTS FOR DRUG-FREE YOUTH

● Mrs. HAWKINS. Mr. President, in a few short days, one of the most important conferences of 1983 will convene here in Washington. More than 500

parents, professionals, educators, and others from as far away as Alaska, who are concerned with adolescent drug and alcohol abuse, will attend the second annual conference of the National Federation of Parents for Drug-Free Youth, September 25-28, 1983.

Honorary chairman of the conference will be First Lady Nancy Reagan. Among others invited to participate in the program are actor/comedian Tim Conway; FBI Director William Webster; Dominic DiCarlo, Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics Matters; Dr. Carlton Turner, Director of the White House Office of Drug Abuse Policy; Dr. William Mayer, Director of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration; Frank Jirka, president of the American Medical Association; Dr. Robert Dupont, president of the American Council on Drug Education; and Jack E. O'Brien, president of McNeil Pharmaceuticals, the sponsor of the highly successful Pharmacists Against Drug Abuse Campaign.

At the conference, parent leaders will describe their accomplishments, share successful strategies, and identify new challenges. Their achievements include sponsoring a drug-free concert for 10,000 youths, organizing congressional wives, working to ban look-alike pills, producing a weekly talk show on teenage drug use, and developing prevention/education programs for children and for physicians. They are proving, Mr. President, that concerned parents can make a difference in the fight against adolescent drug and alcohol abuse, a grave problem that affects millions of American teenagers and preteens.

In addition to the plenary sessions planned for the conference, the parents have scheduled a special visit to Capitol Hill to meet with their elected officials and staff to discuss matters before Congress which are critical to their efforts. Their visit here will culminate Monday evening with a gala reception for all members and spouses in the Cannon House caucus room in honor of the landmark PBS project, "The Chemical People," which the NFP is cosponsoring along with 30 additional national professional and civic associations.

Mr. President, the National Federation of Parents for Drug-Free Youth, organized in 1980, is the collective voice of thousands of parents all across America who have cried "enough" and determined to reverse the escalating use of drugs and alcohol by our young people. They provide accurate, up-to-date information to communities, educators, Members of both Houses of Congress and assist local parent/community groups to organize at the community level. The NFP also maintains the Nancy Reagan Speakers Bureau.

As the only national organization founded, directed, and administered by parents for the sole purpose of drug and alcohol abuse prevention among our young people, this very effective volunteer organization warrants and needs our fullest support and encouragement. I am particularly proud of the NFP because of the efforts of my good friends and fellow Floridians, Bill and Pat Barton, among the cofounders of the group.●

SENATOR HATFIELD ON NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to draw to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article by my good friend and colleague, Senator MARK HATFIELD, which appeared in today's New York Times.

Entitled "This is Arms Control?", Senator HATFIELD's article makes clear the imperative need for an immediate nuclear weapons freeze followed by major reductions. At the same time, he points out the proposal for a nuclear build-down is analogous to trading old Volkswagens for new Rolls-Royces and sleek, agile Ferraris.

Before the end of this session, all Senators can expect to vote on the nuclear freeze initiative, and I hope that they will carefully consider Senator HATFIELD's article as they make final decisions on the alternatives before them.

I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 22, 1983]

THIS IS ARMS CONTROL?

(By Mark O. Hatfield)

WASHINGTON.—The attitudes that threaten to prevail in Congress today are similar to those that gripped European and American leaders at the turn of the 20th century. The peace movement was strong during that period, just as it is today. The political elite sang of disarmament. Yet these leaders had no intention of denying themselves the freedom to build all the arms they desired.

So it is with the vast majority of those in Congress who support the MX missile on the grounds that it will encourage progress at the arms control talks in Geneva. This defies logic. The type of "arms control" they want in exchange for voting for the MX is even more mind-boggling—a "guaranteed build-down" that would remove two or three old nuclear weapons from the arsenals of the superpowers for each new one built.

Arms escalation would thus become what some Congressmen have called "the engine to fuel arms control." George Orwell would have had fun with this one. Build-down is simply a new way to insure continuation of the old rules, allowing the Administration to determine what it "needs" (whatever the weapons laboratories offer) and attach a quantitative ceiling. This is then called arms control—and we move on to the next round in the arms race. Build-down is a general's dream. It is analagous to trading old Volkswagens for new Rolls-Royces and sleek, agile Ferraris.

In contrast, the term "nuclear freeze" accurately reflects the intent and substance of the proposal it represents. It treats technological advancements in weaponry as the greatest danger of the arms race and the first priority of an arms control agreement leading to reductions.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted Tuesday to reject the freeze and build-down but sent them to the Senate floor for a vote. There is talk of reconciling the two measures. Only magic could make this possible. Weapons might be built on both sides while a freeze is being negotiated—and certainly it would seem more desirable to be removing some weapons than to fail to impose any constraints. But there is a catch: New weapons systems desired by build-down advocates will take many years to reach partial or full deployment, while a nuclear freeze could be negotiated within a year.

While some proponents of build-down are fervently committed to its implementation, others are probably quite prepared to settle for much less. They are merely seeking an imaginative justification for the MX. I suspect that all the President would need to do to placate them is announce that our negotiators at the arms talks in Geneva have been instructed to mention build-down to the Russians. Having done this, they could then return to their original agenda. Congressmen and Senators could hold press conferences touting their influence, and that would be that.

Last week, three members of Congress suggested modifications to make build-down more acceptable to freeze advocates. These include ceilings on strategic warheads and destructive capability. They are flawed in two crucial respects.

Surprisingly, the sponsors acknowledged that rough strategic parity now exists. If this is so, nothing useful can be accomplished through spending for new weapons that couldn't be accomplished without spending a dime through a freeze and subsequent reductions tailored to preserve the balance in a purely downward motion.

The second flaw lies with the build-down proposal's formula for measuring destructive capability. The formula takes into account throw-weight, the number of warheads and bomber-carrying capacity. But one glaring omission—missile accuracy—renders it virtually useless. when the accuracy of a missile is improved by a factor of two, its capacity to destroy a specific target increases as though its explosive power were increased by a factor of eight. Accuracy is not verifiable, but missile flight testing, which is necessary to improve accuracy and maintain confidence in existing weapons systems, is easily verified. Unlike the freeze, build-down conspicuously overlooks the single most important factor contributing to destructive capability.

The historian Barbara Tuchman described the mentality that spurred the second international conference on arms limitation at the Hague in 1907 by saying, "political leaders told the public only what sounded virtuous. . . disarmament must be discussed, if only to prove to the public its impracticability and their own honest intentions." In 25 minutes, they agreed to call for "further serious study" of disarmament. Agreement on the acceptable instrument of war consumed six weeks. They agreed to meet again in eight years. Seven years later, World War I had begun. Fortunately, they weren't able to conclude the war in less than an hour—as we are today.●

VIEWPOINT ON FOOD SUBJECT FOR THOUGHT

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, of all the obligations we might attribute to a society of compassion and decency, the care of children—especially its poorest children—must surely be among the most basic. Indeed, it is perhaps primal, almost biblical, that a good society cares for the least of its members, even as it fosters opportunities for the most.

Such being the case—and who among us would assert that it is not?—the present condition of poor children in our Nation is very nearly disastrous. In spring of 1981, I put together a paper for the Journal of the Institute for Socioeconomic Studies that examined the rise since 1940 in the proportion of children who require public assistance. The projections, though tentative, were nonetheless striking: One child in three born in 1980 will be on public assistance, principally aid to families with dependent children (AFDC), before the age 18. That is more than four times the ratio for 1940. Using the same techniques, we project the relevant ratio for New York City at 50 percent—one-half of the children born in 1980 will be on welfare at some time before they become adults.

These numbers suggest that the condition of poor children must be seen as a fundamental national concern. With concern for the descent into dependency must come concern for the health and well-being of these poor children, which is to say that matters concerning their nutrition and health care become ever more important.

Mr. President, it is, thus, with a touch of sadness and a sense of alarm that we read of hunger and malnutrition amongst the Nation's poor children. Specifically, a column recently in the Buffalo News by its altogether distinguished Washington bureau chief, Max McCarthy, seems worthy of close study by this Senate.

Max McCarthy knows of such things not only from his work as a dedicated journalist. He served his native Buffalo and, to be sure, the entire Nation as a Member of the House of Representatives during the years 1965 through 1970. We learn from his attentiveness to a situation that ought command the attention of all.

Mr. McCarthy offered his thoughts on the Reagan administration and child nutrition in an article September 11 in the Buffalo News. He recounts a recent conference on child nutrition and outlines the case, made persuasively by the senior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), for a national nutrition policy.

It is perhaps as great a surprise to read the statistics Mr. McCarthy presents as it is to realize that they have been barely noticed by those responsible for attending to our Nation's nutrition programs. He writes urgently, demandingly, for so much is, after all, at stake.

Mr. President, I commend this article to my colleagues' attention and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the Buffalo News, Sept. 11, 1983]

REAGAN VULNERABLE ON FOOD POLICY

(By Max McCarthy)

WASHINGTON.—The Reagan administration record on food policy for those most in need is nothing less than a national tragedy as hunger and malnutrition afflict more and more Americans.

Attendees at a recent nutrition conference in the Hubert H. Humphrey Building of the Department of Health and Human Services were almost unanimous in this view. All agreed that this country needs a National Nutrition Policy that will have as its goal adequate nutrition for Americans of all ages.

As one specialist, S. R. Cameron of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, lamented: ". . . efforts to establish a (nutrition) policy have virtually come to a halt during the current administration."

A review of the dismal record shows that in many respects this administration is going backward when it comes to the urgent feeding needs of poor mothers and their children.

As the Congressional Budget Office reported Aug. 25, for the fiscal years 1982 through 1985:

Three million youngsters are being barred from eating under the school feeding program.

Some 1 million moderate-income Americans are losing the food stamps for which they previously were eligible.

More than 300,000 families—mostly headed by mothers without husbands—have lost their eligibility under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program.

The life-giving women-infants-children (WIC) feeding program has been slashed by an incredible 27 percent!

House Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill, D-Mass., reacted angrily to the revealing CBO report. He declared: "Despite the president's recent statements that he is 'perplexed and concerned' at news of rising poverty and hunger in America, CBO documents that Reagan policies have contributed to it. He has denied millions of American families the basics of the American dream . . ."

Drawing from the detailed CBO data, O'Neill charged that Reagan administration budget cuts "have been targeted to families of moderate and low income."

Suddenly worried about the issue as the 1984 elections approach, Reagan recently created a Task Force on Food Assistance. But informed critics of administration food policies became even more alarmed. They expressed the fear that the panel could be used to make excuses for still deeper cuts in food assistance programs for the needy.

Robert Greenstein, who headed the Agriculture Department's Food and Nutrition Service during the Carter administration, detailed the record of Reagan's eight nominees for the task force.

None of the eight "has a track record in support of federal food assistance and four have records opposing such aid,"' he recalled. One of the nominees, Greenstein noted, is economist Kenneth Clarkson. As associate director of the Office of Management and Budget under President Reagan, Clarkson helped fashion the budget that called for slashing child nutrition programs by $300 million a year

According to Greenstein, Clarkson in a 1975 book, suggested several minimum cost eating plans including one scandalous 3,000-calorie-a-day diet of wheat and pancake flour, cabbage, spinach and pork liver.

"This is the same administration that said ketchup was a vegetable, so we shouldn't be surprised if it appoints someone who thinks hungry people should live on a diet of pigs liver, pancake flour and cabbage," caustically observed Nancy Amidei, director of the Food Research and Action Center.

Another Reagan nominee to the new panel, Dr. George Graham, reportedly wrote a paper for the Office of Management and Budget which was used to justify cuts in the women-infants-children feeding program.

With people like this on the panel, what can we expect?

What would help check moves like these would be establishment of a clearly articulated and implemented National Nutrition Policy. A drive for such a policy began during the Ford administration. Hearings, chaired by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., and other in Congress a decade ago, now are printed in nine volumes in the cavernous Library of Congress.

On June 21, 1974, Sen. Kennedy proposed a five-point National Nutrition Policy:

Creation of a National Nutrition Center "to coordinate and maintain" a wide range of nutrition programs.

A National Nutrition Education Program. "Special stress," the senator urged, "should be placed on nutrition education in medical schools and special attention also should be directed toward those physicians who deal with high risk nutrition patients such as infants, mothers and the elderly."

The sometimes presidential candidate also recommended that "nutrition education should be incorporated in the curriculum of all those preparing to teach school age children . . ."

Nutrition Monitoring. Since, as the lawmaker pointed out, "nutritional adequacy can be determined only from a knowledge of the actual intake of foods, periodic reviews of eating habits of Americans can provide the basis for ensuring that the public is eating the proper foods."

Research. Sen. Kennedy pointed out that not only is it necessary to obtain information about nutritional problems but it is necessary to understand methods of prevention for such afflictions as obesity and malnutrition and to see that those who need therapy get it.

Manpower. The legislator concluded that programs to provide additional manpower as paraprofessionals and health nutritionists who can deliver these health services at the local level "must be initiated to guarantee the success of the other four basic aspects of a National Nutrition Policy."

It is tragic to observe that there still are starving and malnourished infants and adults in this land of plenty. It's gratifying to see some of the contenders for next year's presidential nominations have been moved by the lamentable situation to reintroduce this urgent topic.●

NATIONAL SICKLE CELL ANEMIA AWARENESS MONTH

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 168, designating September 1983, as

"National Sickle Cell Anemia Awareness Month."

This resolution is important for both humanitarian and practical reasons. Sickle cell anemia is one of the most common chronic illnesses of black children, yet there is a lack of awareness of this disease—not only among the general public, but even among the public at risk. In a survey of the black population in Richmond, Va., only 30 percent had heard of the disease.

One in every 500 black Americans has sickle cell anemia. One in every 10 black Americans carries the sickle cell trait. Since sickle cell victims tend to have a shorter life span, this disease is found most commonly in our young.

Sufferers are particularly susceptible to infection, which is a frequent cause of their death. Other leading causes of death are heart and kidney failures and shock. Since these young sufferers cannot lead normal lives, they often suffer severe emotional problems as well.

Presently, sickle cell anemia is a disease for which there is no cure. Screening high risk groups for carriers and providing genetic counseling offer the only means of prevention. Several simple and inexpensive tests are now available for screening purposes. These are utterly useless, however, if our population is not educated on the realities of this infirmity. I believe Sickle Cell Anemia Awareness Month is an important step toward remedying this situation.

Although there is no cure for sickle cell anemia, much can be done to prevent the disease and improve care for its sufferers. Only through increased awareness, especially among the black population and health research facilities, can we combat this disease effectively. This joint resolution, which has already been passed in the House, seeks to create an environment of understanding from which we can lead our assault on this disease. I urge quick passage of this resolution.●

VIEWS ON RETIRED REAR ADMIRAL LAROCQUE

● Mr. DENTON. Mr. President, many Americans were disturbed when retired Rear Adm. Gene Larocque, Director of the Center for Defense Information, appeared on Soviet television to attack the policies of the United States. No Americans were more upset than were the overwhelming majority of the Navy's retired admirals. Those men, who devoted their careers to the service of their country and risked their lives to defend its freedom and its liberties, were deeply concerned that a retired admiral would exploit his retired rank to lend credibility to highly controversial views expressed on the controlled media of a state dedicated to the overthrow of the United States.

Neither I nor any other thinking American disputes Admiral Larocque's right to express his views, however controversial they may be. Yet there are legitimate concerns about the wisdom, judgment, and motives behind using the controlled broadcast media of a totalitarian state to level an attack upon the policies of the United States, the country whose devotion to freedom makes it possible for all of us to speak out when and how we choose.

Many retired Navy admirals were so disturbed by Admiral Larocque's action, by the way that it was twisted for propaganda purposes by the Soviet Union, and by the precedent it set, that they joined together, at their own expense, to tell the American people of their concerns. They placed a full page advertisement in our major national newspapers, and attached their names to their statement of views. Those signing include men of unquestioned loyalty and achievement who have held the most responsible positions in the naval service. They wanted the American people to know how they feel and to understand that Admiral Larocque is not representative of our country's retired naval officers.

Mr. President, I ask that the complete text of the advertisement and signatories, as it appeared in the Washington Times of August 19, 1983, be printed in the RECORD.

The advertisement follows:

[From the Washington Times, Aug. 19, 1983]

ADVERTISEMENT

We think that it is time to let the American people know where the vast majority of their retired U.S. Navy Admirals stand.

Retired Rear Admiral Larocque's appearance on Soviet television to condemn the policies of the United States is contrary to our precepts and, we think, injurious to the best interests of our country.

While we unequivocally defend his First Amendment right to express his views, we question Rear Admiral Larocque's judgment in using a totalitarian state controlled medium for the purpose. To an equal degree we question the wisdom of people, both in and out of the government, who rely on selected, biased institutions with quasi-military spokesmen, to oppose initiatives to rebuild the nation's defense.

As a recent daily publication pointed out in part, those "who consistently oppose almost every new U.S. weapon system, while just as consistently apologizing for every new Soviet weapons deployment, may be—(and should be)—losing their credibility because of that consistency."

As a case in point, we agree with the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, when he questions the bias of the "Center For Defense Information" (a private, non-government organization) in its implied assumption regarding an anti-satellite system, that there is "no threat to peace if the Soviets have a system deployed, as they do, but it somehow would risk a war in space if the United States even tests such a system." (Congressional Record, House—June 14, 1983, page 15665).

We deplore the attempt of certain officers, without access to the latest classified information, to advance—under the cover of their retired rank—their own biases for the reasoned conclusion of the professional active military officers, who are briefed daily on Soviet progress in weapons development and deployment.

We particularly consider reprehensible the use of Soviet television by a retired flag officer—in this case Rear Admiral Gene Larocque, Director, The Center For Defense Information—to condemn the policies of the United States, his own country. (See: Washington Post, June 13, 1983; Time Magazine, June 27, 1983)

We, the undersigned, believe we are only a sample of the overwhelming majority of lifetime professionals who, regardless of individual views on specific weapon systems, would never, under any circumstances, permit themselves to be used as "front men" for Soviet propaganda.

SIGNATURES RECEIVED AS OF JULY 18, 1983

Rear Admiral J. Lloyd Abbot, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Inspector General, Atlantic Fleet.

Rear Admiral Frank Akers, USN (Ret.), Former Commander Fleet Air Alameda.

Rear Admiral John M. Alford, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Commander Military Sealift Command.

Rear Admiral John H. Alvis, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Commander, Naval Air Systems Command.

Admiral George W. Anderson, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Operations.

Rear Admiral Herbert H. Anderson, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Policy, Plans, & NSC Affairs, Sec. Def. (ISA).

Rear Admiral Roy G. Anderson, USN (Ret.), Former Navy Member, Weapon Systems Evaluation Groups JCS.

Rear Admiral Clyde C. Andrews, USN (Ret.) Former Assistant Commander, Naval Air Systems Command, for R&D.

Rear Admiral J. J. Appleby, (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Commandant, Armed Forces Industrial College.

Vice Admiral Parker Armstrong, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Research & Development, Naval Operations.

Admiral Jackson D. Arnold, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Material.

Rear Admiral Murr E. Arnold, USN (Ret), Former Commander, 11th Naval District.

Vice Admiral Frederick L. Ashworth, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, U.S. Sixth Fleet.

Vice Admiral Evan P. Aurand, USN (Ret.), Former Commander Anti-Submarine Warfare Forces, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral Donald G. Baer, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief Naval Material.

Rear Admiral Fred E. Bakutis, USN (Ret), Former Commander, Hawaiian Sea Frontier.

Vice Admiral Robert B. Baldwin, USN (Ret.), Former Commander Seventh Fleet.

Vice Admiral F. A. Bardshar, USN (Ret.), Former Commander Task Force 77.

Rear Admiral John M. Barrett, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Logistics Force, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral Thomas E. Bass, II, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Cruiser-Destroyer Flotillas (Nine & Three).

Rear Admiral Hadley Batcheller, USN (Ret.), Former Commander Charleston Naval Shipyard.

Vice Admiral Walter H. Baumberger USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral T. L. Becknell, Jr., (SC), USN (Ret), Former Commander Defense Fuel Supply Center.

Rear Admiral F. Julian Becton, USN (Ret), Former Deputy Naval Inspector General.

Rear Admiral John K. Bolling, USN (Ret.), Former Commander Iceland Defense Force.

Rear Admiral Roy S. Brennan, USN (Ret.), Former Commander Submarine Force Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral Karl J. Brernstein, USN (Ret.) Former Commander, Iceland Defense Force.

Vice Admiral Phillip A. Beshany, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy CNO (Submarine Warfare).

Rear Admiral Dean Black, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Commander Defense Atomic Support Agency.

Rear Admiral Charles A. Blick, (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Commanding Officer, Naval Resale and Support.

Vice Admiral Francis J. Blouin, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Operators (Plans & Policies).

Admiral Walter F. Boone, USN (Ret.), Former U.S. Representative Standing Group NATO.

Vice Admiral C. T. Booth, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Air Force Atlantic Fleet.

Vice Admiral Harold G. Bowen, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Intelligance).

Rear Admiral Paul C. Boyd, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Director Joint Chief of Staff.

Vice Admiral Jon L. Boyes, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Director General, (NICSMA) NATO.

Rear Admiral Frank A. Brandley, USN (Ret.), Former Chief Naval Air Advanced Training.

Admiral William F. Bridge, USN (Ret.), Former Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe.

Rear Admiral James A. Brown, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Norfolk Naval Shipyard.

Rear Admiral S. R. Brown, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Deputy CHO—(Fleet Ops & Readiness).

Vice Admiral C. R. Bryan, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Sea System Command.

Vice Admiral C. F. Bryant, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Operational Training Command, Atlantic.

Rear Admiral Charles A. Buchman, USN (Ret.), Former Commandant, 14th Naval District.

Rear Admiral Raymond W. Burk, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command.

Admiral Arleigh Burks, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Operations.

Rear Admiral John L. Butts, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Carrier Division One.

Vice Admiral M. W. Cagle, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Education and Training.

Rear Admiral H. H. Caldwell, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Caribbean Sea Frontier.

Vice Admiral Turner F. Caldwell, USN (Ret.), Former Director ASW Programs, Naval Operations.

Rear Admiral William M. Callaghan, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Fleet Air Mediterranean.

Vice Admiral William M. Callaghan, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, U.S. Naval Forces, Far East.

Vice Admiral James F. Calvert, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, U.S. First Fleet.

Rear Admiral Lucien Capone, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Director, Inter-American Defense College.

Rear Admiral Martin D. Carmody, USN (Ret.), Former Navy Inspector General.

Rear Admiral Ralph H. Camahan, USN (Ret.), Former Commandant Naval District Washington.

Admiral Robert B. Camey, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Operations.

Vice Admiral Alvin D. Chandler, USN (Ret.), Former Logistic Plans, Navy Department.

Rear Admiral John D. Chase, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Logistics.

Vice Admiral John L. Chew, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Taiwan Defense Command.

Rear Admiral K. C. Childers, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Naval Air Systems Command Representative, Atlantic.

Rear Admiral J. C. Christiansen, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air Warfare).

Rear Admiral K. J. Christoph, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Staff, U.S. Readiness Command.

Rear Admiral William F. Clifford, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Cruiser Destroyer Group 12.

Rear Admiral L. D. Coates, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Research.

Rear Admiral Phillip P. Cole, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Service Force, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral Joseph L. Coleman, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Base Philadelphia.

Rear Admiral Robert M. Collins, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Task Force Seventy Three.

Rear Admiral Walter V. Combs, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Service Force, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral Warren M. Cone, USN (Ret.), Former J-6, Staff, U.S. Commander in Chief, Europe.

Vice Admiral Thomas F. Connolly, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Air Warfare.

Rear Admiral Robert C. Connolly, II, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Inter-American Defense College.

Rear Admiral Ralph E. Cook, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Security Group.

Rear Admiral S.M. Cooley, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Patrol Wings, Pacific.

Vice Admiral Damon W. Cooper, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Striking Force, Seventh Fleet.

Rear Admiral Josua W. Cooper, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of the Military Assistance Group, Norway.

Rear Admiral Frank W. Corley, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Iberian Atlantic Area.

Rear Admiral Peter Corradi, (CEC), USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Civil Engineers.

Rear Admiral John T. Coughlin, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant to Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

Rear Admiral J. S. Coye, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Training Command, Atlantic Fleet.

Rear Admiral Kenneth Craig, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Fleet Air Jacksonville.

Rear Admiral Earl R. Crawford, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Staff, European Command.

Rear Admiral John Crumpacker, (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Chief Bureau of Supplies & Accounts.

Rear Admiral Robert R. Crutchfield, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Cruiser-Destroyer Flotilla Six.

Vice Admiral Walter L. Curtis, USN (Ret.), Former Special Representative of The Secretary of Defense.

Rear Admiral James A. Dare, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, South Atlantic Force, Atlantic Fleet.

Rear Admiral John F. Davidson, USN (Ret.), Former Superintendent, U.S. Naval Academy.

Admiral Donald C. Davis, USN (Ret.), Former Commander-in-Chief, Pacific Fleet.

Vice Admiral George M. Davis, (MC), USN (Ret.), Former Surgeon General, U.S. Navy.

Rear Admiral John D. Davis, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Amphibious Operations Support Command, Pacific.

Rear Admiral T. F. Dedman, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Iberian Atlantic Area.

Vice Admiral Francis C. Denebrink, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Military Sea Transportation Service.

Rear Admiral Jeremiah A. Denton, USN (Ret.), Former Commander Armed Forces Staff College.

Vice Admiral Vincent P. dePoix, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Defense Intelligence Agency.

Rear Admiral John H. Dick, USN (Ret)., Former Commander, U.S. Naval Forces, Philippines.

Vice Admiral Glynn R. Donaho, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Military Sea Transportation Service.

Rear Admiral H. C. Donley, Jr., (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Defense Construction Supply Center.

Rear Admiral Marshall E. Dornin, USN (Ret.) Former Commander, Cruiser Destroyer Force, Pacific Fleet.

Vice Admiral J. H. Doyle, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Surface Warfare).

Rear Admiral Raymond F. DuBois, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Cruiser Destroyer Group, Western Pacific.

Rear Admiral C. H. Duerfeldt, USN (Ret.), Former ComFair Hawaii-Commander, Barrier Force.

Rear Admiral Alene B. Duerk, (NC), USN (Ret.), Former Director, Navy Nurse Corps.

Vice Admiral Ralph Earle, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Base Commander, Newport, R.I.

Rear Admiral Paul J. Early, USN (Ret.), Former Director of Ocean Surveillance.

Rear Admiral Earl R. Eastwold, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Middle East Forces.

Vice Admiral C. E. Ekstrom, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Sixth Fleet.

Rear Admiral Donald T. Eller, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Chief of Staff-Administration, NATO.

Rear Admiral Ernest M. Eller, USN (Ret.), Former Director of Naval History.

Rear Admiral George F. Ellis, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, South Atlantic Force, Atlantic Fleet.

Rear Admiral William H. Ellis, USN (Ret.), Former Commander Naval Base, Norfolk.

Rear Admiral Paul H. Engel, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command.

Rear Admiral Walter M. Enger, (CEC), USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Civil Engineers.

Rear Admiral Horace H. Epes, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Office of the Assistant Secretay of Defense, (ISA).

Rear Admiral Robert B. Erly, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Iberian Atlantic Area.

Rear Admiral Arthur G. Esch, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Cruisers-Destroyers, Seventh Fleet.

Vice Admiral Carl F. Espe, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Amphibious Force, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral C. T. Faulders, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Commander, Naval Air Systems Command.

Rear Admiral Edward L. Feightner, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Commander Naval Air Systems Command.

Admiral Harry D. Felt, USN (Ret.), Former Commander in Chief, Pacific.

Rear Admiral W. E. Ferrall, USN (Ret.), Former Commandant, 13th Naval District.

Vice Admiral John G. Finneran, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Second Fleet.

Rear Admiral John R. Fisher, (CEC), USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Pacific Fleet Seabees.

Rear Admiral W. R. Flanagan, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Forces, Carribean.

Rear Admiral Allan F. Fleming, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Fleet Air Mediterranean.

Rear Admiral H. J. P. Foley, Jr., (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Navy Aviation Supply Officer.

Vice Admiral B. B. Forbes, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Deputy & Chief of Staff, CINCLANT/CINCLANTFLT.

Rear Admiral Richard E. Fowler, USN (Ret.), Former Director of Logistics, U.S. Pacific Command.

Rear Admiral Norbert Frankenberger, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Mare Island Naval Shipyard.

Rear Admiral Dewitt L. Freeman, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Carrier Division Four.

Rear Admiral Rowland G. Freeman, III, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Weapons Center, China Lake.

Rear Admiral Mark P. Frudden, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Surface Group, Western Pacific.

Rear Admiral R. Byron Fuller, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Carrier Battle Group Four.

Vice Admiral Walter D. Gaddis, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics).

Admiral I. J. Galantin, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Material.

Rear Admiral Richard T. Gaskill, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Politico-Military Policy & Plans, Naval Operations.

Rear Admiral Donald Gay, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Fleet Air Wings Pacific.

Rear Admiral Harry E. Gerhard, USN (Ret.), Former DCOS, Plans, Operations & Intelligence, SACLANT.

Rear Admiral Fillmore B. Gilkeson, USN (Ret.), Former Commandant, Eleventh Naval District.

Rear Admiral Richard P. Glass, USN (Ret.), Former Special Assistant to Secretary of the Navy.

Rear Admiral Henry P. Glindeman, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Safety Center.

Rear Admiral A. S. Goodfellow, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Operational Test and Evaluation Force.

Vice Admiral Arthur R. Gralla, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Ordnance Systems Command.

Rear Admiral E. B. Grantham, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Staff, Commander in Chief Pacific.

Rear Admiral Norm Green, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Carrier Group Six.

Vice Admiral Howard E. Greer, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Air Forces, Atlantic Fleet.

Admiral Charles D. Griffin, USN (Ret.), Former Commander-in-Chief, Allied Forces, Southern Europe.

Vice Admiral Charles H. Griffiths, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Submarine Warfare).

Rear Admiral William H. Grovermen, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Western Sea Frontier.

Rear Admiral William S. Guest, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Military Sealift, Pacific.

Rear Admiral Frank S. Haak, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Information Systems Division, CNO.

Rear Admiral Mayo A. Hadden, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Fleet Air Wings, Atlantic.

Rear Admiral Grover B. H. Hall, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Fleet Air Hawaii.

Rear Admiral Robert J. Hanks, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Strategic Plans & Policy, Navy Department.

Vice Admiral Patrick J. Hannifin, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Joint Staff, JCS.

Vice Admiral Frederick J. Harifinger, USN (Ret.), Former Director Naval Intelligence.

Rear Admiral William H. Harris, USN (Ret.), Former COMMEDATTACK Electronic Warfare Wing, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral William L. Harris, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander Naval Weapons Center, China Lake.

Vice Admiral C. Monroe Hart, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant to the Secretary of Defense.

Rear Admiral Paul E. Hartman, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

Vice Admiral H. L. Harty, USN (Ret.), Former Senior Naval Member, UN Military Staff Committee & Commander, Eastern Sea Frontier.

Vice Admiral John T. Hayward, USN (Ret.), Former President, U.S. Naval War College.

Admiral Thomas B. Hayward, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Operations.

Vice Admiral Truman J. Hedding, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant to Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Rear Admiral Richard E. Henning, USN (Ret.), Former Inspector General, Naval Ships.

Rear Admiral Lawrence Heyworth, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Staff, CINCPAC.

Rear Admiral James B. Hildreth, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Cruiser-Destroyer Flotillas, Atlantic.

Rear Admiral Andrew J. Hill, USN (Ret.), Former Commandant, Naval District, Washington.

Rear Admiral Clarance H. Hill, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower).

Rear Admiral Wellington T. Hines, USN (Ret.), Former Fleet Readiness Rep., Bureau, Naval Weapons.

Rear Admiral Roy F. Hoffmann, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Mine Warfare Force.

Vice Admiral Reynold D. Hogle, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Fifth Naval District.

Admiral James L. Holloway, III, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Operations.

Rear Admiral John B. Holmes, (DC), USN (Ret.) Former Commanding Officer, Regional Dental Center, Norfolk

Rear Admiral Carl O. Holmquist, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Research.

Rear Admiral Billy D. Holder, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Strategic Plans & Policy Control Division, CNO.

Admiral Ephraim P. Holmes, USN (Ret.), Former Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet & Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic.

Rear Admiral L. V. Honsinger, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief, Bureau of Ships.

Rear Admiral L. E. Hopkins, (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command.

Rear Admiral William H. House, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Air Warfare Division, CNO.

Rear Admiral Lester E. Hubbell, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Destroyer Flotilla Six.

Rear Admiral Harry Hull, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Cruiser-Destoryer Flotilla 10.

Rear Admiral William C. Hushing, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard.

Admiral John J. Hyland, USN (Ret.), Former Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral Eugene S. Ince, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Security Group Command.

Rear Admiral William D. Irvin, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Service Force, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral Joseph A. Jasp, USN (Ret.), Former CINCPAC Rep., Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff & SAC.

Vice Admiral Andrew McB Jackson, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, (Plans & Policy).

Rear Admiral P. W. Jackson, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Carrier Division 14.

Rear Admiral Ralph K. James, USN (Ret.), Former Chief, Bureau of Ships.

Rear Admiral Frederick E. Janney, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Logistic Support Force, Seventh Fleet.

Rear Admiral Henry J. Johnson, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Western Division.

Vice Admiral Nels C. Johnson, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Joint Staff of the JCS.

Rear Admiral Ralph C. Johnson, USN (Ret.), Former Commandant, 15th Naval District.

Admiral Roy L. Johnson, USN (Ret.), Former Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet.

Admiral Means Johnston, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander in Chief, Allied Forces, Southern Europe.

Rear Admiral Carlton B. Jones, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Forces, Marianas.

Rear Admiral Robert F. Jortberg (CEC), USN (Ret.), Former Director, Shore Facilities Programming Division.

Rear Admiral C. A. Karaberis, USN (Ret.), Former Manager, ASW Project Office.

Rear Admiral A. L. Kelin, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Director, Defense Intelligence Agency.

Admiral Isaac Campbell Kidd, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet & Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic.

Vice Admiral Ingolf N. Kiland, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Amphibious Force, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral Ed R. King, USN (Ret.), Former Commander Mid-East Force.

Vice Admiral J. H. King, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Director for Operations, JCS.

Admiral G. E. R. Kinnear II, USN (Ret.), Former U.S. Military Representative to the NATO Military Committee.

Rear Admiral Louis J. Kim, USN (Ret.), Former Defense Attache, U.S. Embassy, London, England.

Rear Admiral Wm. L. Knickerbocker (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Defense Medical Supply Center.

Rear Admiral Arthur K. Knoizen, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Legislative Affairs, Navy Department.

Rear Admiral Ferdinand B. Koch, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Aircraft Carrier Programs Division, Naval Operations.

Rear Admiral Herman J. Kossler, USN (Ret.), Former Commandant, Sixth Naval District.

Rear Admiral Paul L. Lacy, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Submarine Force, Pacific Fleet.

Vice Admiral Harold O. Larson, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, MSTS, Pacific.

Rear Admiral Edwin T. Layton, USN (Ret.), Former Director Naval Intelligence School.

Vice Admiral Julien J. LeBourgeois, USN (Ret.), Former President, Naval War College.

Vice Admiral Fitzhugh Lee, USN (Ret.), Former Commandant, National War College.

Vice Admiral Kent L. Lee, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Air Systems Command.

Rear Admiral G. W. Lenox, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Light Attack Wing, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral William N. Leonard, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Navy Safety Center.

Vice Admiral Ruthven E. Libby, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, First Fleet.

Rear Admiral James B. Linder, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, U.S. Taiwan Defense Command.

Rear Admiral William H. Livingston, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Air, Surface, & Electronic Warfare, Naval Operations.

Rear Admiral Thomas A. Long, (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Supply Center, Norfolk.

Vice Admiral V. L. Lowrance, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Submarine Force, Atlantic Fleet.

Rear Admiral John J. Lynch, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Commander Striking Forces South.

Rear Admiral Harvey E. Lyon, USN (Ret.), Former Project Manager, Trident Project.

Vice Admiral William P. Mack, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Seventh Fleet.

Rear Admiral Robert A. Macpherson, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Air Advanced Training.

Rear Admiral Thomas L. Malone, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Cheif of Naval Technical Training.

Rear Admiral Robert C. Mandeville, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Cheif Naval Material Command (Logistics).

Rear Admiral G. Patrick March, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Electronic Warfare & Cryptology Div., OPNAV.

Rear Admiral John L. Marocchi, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Director, National Security Agency.

Vice Admiral William I. Martin, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, U.S. Sixth Fleet.

Rear Admiral Forsyth Massey, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Fleet Air Quonset.

Rear Admiral H. Spencer Matthews, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Air Warfare & Aviation Training, Naval Operations.

Rear Admiral Brian McCauley, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Mine Forces—Haiphong Channel & Suez.

Rear Admiral Thomas R. McCellan, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Air System Command.

Rear Admiral William R. McClendon, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Attack Carrier Striking Force, Seventh Fleet.

Rear Admiral R. B. McClinton, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Base Charleston, S.C.

Rear Admiral F. D. McCorkle, USN (Ret.), Former President, Board of Inspection & Survey.

Rear Admiral Leo. B. McCuddin, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Carrier Division Three.

Admiral David L. McDonald, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Operations.

Rear Admiral Lucien B. McDonald, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Military Sea Transport Service, Far East.

Rear Admiral Rhodam Y. McElroy, Jr., USN, (Ret.), Former Chief of Legislative Affairs, Navy Department.

Rear Admiral Robert P. McKenzie, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, U.S. Forces Caribbean.

Rear Admiral E. B. McKinney, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Forces Korea.

Vice Admiral Ephraim R. McLean, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Cruiser Division Two.

Rear Admiral Robert W. McNitt, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower).

Rear Admiral John H. McQuillkin, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, San Francisco Bay Naval Shipyard.

Rear Admiral W. K. Mendenhall, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Staff, U.S. European Command.

Rear Admiral Jeffrey C. Metzel, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Director, Antisubmarine Warfare Programs.

Rear Admiral Edward F. Metzger, (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Pacific Fleet Supply Officer.

Admiral F. H. Michaelis, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Material.

Rear Admiral Floyd H. Miller, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Cruiser Destroyer Group One.

Vice Admiral G. E. Miller, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Sixth Fleet.

Rear Admiral George H. Miller, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Navy Long Range Objectives Group.

Rear Admiral Ward S. Miller, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Base, Los Angeles-Long Beach.

Vice Admiral Charles S. Minter, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chairman NATO Military Committee.

Rear Admiral C. N. Mitchell, USN, (Ret.), Former Deputy Director, Navy Edcation and Training.

Rear Admiral A. J. Monger, USN (Ret.), Former Assistand Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air Warfare).

Rear Admiral Henry S. Monroe, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Amphibious Training Command, Pacific.

Rear Admiral Jack P. Monroe, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, U.S. Naval Forces, Philippine.

Rear Admiral James W. Montgomery, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command.

Rear Admiral Michael U. Moore, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Amphibious Group Two.

Rear Admiral Robert B. Moore, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Carrier Division Five.

Rear Admiral Robert L. Moore, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief, Bureau of Ships.

Vice Admiral Joseph P. Moorer, USN (Ret.), Former Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe.

Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, USN (Ret.), Former CNO and Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Rear Admiral Max K. Morris, USN (Ret.), Former Commander of Midshipmen, U.S. Naval Academy.

Rear Admiral A. G. Mumma, USN (Ret.), Former Chief, Bureau of Ships.

Rear Admiral Ralph F. Murphy, Jr., (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Chief of Staff, Logistics & Readiness, Atlantic.

Rear Admiral George R. Muse, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, U.S. Naval Forces, Philippines.

Vice Admiral Lloyd M. Mustin, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Defense Nuclear Agency.

Rear Admiral Charles D. Nace, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, U.S. Naval Forces, Southern Command.

Rear Admiral James W. Nance, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

Rear Admiral William T. Nelson, USN (Ret.), Former Chief, Military Assistance Advisory Group, Denmark.

Vice Admiral John H. Nicholson, USN (Ret.), Former Vice Director, Joint Strategic Targeting Staff.

Rear Admiral R. E. Nicholson,USN (Ret.), Former Battle Group Commander.

Rear Admiral Emmet O'Beime, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Field Command, DASA.

Rear Admiral O. H. Oberg, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans & Operations, CINCPACFLT.

Rear Admiral Leslie J. O'Brien, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Service Force, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral Edward J. O'Donnell, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Base Guantanamo.

Vice Admiral James W. O'Grady, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Staff, SACLANT.

Vice Admiral Howard E. Orem, USN (Ret.), Former Navy Member Joint Strategic Survey Committee, JCS.

Rear Admiral Edward C. Outlaw, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Task Force 77.

Rear Admiral Roger W. Paine, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Training Command, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral Charles J. Palmer, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard.

Vice Admiral Edward N. Parker, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Rear Admiral G. Serpell Patrick, USN (Ret.), Former Naval Inspector General.

Rear Admiral John B. Pearson, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Bureau of Aeronautics Rep., Western District.

Rear Admiral Eugene J. Peltier (CEC), USN (Ret.), Former Chief Bureau of Yards & Docks.

Rear Admiral Forrest S. Petersen, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Air Systems Command.

Rear Admiral W. F. Petrovic, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard.

Rear Admiral Chester G. Phillips, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Director National Security Agency.

Rear Admiral Ben B. Pickett, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Staff, Atlantic Fleet.

Rear Admiral Frank L. Pinney, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Operational Test & Evaluation Force.

Vice Admiral Robert B. Pirie, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

Rear Admiral George F. Pittard, USN (Ret.), Former Chairman Ship Characteristics Board.

Vice Admiral Douglas C. Plate, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Commander in Chief, Atlantic.

Rear Admiral Donald T. Poe, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Naval Communications.

Rear Admiral William S. Post, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Task Force Commander, Seventh Fleet.

Rear Admiral Richard R. Pratt, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Service Force, Atlantic Fleet.

Rear Admiral Arthur W. Price, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Amphibious Force Seventh Fleet.

Vice Admiral Frank H. Price, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Surface Warfare.

Rear Admiral Walter H. Price, USN (Ret.), Former Commandant, 11th Naval District.

Admiral Alfred M. Pride, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Seventh Fleet.

Rear Admiral Schuyler N. Pyne, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, New York Naval Shipyard.

Vice Admiral W. F. Rabom, USN (Ret.), "Father" of Polaris Submarine Weapon System.

Vice Admiral Thomas C. Ragan, USN (Ret.), Former Chief, U.S. Naval Mission, Brazil.

Rear Admiral James D. Ramage, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Forces, Caribbean.

Vice Admiral W. T. Rapp, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Third Fleet.

Rear Admiral William L. Read, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Surface Force, Atlantic Fleet.

Vice Admiral Earl F. Rectanus, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Deputy Secretary of Defense (Resources & Management).

Rear Admiral Alan L. Reed, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Staff, Defense Intelligence Agency.

Rear Admiral James R. Reedy, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Task Force 77.

Vice Admiral William L. Rees, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Air Force, Atlantic Fleet.

Vice Admiral Eli T. Reich USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Assistant Secretary Defense.

Rear Admiral Joseph E. Rice, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Electronic Systems Command.

Vice Admiral Robert H. Rice, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Cruiser Division One.

Rear Admiral H. G. Rich, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Iceland Defense Force.

Vice Admiral David C. Richardson, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Sixth Fleet.

Rear Admiral Robert E. Riera, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Fleet Air Western Pacific.

Rear Admiral Maure H. Rindskopf, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Deep Submergence Program.

Admiral Horacio Rivero, USN (Ret.), Former Commander in Chief, Allied Forces, Southern Europe.

Rear Admiral William D. Robertson, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Vice Director, Defense Intelligence Agency.

Rear Admiral W. F. Rodee, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Fleet Air, San Diego.

Rear Admiral David M. Rubel, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Director Command, Control & Communications, CNO.

Rear Admiral Edward A. Ruckner, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy CNO for Research, Development, Test & Evaluation.

Rear Admiral Richard E. Rumble, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Staff, Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic.

Admiral James S. Russell, USN (Ret.), Former Commander in Chief, Allied Forces, Southern Europe.

Rear Admiral Thomas B. Russell, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, U.S. Naval Forces, Japan.

Vice Admiral L. S. Sabin, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Staff, Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic.

Vice Admiral Robert S. Seizer, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Surface Forces, Pacific.

Rear Admiral Merrill H. Sappington, USN (Ret.), Former Acting Director, Weapon System Evaluation Group, DOD.

Rear Admiral Louis R. Saroady, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Commander, Naval Systems Command.

Vice Admiral Arnold F. Schade, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Submarine Forces, Atlantic.

Rear Admiral Raymond J. Schneider, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Electronic Systems Command.

Rear Admiral G. J. Schuller, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Fleet Air Western Pacific.

Rear Admiral Floyd B. Schultz, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships.

Rear Admiral James H. Scott, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Tactical Wings Atlantic.

Vice Admiral Harry E. Sears, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Carrier Division Fourteen.

Rear Admiral Kenneth P. Sears, (CEC), USN (Ret.), Former Vice Commander, Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

Rear Admiral Carl J. Selberlich, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Military Personnel Command.

Rear Admiral Leslie H. Sell, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Command Support Programs, OPNAV.

Vice Admiral B. J. Semmes, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former President, Naval War College.

Rear Admiral John Nevin Shaffer, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Cruiser Destroyer Force, Atlantic.

Rear Admiral Sumner Shapiro, USN (Ret.), Former Director of Naval Intelligence.

Admiral U.S. Grant Sharp, USN (Ret.), Former Commander in Chief, Pacific.

Rear Admiral D. B. Shelton, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Policy & Plans, CINCPAC.

Rear Admiral Alan B. Shepard, USN (Ret.), Former Chief, U.S. Astronaut Corps.

Rear Admiral Tazewell T. Shepard, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Joint Integrated Planning Staff.

Vice Admiral Ralph L. Shifley, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics)

Vice Admiral Allen M. Shinn, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Air Force, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral Donald M. Showers, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Staff, Defense Intelligence Agency.

Rear Admiral Burton H. Shupper, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower).

Rear Admiral William B. Sieglaff, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, First Naval District.

Rear Admiral Walter L. Small, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Submarine Force, Pacific.

Vice Admiral William R. Smedburg III, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Personnel.

Rear Admiral W. R. Smedburg IV, USN (Ret.), Former Director Naval Warfare.

Vice Admiral Allan E. Smith, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Blockade Force, Korea.

Rear Admiral Allan Smith, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Middle East Force.

Vice Admiral John V. Smith, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Amphibious Forces, Pacific.

Rear Admiral Leonard A. Snead, USN (Ret.), Former F-14 Program Manager.

Vice Admiral Edwin K. Snyder, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, U.S. Taiwan Defense Command.

Rear Admiral Philip W. Snyder, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard.

Rear Admiral Robert H. Speck, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Cruise-Destroyer Force Atlantic Fleet.

Rear Admiral Roger E. Spreen, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Ordnance Systems Command.

Vice Admiral George R. Steele, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Seventh Fleet.

Rear Admiral Edward C. Stephan, USN (Ret.), Former Oceanographer of the Navy.

Vice Admiral James B. Stockdale, USN (Ret.), Former President, Naval War College.

Rear Admiral Frank B. Stone, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Iceland Defense Force.

Vice Admiral B. M. Strean, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Air Training.

Vice Admiral Robert J. Stroh, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Director, Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff.

Vice Admiral Paul D. Stroop, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Air Force, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral William A. Stuart, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Hunter Killer Forces, Atlantic.

Rear Admiral Henry Suerstedt, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, U.S. Naval Weapons Center, China Lake.

Rear Admiral L. V. Swanson, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Commander, Naval Forces, Europe.

Rear Admiral Gerald E. Synhorst, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Submarine Warfare).

Vice Admiral George C. Talley, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Plans, Policy & Operations).

Rear Admiral Charles P. Tesh, USN (Ret), Former Deputy Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe.

Rear Admiral John M. Thomas, USN (Ret), Former Commander, Pacific Missile Test Center.

Rear Admiral William Thompson, USN (Ret), Former Chief of Information (U.S. Navy,

Rear Admiral J.B. Tibbets, USN (Ret), Former Commander, Hunter Killer Forces, Atlantic Fleet

Rear Admiral John M. Tieney, USN (Ret), Former Commander, Tactical Electronic Wing, Pacific.

Rear Admiral Ernest E. Tissot, USN (Ret), Former Assistant for Plans & Policy, CINCPAC.

Rear Admiral W.D. Toole, Jr., USN (Ret), Former Commander, Amphibious Forces, Seventh Fleet.

Rear Admiral Theordore A. Torgerson, USN (Ret), Former Deputy Communications Electronics, Joint Staff, JCS.

Vice Admiral George C. Towner, USN (Ret), Former Commander, Amphibious Force, Atlantic Fleet.

Vice Admiral Robert L. Townsend, USN (Ret), Former Commander, Naval Air Force, Atlantic Fleet.

Vice Admiral Frederick C. Turner, USN (Ret), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air Warfare)

Rear Admiral M.H. Tuttle, USN (Ret), Former Deputy Commander, Pacific Missile Range.

Vice Admiral John A. Tyree, USN (Ret), Former Chief of Staff, European Command

Rear Admiral Clyde J. Vanarsdall, Jr., USN (Ret), Former Commander, Western Sea Frontier.

Rear Admiral L.R. Vassey, USN (Ret), Former Chief of Strategic Plans & Policies, CINCPAC.

Rear Admiral K.L. Veth, USN (Ret), Former Commander, Naval Forces, Vietnam.

Rear Admiral John R. Wadleigh, USN (Ret), Former Commander Training Command, Atlantic Fleet.

Rear Admiral George H. Wales, USN (Ret), Former Director Pan American Affairs, Naval Operations.

Vice Admiral T.J. Walker, USN (Ret), Former Commander, Naval Air Force, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral Norvell G. Ward, USN (Ret), Former Commander, Caribbean Sea Frontier.

Rear Admiral Frederick B. Warder, USN (Ret), Former Commander, Submarine Force Atlantic.

Rear Admiral William B. Warwick, USN (Ret), Former Commander, Carrier Group Four.

Rear Admiral O.D. Waters, Jr., USN (Ret), Former Oceanographer of the Navy.

Rear Admiral Robert W. Watkins, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Service Group Two, Altantic.

Rear Admiral Thomas C. Watson, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Director Logistics, JCS.

Rear Admiral David A. Webster, USN (Ret.), Former Principal Assistant (Material Acquisition), Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Rear Admiral Robert O. Welander, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Plans & Policy).

Rear Admiral Edward F. Welch, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former President, U.S. Naval War College.

Rear Admiral Joseph H. Wellings, USN (Ret.), Former Vice Director of the Joint Staff of the JCS.

Rear Admiral David J. Welsh, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Fleet Air, Alameda.

Admiral Waldemar F.A. Wendt, USN (Ret.), Former Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe.

Rear Admiral R.S. Wentworth, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Logistics Command, Pacific.

Rear Admiral Robert H. Wertheim, USN (Ret.), Former Director Strategic Systems Projects.

Vice Admiral K.R. Wheeler, (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Vice Chief of Naval Material.

Rear Admiral Donald M. White, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Carrier Division Twenty.

Rear Admiral Marshall W. White, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Pacific Missile Range, Mugu.

Admiral A.J. Whittle, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Material.

Rear Admiral Charles S. Williams, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Aviation Training, Naval Operations.

Rear Admiral J.W. Williams, Jr, USN (Ret.), Former Acting Commander, Seventh Fleet.

Rear Admiral Francis T. Williamson, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Training, Pacific Fleet.

Vice Admiral James B. Wilson, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Education and Training.

Vice Admiral Ralph E. Wilson, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics).

Rear Admiral Mark W. Woods, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Cruiser-Destroyer Force, Pacific Fleet.

Admiral Jerauld Wright, USN (Ret.), Former Commander in Chief, Atantic Fleet, Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic.

Rear Admiral Don W. Wuizen, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Amphibious Force, Seventh Fleet.

Rear Admiral Earl P. Yates, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Chief of Staff for Plans & Policy, CINCPAC.

Rear Admiral C.J. Youngblade, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Safety Center.

SIGNATURES RECEIVED AS OF AUGUST 15, 1983

Vice Admiral R. E. Adamson, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Operstions (Surface Warfare).

Rear Admiral B. H. Andrews, USN (Ret.), Former Vice Commander, Navy Electronic Systems Command.

Rear Admiral H. D. Arnold, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Navy Electronic Systems Command.

Rear Admiral Dean L. Axene, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Education and Training

Rear Admiral James V. Bartlett (CEC), USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Civil Engineers of the Navy

Vice Admiral Marmaduke G. Bayne, USN (Ret.), Former President, National Defense University

Rear Admiral David B. Bell, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Commandant, National War College

Vice Admiral Fred G. Bennett, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, ASW Forces, Atlantic

Rear Admiral Lawrence G. Bernard, USN (Ret.), Former Director Navy Shore Installations Division, Naval Operations

Rear Admiral George A. Besbekos, (DC), USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Regional Dental Center, Norfolk

Rear Admiral B. H. Bieri, Jr., (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Chief Naval Supply Systems Command

Rear Admiral Horace V. Bird, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Legislative Affairs, Navy Department

Vice Admiral Paul P. Blackburn, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, U.S. Seventh Fleet

Rear Admiral Elliott Bloxom, (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Fleet Supply Officer, U.S. Atlantic Fleet

Rear Admiral F. Taylor Brown, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Director International Programs, OSD

Rear Admiral F. J. Brush, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Key West Forces

Vice Admiral George G. Burkley, (MC), USN (Ret.), Former Physician to the President.

Rear Admiral Joseph M. Carson, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, U.S. Naval Forces, Philippines.

Rear Admiral George L. Cassell, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Fleet Air Quonset Pt.

Rear Admiral Robert W. Cavenagh, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Cruiser Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet

Rear Admiral Lester S. Chambers, USN (Ret.), Former Bureau of Naval Weapons Representative, Atlantic

Rear Admiral Robert W. Chewning, USN (Ret.), Former Director for Plans and Policy, CINCPAC

Rear Admiral E. E. Christensen, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Air Technical Training Command

Rear Admiral Thomas A. Christopher, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Manned Spacecraft Recovery Force, Atlantic

Rear Admiral Bernard A. Clarey, USN (Ret.), Former Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet

Rear Admiral Neal W. Clements (CEC), USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Construction Batallions, Pacific Fleet

Vice Admiral John B. Colwell, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Fleet Operations & Readiness)

Rear Admiral Clifford S. Cooper, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Carrier Division Six

Admiral Ralph W. Cousins, USN (Ret.), Former Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet & Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic

Rear Admiral G. C. Crawford, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Sixth Naval District

Rear Admiral John E. Dacey, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Operations and Readiness)

Rear Admiral Cabell S. Davis, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command

Rear Admiral James R. Davis, (CEC), USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Pacific Seabees.

Rear Admiral John M. DeLargy, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Management and Inspector General, CINCPACFLT.

Vice Admiral Harold T. Deutermann, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Second Fleet.

Rear Admiral John W. Dolan, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Fleet Maintenance Officer, Atlantic Fleet.

Rear Admiral Wallace R. Dowd, Jr. (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Supply Systems Command.

Admiral Charles K. Duncan, USN (Ret.), Former Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet & Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic.

Vice Admiral George C. Dyer, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, United Nations Blockade & Escort Force.

Rear Admiral Robert J. Eustace, USN (Ret.), Former Vice-Commander, Naval Electronic Systems Command.

Rear Admiral Edward J. Fahy, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Ship Systems Command.

Rear Admiral Eugene H. Farrell, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Rear Admiral James M. Farrin, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Norfolk Naval Shipyard.

Rear Admiral Emerson E. Fawkes, USN (Ret.), Former Vice-Commander, Naval Air Systems Command.

Rear Admiral M. F. D. Flaherty, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Training Command, U.S. Atlantic Fleet.

Rear Admiral Eugene B. Fluckey, USN (Ret.), Former NATO Commander, Iberian-Atlantic Area.

Rear Admiral Francis D. Foley, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Operations & Readiness).

Rear Admiral James E. Forrest, (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Auditor General of the Navy.

Rear Admiral Mason Freeman, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Rear Admiral Robert B. Fulton, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Ship Engineering Center.

Vice Admiral William E. Gentner, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Sixth Fleet.

Rear Admiral Paul C. Gibbons, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe.

Rear Admiral Norman C. Gillette, USN (Ret.), Former Commander Anti-Submarine Warfare Group Three

Rear Admiral Hershel J. Golden, (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Supply Systems Command

Vice Admiral R.C. Gooding, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command

Rear Admiral Emery A. Grantham, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Ships Material Readiness Division, OPNAV

Vice Admiral Samuel L. Gravely, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Director, Defense Communications Agency

Rear Admiral William M.A. Greene, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Navy Recruiting Command

Rear Admiral Donald P. Harvey, USN (Ret.), Former Director of Naval Intelligence

Rear Admiral Vincent P. Healey, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Undersea and Strategic Warfare Development—OPNAV

Rear Admiral W.M. Heaman, (CEC), USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Pacific Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Rear Admiral Charles C. Heid, (CEC), USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Vice Admiral Alexander S. Heyward, Jr., (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Air Training

Vice Admiral W.O. Hiltabidle, (CEC), USN (Ret.), Former Public Works Officer, 11th Naval District

Rear Admiral Morris A. Hirsch, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Comptroller, Navy

Vice Admiral Edwin B. Hooper, USN (Ret.), Former Director of Naval History.

Vice Admiral William D. Houser, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air Warfare).

Rear Admiral Miles H. Hubbard, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of the Bureau of Ordinance.

Rear Admiral Samuel W. Hubbard, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Director Aviation Manpower & Training.

Rear Admiral Roy M. Isaman, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Air Test Center.

Rear Admiral Frank C. Jones, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Ship Engineering Center.

Vice Admiral Robert Y. Kaufman, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Command & Control, Office of Chief of Naval Operations.

Rear Admiral John S. Kern, USN (Ret.), Former Commander Cruiser-Destroyer Groups one, three & five.

Vice Admiral Dixwell Ketcham, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Carrier Division Five.

Rear Admiral Sheldon Kinney, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Cruiser/Destroyer Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral William J. Kotsch, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Director for Operations (Environmental Sciences), JCS.

Rear Admiral W. E. Kuntz, USN (Ret.), Former Director Communications, U.S. European Command.

Rear Admiral V. G. Lambert, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Carrier Division Six.

Vice Admiral Vincent A. Lascara, (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Vice Chief, Naval Material Command.

Rear Admiral M. J. Lawrence, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Industrial Relations, Navy Department.

Rear Admiral William H. Leahy, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Norfolk Naval Shipyard.

Rear Admiral Isham Linder, USN (Ret.), Former Superintendent, Naval Post Graduate School.

Rear Admiral Walter M. Locke, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Joint Cruise Missiles Project.

Vice Admiral Victor D. Long, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Mine Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Vice Admiral Joseph M. Lyle, (SC), USN, (Ret.), Former Director, Defense Supply Agency.

Rear Admiral Douglas H. Lyness (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Supply Center, San Diego.

Vice Admiral Kleber S. Masterson, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Weapons Systems Evaluation Group.

Rear Admiral Alfred R. Matter, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Caribbean Sea Frontier.

Rear Admiral John H. Maurer, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Submarine Force, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral Roger W. Mehle, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Carrier Division Five.

Rear Admiral John O. Miner, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Cruiser-Destroyer Flotilla Eight.

Rear Admiral L. W. Moffit, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Joint Reconnaissance Center, JCS.

Vice Admiral George E. Moore II, (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Vice Chief of Naval Material.

Rear Admiral Howard S. Moore, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Pacific Missile Range.

Rear Admiral Sam H. Moore, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Military Sealift Command.

Rear Admiral James B. Morin, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Staff-Defense Intelligence Agency.

Rear Admiral Douglas F. Mow, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Tactical Wings Atlantic.

Rear Admiral Melvin Museles, (MC), USN (Ret.), Former Chief, Professional Division, BuMed.

Rear Admiral L. Richard Myers, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Washington, D.C., Naval District.

Rear Admiral William A. Myers III, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Cruisers-Destroyers, Seventh Fleet.

Rear Admiral C. A. Nicholson, USN (Ret.), Former Material Officer, Commander, Fleet Air Atlantic.

Rear Admiral James B. Osborn, USN (Ret.), Former Director, Strategic Offensive and Defensive Systems, OPNAV.

Rear Admiral Charles N. Payne, USN (Ret.), Former Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Pescagoula, Miss.

Rear Admiral Paul A. Peck, USN (Ret.) Former Commander, Carrier Group Three.

Vice Admiral Oliver H. Perry, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Chairman, Inter-American Defense Board.

Rear Admiral Henry S. Persons, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Staff, CINCPAC.

Rear Admiral Wallis F. Petersen, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, U.S. Naval Base, Norfolk.

Rear Admiral Richard H. Phillips, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Commander, National War College.

Vice Admiral Lawson P. Ramage, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, First Fleet.

Rear Admiral Charles F. Rauch, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel for Human Resource Management.

Rear Admiral Harry L. Reitter, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former President, Navy Board of Inspection and Survey.

Rear Admiral Robert M. Reynolds, USN (Ret.), Former Force Material Officer, Pacific.

Rear Admiral Reuben G. Rogerson, USN (Ret.) Former Deputy Commander, Naval Surface Force, Pacific.

Vice Admiral Murrey L. Royar, (SC), USN (Ret.), Former Chief, Office of Naval Material.

Rear Admiral Thomas J. Rudden, USN (Ret.), Former Director, ElectoMagnetic Programs, OpNav.

Rear Admiral Joseph W. Russel, USN (Ret.), Former Chief, National Strategic Target List Division, Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff.

Rear Admiral J. Parke Sager, USN (Ret.), Former Vice Commander, Naval Air Systems Command.

Rear Admiral Paul S. Savidge, USN (Ret.), Former Commander Amphibious Training Command, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral Walter F. Schlech, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Military Sealift Command, Atlantic.

Vice Admiral Frederick H. Schneider, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Inspection Services).

Rear Admiral Lester R. Schultz, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Director, National Security Agency.

Rear Admiral Paul E. Seuter, (CEC), USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Atlantic Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

Vice Admiral John J. Shanahan USN (Ret.), Former Commander, NATO Strike Fleet, Atlantic.

Rear Admiral William H. Shawcross, USN (Ret.), Former Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Logistics.

Rear Admiral W. B. Short, (CEC) USN (Ret.), Former Director of Construction, Spanish Bases Program.

Rear Admiral Gordon H. Smith, USN (Ret.), Former Vice Commander, Naval Electronics Systems Command.

Rear Admiral James H. Smith, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Air Integrated Logistic Support Center.

Vice Admiral Levering Smith, USN (Ret.), Former Director Strategic Systems Projects Office.

Rear Admiral Robert S. Smith, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Cruiser-Destroyer Group One.

Rear Admiral Nathan Sonenshein, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Ship Systems Command.

Vice Admiral William R. St. George, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Surface Forces, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Rear Admiral James J. Stilwell, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief BuShips for Field Activities.

Rear Admiral A. P. Storrs, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Carrier Division Five.

Rear Admiral W. E. Sweeney, USN (Ret.), Former Navy Deputy, F-111 Systems Project Director.

Rear Admiral H. J. Trum, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Fleet Air Whidbey.

Rear Admiral David M. Tyree, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Support Force, Antartica.

Vice Admiral Frank Vannoy, USN (Ret.), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Plans & Policies).

Rear Admiral M. D. Van Orden, USN, (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Research.

Rear Admiral Frank Virden, USN (Ret.), Former Director of Naval Communications.

Rear Admiral Harry N. Wallin, (CEC), USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

Rear Admiral John A. Walsh, USN (Ret.), Former Chief of Staff, Defense Intelligence Agency.

Rear Admiral A. W. Walton, Jr., (CEC), USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

Admiral Maurice F. Weisner, USN (Ret.), Former Commander in Chief, Pacific.

Vice Admiral Charles Wellborn, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Commander, U.S. Second Fleet & NATO Strike Fleet, Atlantic.

Vice Admiral T. R. Weschler, USN, (Ret.), Former Director Logistics, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Vice Admiral Richard F. Whitehead, USN (Ret.), Former Chief, U.S. Naval Mission to Brazil.

Rear Admiral Kenneth E. Wilson, Jr., USN (Ret.), Former Vice Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command.

Rear Admiral Raymond N. Winkel, USN (Ret.), Former Program Manager, Light Airborne Multipurpose System Mark III.

Rear Admiral John G. Wissler, USN (Ret.), Former Commander, Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River.

Rear Admiral N. O. Wittmann, USN, (Ret.), Former Vice Commander, Naval Air Systems Command.

Rear Admiral J. C. Wylie, USN (Ret.), Former Commandant, First Naval District.●

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ANTITRUST ACT OF 1983

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I rise to state my support for S. 1578, the Local Government Antitrust Act of 1983. Two recent Supreme Court decisions have effectively stripped local governments of any protection from this country's antitrust laws. Before these rulings were handed down, local governments were assumed by the Court to have the same immunity from the provisions of the Sherman Act that State governments have.

A clear exemption from the antitrust laws is necessary if local governments are to effectively administer zoning laws, regulate taxicab and other services, and take other actions to protect the health, welfare, and safety of their citizens.

I congratulate Senator THURMOND for introducing S. 1578 to clarify the application of Federal antitrust laws to local governments, as the ranking member of the Intergovernmental Subcommittee, I am pleased to join him in this effort.

This legislation does not automatically extend protection from the antitrust laws to local governments. Protection from the antitrust laws is given only to the extent that State governments are protected for the same activity. Actions by a local government to sell goods or services in competition with private entities would not be exempt from the antitrust laws.

The Supreme Court decisions in *City of Lafayette, La.* v. *Loisiana Power & Light Co.* (435 U 389 (1978) and *Community Communications Co., Inc.* v. *City of Boulder, Colo.* (455 U.S. 40 (1982) make it harder for States to delegate their immunity from antitrust laws to local governments under their jurisdiction. The Court has ruled that merely authorizing home rule does not transfer this immunity.

It seems unlikely that the courts would accept broad immunizing legislation from the State governments to protect the locals from antitrust suits. State legislation would have to be very specific for the exemption to apply. Further, there might have to be active State supervision of local jurisdictions granted antitrust exemptions.

To allow this kind of specificity and supervision, local governments might have to relinquish hard-won rule provisions in their State constitutions.

The very structure of legal relations between the States and their political subdivisions would be shaken if this approach to resolving the antitrust immunity question is taken.

Local governments need the protection that S. 1578 can give them so that they can go about the necessary functions of government without the fear of antitrust lawsuits based on their actions.

I urge the Committee on the Judiciary to begin hearings on this measure just as soon as possible. It is my hope that S. 1578 can move quickly toward passage by the Senate.●

REVENUE SHARING

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, last night the Senate approved the reauthorization of the general revenue-sharing program for 3 years at current funding levels of $4.6 billion annually. In so doing, we also took a major step in laying the foundation for future federalism reforms. The Senate agreed to my amendment to have the Department of the Treasury, the General Accounting Office, the Commerce Department and the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations undertake a series of studies on the present condition of the American intergovernmental system with the intended purpose of making recommendations for reforms.

This amendment was not drafted in haste or by me alone. During the 6 weeks prior to its adoption last night, I consulted with many other Senators, various Federal agencies and State and local interest groups. The result was language that is balanced and fair to all of the interests involved. The amendment was adopted with bipartisan support and support from all regions of the Nation.

While voting for the study amendment, a few Senators expressed reservations regarding its long run implications for certain States. Representative of these concerns was the Senator from Montana's (Mr. BAUCUS) belief that lurking beneath this was a desire by myself and other Senators to redistribute Federal funds among regions of the Nation. In speaking on the study, Senator BAUCUS said, "This is the opening shot in a battle which will rage royally in this Congress and in the future."

Mr. President, let me assure my colleagues, and the good Senator from Montana in particular, that my intention is not to declare war on the energy-rich States of this Nation. This perception is one that constantly recurs whenever I talk about reforming American federalism and the vast network of intergovernmental grants which defines modern day "cooperative Federalism."

I understand why this might be the perception. When people like myself and Gov. Richard Snelling of Vermont talk about the future of American federalism, a major point we stress is that fiscal disparities is a fundamental problem that must be addressed. This, I am sorry to say, has become a red flag to many. And, once that red flag is raised, all communication seems to break down. This is unfortunate, because if we could continue to discuss federalism, it would become clear that the second assumption I hold is that the Federal Government is doing too much in too many areas; and not only too much, but doing most of it very inefficiently.

When these two assumptions are combined, it becomes evident that a new federalism is possible without doing harm to any one State or region—a federalism in which all States, regardless of their capacity, can be assured that if they tax themselves at reasonable levels, they will be guaranteed resources to provide their citizens an adequate level of those public goods and services appropriately provided by States and their subdivisions. At the same time, by giving more precise definition to what constitutes a Federal purpose, such a federalism can alleviate much of the federally imposed burden and fiscal drain on States and their local governments.

In fact, the great inefficiency with which we spend money through the intergovernmental system offers us a golden opportunity. For no more Federal spending, it should be possible to mitigate the worst fiscal disparities, accomplish our national objectives, at the same time we leave more resources for State and local government to raise and spend as they see fit.

I know when I talk with Western Governors they find themselves in a dilemma. Most would prefer a reduced Federal role in exchange for the Federal Government's leaving more of the States' capacity at home. At the same time, they find themselves in a vicious competition with other States over an alluring $90 billion pot of Federal assistance dollars. In the past, they have not had much hope that significant portions of the $90 billion would simply be left within their State to be raised and spent as they saw fit. So, they have had no alternative but to resist any and all efforts which they perceived might redistribute those prize dollars away from their State and region.

The fallacy in the belief that a war among regions is imminent results from this fundamental misperception of what the future Federal system will be. To date, it has not been possible for many to move beyond the view that new federalism will be simply a redistribution of Federal grant dollars. Of course, if that were the proposal, there necessarily would be losers; and if such a redistribution were to occur with an eye toward benefiting the lowest capacity States, the higher capacity States would have cause for concern. But that is not what I have in mind, nor do I believe this is what Governor Snelling wants.

So I ask my colleagues to consider the following premise. The fundamental obstacle to a genuine reinvigoration of the States is the possibility that some States will be unable to provide an adequate level of service at reasonable levels of taxation under a simple "dump and run" approach by the Federal Government. Once this reality is accepted, the self-interest of the higher capacity States dictates a commitment to a reduction in fiscal disparities. The only way to help all of the States by achieving a better federal system is to provide some fiscal assurances to the poorest among them.

If we could just come to this basic agreement, it would be possible to move forward to a more detailed discussion of what constitutes national purposes and how the remaining responsibilities can best be returned to the States; and, equally important, how much of the present tax capacity of all States that is recirculated through Washington can be left intact in the States.

Mr. President, in a recent speech to the Western Governors' Policy Office, Governor Snelling had some very enlightening things to say on these very issues. For example, he laid to rest the misperception that alleviating the most glaring fiscal disparities requires or presupposes a desire to reward high State spending. He talks at some length about the distinction among, need, capacity and effort, a point I have been stressing for several years as well.

I urge my colleagues to read Governor Snelling's remarks with care.

The studies that would be undertaken in the Senate bill could be the beginning of meaningful discussion on federalism after the false start of a year ago in the President's new federalism initiative. As a conferee, I will work diligently to see that the Senate study language prevails.

Mr. President, I ask that the remarks of Governor Snelling before the Western Governors' Policy Office be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The remarks follow:

THE ONE AND THE MANY—SERVING NATIONAL PURPOSES THROUGH FIFTY DIVERSE STATES

(Remarks of Richard A. Snelling, Governor of Vermont)

As governors of lay citizens, almost all Americans have experienced severe frustrations with this country's federal system. At the same time we place ultimate faith in this system and rely on it for most governmental processes. These two outlooks, frustration and faith, reflect great issues very much needing discussion.

The greatest federalism challenge of all is to get governmental budgets under control and at the same time support essential public services at nationally expected levels with equitable distribution of cost among all states and citizens. The nation cannot afford fiscally to continue to run $200 billion annual deficits, economically to burden the people of some states with gross overtaxation, or humanely to balance budgets through drastic cutbacks in welfare, environmental, developmental, and other domestic services.

Through managed restraint in fiscal policies, fairer allocation of the burden of taxes among the states, and more extensive decentralization of the delivery of public services, not only to the states but through them to counties and local governments, America must both get its finances in order and promote a satisfying life for all Americans. Within this framework, such fundamental goals as these should be addressed: Local discretion to deal with local problems; certitude that state-administered national programs are equitably conducted; state-level capacity to integrate multitudinous activities into comprehensive programs; fair incidence of the cost of national services on the residents and resources of all states.

Concerns like these are central themes of the American experience, hard nuts which we as a unified yet diverse people have had to crack and recrack, in almost every generation. We are now approaching, indeed may already have entered, another period in which these great issues must be openly faced and reasonably re-resolved.

America is poised to move either toward renewed centralization of domestic power in the federal government or toward expanded reliance on the states and their subdivisions. The states, particularly their governors, should be at the heart of decision-making in this transition, ready to grapple with whatever need be faced, no matter how threatening or controversial.

If the states fail to position themselves in this way, the decisions will be made by others, most likely to state-level detriment. Most important, the states should be willing as states to adjust the domestic cost burden among themselves in such a way as to avoid either massively enlarged direct federal provision of domestic services, the starvation of those services through underfinancing, or greatly aggravated maldistribution of the state-local tax burden.

The issues are already on the table, placed there by dissatisfaction with governmental cumbersomeness and overkill, by President Reagan in his New Federalism proposals (no matter whether we agree or not with the specifics), by the Congress in its consideration of federalism matters in the debate on renewing Revenue Sharing. Governors should grab these issues, nettles and all, discuss them and research them, fight over them if need be, establish common positions, and then go out to do battle together for them. As a first step, now, it will be useful to review the following: the federalism fundamentals about which Americans agree; the present-day realities of the federal system; the problems this system poses vis a vis the fundamentals; and the lines along which these problems might eventually be solved.

As preliminary to this review, a word about "sorting out" is in order. This approach to federalism reform, proposed by the President in 1982 and diligently pursued by the governors, failed. Why? Because, as the history of the negotiations suggests, sorting-out was fatally flawed in its preoccupation with "no winners, no losers". The only way that functions and taxes could be realigned consistent with that preoccupation was through holding all states harmless. This required, not more equitable burdens on wealthier states, but larger federal assistance to states disadvantaged by the swap as to their capacities or new responsibilities—a roadway toward larger budgets, not toward restrained spending with fairer financing.

Since its beginnings, America has been a federated land, even before it was so recognized, with separate colonies sharing common roots, with thirteen and then eventually fifty states grouped under a common constitution, with great diversity of peoples and geography held together by superior common interests. Thus it is today, a tradition of separateness combined with nationhood reflected in an overarching consensus

among state leaders about governance in the United States. These "shared views" are key elements of that consensus:

(1) Nationwide Americans have an accepted set of goals and standards, hard to articulate but nontheless real, about floors of decency for everyday living; about environmental amenities as to land and air and water; about the physical facilities of the nation in roads, water systems, airports, and the like; about the education of our children and the health of our citizens; indeed about most aspects of the basic framework of American life.

(2) Governments—federal, state, county, local—are appropriate instruments, along with private enterprise and voluntary organizations, for advancing these goals and enforcing appropriate standards. The federal government provides a proper forum for the national articulation of goals and standards.

(3) Agreed purposes and service expectations should be broadly drawn so they can be implemented in different ways in different places, both recognizing and encouraging diversity rather than standardization in American ways of life.

(4) For most public services, as varied as housing, clean water, child nutrition, and law enforcement, the states and their local and regional subdivisions, close to end-of-the-line needs, are preferable over direct federal services as the instruments by which national goals are served.

(5) The financing of nationwide public services, even with these services being state and locally performed, should be substantially federal, drawing properly on the national economy to help meet national objectives.

(6) The needs and capacities of the states relative to financing their share of the costs are diverse, calling for some equalization of burden on in-state resources through differential allocations of federal grants.

(7) The overall cost of domestic public services for national as well as strictly state or local purposes must be realistically, and preferably rationally, related to what national and subnational economies will bear, requiring in short that the suit of services be cut to the cloth of resources, not just to needs.

This list, though perhaps not all encompassing or all accepted, embraces the basic national and subnational components of cooperative federalism. They make up what most Americans envision about how our federal-state-local system should ideally function.

How does real-life federalism, 1983, stack up against that vision? Not very well, many would agree. National goals, while internalized and expressed in programs, are not clearly or comprehensively articulated. Nor is there a clear, consistent, logic-based division of roles among governmental levels for the financing or performance of various services.

In short, American federalism, objectively not visionarily viewed, is today a hodgepodge of accommodations, imperfections, anachronisms, inefficiencies, inequities, and inconsistencies. Yet somehow, a tribute to the ultimate rightness of the federal design, the system does deliver great varieties and quantities of public service throughout our supra-continental nation. The tragedy, the challenge if you will, is that we could do so very much better—and it is this, the sense of falling short, that drives, or will drive, this time of transition in American governance.

Instead of a few broadly stated purposes, with simple standards, financed with sensibly homogeneous block grants, there are 441 distinct federal domestic assistance programs, even after the elimination and pulling together of some 100 separate grants in the last couple of years. Again, despite recent progress, there is still much detailed regulation from federal administrators on how programs are conducted, not just broad supervision toward the achievement of ends. Yes, there is major federal financial participation in many domestic programs, some $93 billion worth in fiscal 1983, but it is almost infinitely divided among programs, not substantially consolidated into blocks or into General Revenue Sharing.

Unfortunately, federal assistance does not in a consistent or comprehensive fashion take into account the differential needs or capacities of the states as to state-conducted national services. A variety of need indicators are used, often including population as a basic measure, but usually not finely tuned to the problems addressed. And, as to capacity, only 29 of the 441 federal grants, about a third of the grants as to total dollars, include an indicator, in every case per capita income, a simplistic and incomplete guide to capacity.

The gross inadequacy lies in the maldistribution of the state-local fiscal burden in relation to capacity. As an analogy, we have come within the individual states to accept that all citizens must have a basic educational minimum, locally provided, regardless of the fiscal resources of particular communities. Through various equalization arrangements, the states have pursued this principle. Also, with equalization, they have served another principle, namely that the cost burden must not be allocated in gross unevenness. Communities are free with their own resources go beyond the minimum, but no community is to be pauperized by it.

Similar principles might well be applied to the battery of domestic services which constitute a minimum national standard of decency. To support this minimum, no citizens in any particular state should have to pay grossly more in relation to their capacity than citizens of other states. This is not to argue now for the Representative Tax System (RTS) developed by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) or for any other particular way in which these principles should be observed. But, as public finances grow tighter and tighter, equalization of some sort becomes necessary both for financing and for fairness. As citizens of a single great commonwealth, the United States, can we indefinitely accept in good conscience an uneven distribution of the burden for performing national services?

The question can be even more broadly stated: Ought we remain content with a system so far at variance from our ideal? One approach to that question is to consider more specifically some of the particular problems of the system and the possibilities of doing something constructive about them. The problems are surely not in any respect simple, quite the contrary. But on matters of such moment, those listed below, that ought not deter us.

(1) The inadequate, uneven articulation of national goals. Many individual programs are authorized with limited statements of purpose. Broader goals are implied, too, for congeries of programs in such areas as welfare, environment, transportation, and economic development. But can we, and if we can, ought we not, by national action get clearly before us what we as a nation seek in each great area of this sort? Such articulation is a pre-requisite for comprehensive block grants for each such area.

(2) The need for performance standards, objective yet broad, preferably as to end results, not simply as to program activities. If states are really to have wide discretion in operations toward objectives, the objectives must be clearly, even if possible quantifiably, stated. Then, federal program audits can focus on what has been accomplished, not on how. But can such standards really be drawn in any fields? In more physical fields, miles of roads maintained, for example, probably yes. But in personal welfare areas, child nutrition, for example, is it being, can it be, done? Such a task, the articulation of standards, is certainly worth much more trying than it so far has been given.

(3) Confusion, inequity, and inadequate measures as to service needs. Misunderstandings abound in this regard, for example, as between need and capacity, need and effort, need and activity. Need is differentiated from these other concerns in having to do with the direct-life circumstances which call for public action, e.g. with extent of illiteracy, numbers of malnourished children, units of substandard housing, population pressure on recreational space, volume and composition of solid waste, rates of various kinds of crime, and miles of potholed roads. Need is an end to be met, not the cost, methods, or activity to meet it.

All the federal grant formulas, including that for General Revenue Sharing, consider need in some degree, often as elementally as just gross population differentials. However, the relevance, sophistication, and fairness of indicators varies greatly from program to program, quite understandably in a nation so large and diverse as ours—partly urban, partly rural, partly industrial, partly agrarian. And the larger questions, relating need in gross measures to block grants, have scarcely been addressed.

If we are to have a truly needs-oriented grant-in-aid system, one in which there is large discretion in the way needs are met, this area requires much work. To some extent, indicators of low capacity, notably per capita income, may run in the same direction as indicators of need, but they are not satisfactorily congruent.

(4) Unsatisfactory recognition, even nonrecognition, of capacity-to-pay differences among the states. Resident per capita income, unrefined and unmodified, is flawed as a capacity indicator since it does not take into account non-resident, non-income resources which some states have in substantial measure while others have scarcely none. Thus, for example, recreational magnet states like Nevada or Vermont are able to tax non-residential resources more lucratively than are low-tourism states. Similarly, energy-rich states like Oklahoma have stronger non-income resources than do energy-poor states like Mississippi.

When comparative state-by-state capacities are measured with these non-resident, non-income considerations taken into account, the relative positions of the states vis-a-vis a national norm for the states are considerably different than from a similar calculation considering only per capita income. The capacity measure developed by ACIR as part of the Representative Tax System gets at the overall capacities of the states by calculating the revenues that each state would raise if each used, with a few exceptions, all the taxes at average national rates that any state uses.

There are imperfections in the RTS measure, of course, e.g. differential impacts of different taxes on future tax base, but it does appear to be the best presently available comprehensive state-by-state revenue capacity measure. Comparing ACIR rankings with per capita income rankings, differences do stand out, for example, as for the State of Washington, which ranks among the nation's top ten states in per capita income but comes in near the mid-point, 24th, with the ACIR measure.

All this is not to argue for the substitution, today, of the ACIR measure for per capita income, nor to suggest some other measure which might be better than either. Rather, we should note that there are real differences among the states in the resources, in relation to population, on which each can draw to meet the state-and-local costs of carrying out national programs. Whether measured by income-only or comprehensively, Tennessee and Vermont, for example, show up as low capacity states while California and Connecticut on both measures stand out as high capacity. It seems both unjust and ineffective to lay substantially heavier burdens on the residents of some states than on those of others to finance the state-local role in delivering national services.

Even though present grants-in-aid tend toward equalization in some states, we have a very long way to go for bearable equity. And, as government budgets across the board are increasingly squeezed, witness the huge federal deficit and the shortfalls this year in almost all states, the pressure for fairly distributing state-and-local burdens and for raising what must be raised wherever it can best be raised will surely increase. These are undeniable reasons why capacity considerations in grant formulas constitute one of the major problems of federalism.

(5) Poor understanding, perhaps overstress, on fiscal effort in relation to state fiscal positions. To begin, effort and capacity are quite separate though related matters. Effort has to do with how strongly a government is drawing on its tax base, not with the size (capacity) of the base per se.

General Revenue Sharing rewards high effort in the above sense as one of the components in its allocation formulas. Most categorical and block grants require matching—some unit of state-or-local outlay for specified counterpart amounts of federal participation—and in this way states that put up more money for particular programs, i.e. "make a greater effort", are also rewarded. Effort, in the pure sense of collections related to capacity, is taken into account in ACIR's work on its Representative Tax System but (and this is important) effort is not part of the capacity measurements and need not be part of any introduction of RTS into federal grant formulas.

Conceptually, the core question about effort in relation to a model intergovernmental system is whether it should be a determinant at all of the amount of federal monies going to different states. Spending more on particular programs in order to bring more federal dollars into a state is not in itself a direct indicator that a state is necessarily doing more about a particular problem, certainly not that it is necessarily being more effective in dealing with a problem. In some states, heavy matching may indicate ample resources, in others real sacrifice to attack real problems, while low matching (even low tax-to-capacity effort) may reflect effective administration, or simply capacity so low that normal leeway for effort is not available.

The point of all this is that the extent to which and the way in which effort, more realistically "matching," should be a component in grant formulas deserves to be questioned. Another concept would be that each state for each major functional area, perhaps for its services across-the-board, has a responsibility, not a carrot-induced "choice," to do what must be done at whatever cost and in whatever ways best suit its circumstances to carry out its part in executing national-goal programs within its boundaries. The amount it would get in federal assistance would be determined by need and capacity, and it would be free on its own with its own resources, unmatched, to go beyond its standard responsibility as part of the Union, offering such additional or more intensive services as it wished. A heroic idea, perhaps, but one that would lead to greater decentralization and fruitful diversity, with national programs still carried out through the states, than most of us could scarely now conceive to be possible.

(6) An overburden of detail, multiplicity, and inappropriateness in federal grant administration. This is an old story, familiar to all of us, and one in which the story is not quite as sad as a few years ago. With the 1981 block grants and the anti-regulatory efforts of the Reagan Administration, the pendulum swing toward tighter and tighter supervision of more and more separate grants programs has at last been checked, acutally reversed. But, even within the confines of the still largely categorical system, much headway remains to be made. As noted at recent NGA meetings, state government, no longer the last refuge of "good-time Charlies," is today professionally competent to handle whatever comes our way.

What can governors do about these problems? As regards some elements of the puzzle, particularly the matter of federal overcontrol, governors are already doing considerable through their national and regional organizations. But what about the more fundamental problems—things like standards, capacity, effort? Here are a few ideas on this, all geared basically not to making landmark changes now but to going down the road of commitment, discussion, negotiation toward such changes.

To begin, the general nature of the problems and of the solutions already seems sufficiently clear and understood to enable governors to take positions of principle on them now. It was for that reason, not to commit NGA to RTS, that proposals were recently considered within NGA to have governors accept the desirability of capacity equalization of some kind as part of NGA federalism policy.

Beyond this, the national and regional staffs of governors should be encouraged, indeed directed, to give major attention to the fundamentals raised here. The results of this work should be brought to the discussion tables, and governors should not shy away when their cherished preconceptions are challenged. For example, even the states' long fight against any limitation on the federal tax deductibility of state and local taxes might merit some "give" if important ground for the states could be gained thereby.

Governors should be prepared not only to state their positions but, where advantages might be gained, to work in a give-and-take way with their federal and local governmental brethren—with the Congress, the President, local governmental groups, federal progam executives. A most important venture of this sort now looms sizable on the Congressional horizon—the possibility that Congress this fall in dealing with Revenue Sharing will adopt an amendment calling for a major federal study of federalism issues, jointly by Treasury, Commerce, GAO, and ACIR, a study not just of RTS but of the whole range of great intergovernmental questions. This is something, especially if full state and local participation is guaranteed, which governors should vigorously support.

Finally, a word about regional groups like WESTPO, the Western Governors Conference, the New England Governors Conference, and others. Groups like this, bringing together governors in the way this meeting has, are crucial vehicles for consideration of intergovernmental matters. Even more, they provide influential forums of policy setting and program coordination intermediate between the individual states and the federal government.

In essence, the theme of federalism debate should be the motto on the Great Seal of the United States—"E Pluribus Unum", out of the Many, One. But the emphasis, today, the desirable emphasis for federalism reform, should be a bit more on the Many, how to sustain their strength diversely but equitably, than on the One.

This paper does not get deeply into the fiscal technicalities of federalism, of which there are a great many, but these must of course be addressed as the great issues are explored. The main thing now is for the governors to "reason together" on these issues, too long held back on the national agenda. History is on the move. Governors should be with it, not off to the side.●

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PERCY. Does the majority leader have any feeling as to what time we may be able to return to the State Department authorization bill tomorrow?

Mr. BAKER. Yes, Mr. President, what I am about to say is not meant to be flip but to be accurate. We shall go back to it as soon as the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee reports that they are finished in that committee meeting.

Mr. PERCY. So we possibly could finish this bill, I hope, tomorrow. If we get over here at 12:30, we could finish it within an hour and a half, 2 o'clock or 1:30.

Mr. BAKER. I hope so.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I thank the leader for his consideration.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORIZATIONS

The Senate continued with consideration of the bill.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, it is my intention and that of the ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee to take up now non-

controversial amendments and take them up as rapidly as we can.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not see any sponsors of other amendments on the floor. I have two noncontroversial amendments which have been cleared. I wonder if I may proceed at this time, since I have waited for that purpose.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, we did intend to take up a number of others first, but in view of the fact that we are going to have to stay anyway, to accommodate our distinguished colleague, we shall be happy to take up these two amendments which I understand are noncontroversial.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct and cleared on both sides.

Mr. PERCY. We shall make our comments very brief and maybe we can put the comments in the RECORD.

AMENDMENT NO. 2204

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Congress with respect to the actions of the Government of the Soviet Union in jamming the broadcasts of Voice of America and RFE/RL, Incorporated)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I be recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I send an amendment to the desk, Mr. President, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. HUMPHREY) proposes an amendment numbered 2204.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the bottom of page 48, add the following:

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

POLICY ON THE JAMMING BY THE SOVIET UNION OF BROADCASTS OF VOICE OF AMERICA AND RFE/RL, INCORPORATED

SEC. 701. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the permanent unrestrained flow of accurate information would greatly facilitate mutual understanding and world peace;

(2) the Soviet Union and its allies are at present electronically jamming the broadcasts of Voice of America and RFE/RL, Incorporated (also known as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty); and

(3) electronic jamming of international broadcasts violates at least four international agreements: Article 35 (1) of the International Telecommunications Union Convention, Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (also known as the Helsinki Accords).

(b) It is the sense of the Congress that the President should urge the Government of the Soviet Union to terminate its jamming of the broadcasts of Voice of America and RFE/RL, Incorporated (also known as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty).

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators EAST and PRESSLER be listed as original cosponsors.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer this afternoon an amendment to the Department of State authorization bill stating the sense of the Congress that the President urge the Soviet Government to cease its jamming of Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and Voice of America broadcasts. On May 19 of this year, I introduced this in the form of a concurrent resolution that enjoyed the cosponsorship of 10 of my colleagues.

According to many, the United States is a warmonger, building up a vast military machine to bully the Soviet Union and trigger a nuclear holocaust. Yet, it takes a distorted view of history and a selective memory to justify this position. The true state of affairs is different indeed and is demonstrated by the Soviets and its satellites' jamming of Western broadcasts. This activity is a $300 million a year Soviet industry. In comparison, the annual budgets of RFE/RL and VOA are roughly $90 million and $140 million respectively. It is clear that the Soviet Union spends more on jamming then we spend on broadcasting.

The United States provides funding for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, independent corporations overseen by the Board for International Broadcasting, an independent Federal agency. Together, RFE and RL broadcast to the citizens of the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Romania in 21 of the languages native to these countries. In the course of a typical week, some 40 to 50 million listen to RFE/RL broadcasts, despite heavy Soviet-bloc jamming. RFE/RL serve as an alternative domestic radio service, providing uncensored news and commentary to people living in Soviet-bloc countries.

The Voice of America is a global radio network broadcasting over 900 hours a week in more than 40 languages with an estimated weekly audience of 100 million people all over the world. VOA broadcasts are of tremendous importance, especially in countries behind the Iron Curtain where truth refers primarily to the title of a newspaper, Pravda, rather than its contents.

The Soviet response to U.S. international broadcasts has been heavy jamming designed to make Western broadcasts unintelligible.

This interference violates at least four international agreements, including article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states that all have the right to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers. It is in contravention of the International Telecommunications Convention, which forbids harmful interference to radio services of communications of others members.

Jamming is a human rights issue. The control and obstruction of ideas and information is probably the most effective of the totalitarian methods of repression. Jamming is also an international security issue. By jamming competing sources of information, national leaders facilitate their ability to manipulate their citizens into supporting actions that they otherwise might not take if they were exposed to the truth.

In accordance with international law, the United States has never jammed Radio Moscow or like entities. However, as recently as November 1982, the Soviet bloc attempted to secure international approval of its jamming activities. At a meeting of the United Nations International Telecommunications Union held in Nairobi, Czechoslovakia asked delegates to sanction the electronic jamming of international radio broadcasts deemed dangerous to state security, but withdrew its proposal following threats by Western nations to disrupt the conference.

The ulterior motive behind the jamming is self-evident: The Soviet Government is extremely insecure about the possible impact of informed and sophisticated citizens. Only through severe strangulation of news and information can the Soviet Government exist.

Two recent events dramatically illustrate the Soviet bloc citizens' extreme need for accurate news, and the Soviet Government's fear of that news. The first was the Pope's June 1983 visit to Poland. The Soviet Union jammed VOA's broadcasts to Poland, which had been increased to give adequate converage on the historic event. I ask unanimous consent that VOA Director Ken Tomlinson's statement and two articles about the Soviet's actions be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY VOA DIRECTOR KENNETH TOMLINSON, June 22, 1983

Pope John Paul's visit to Poland is an event of historic importance and has attracted worldwide attention. Like virtually every other free journalistic organization, the Voice of America is providing thorough coverage of the visit to audiences all over the world. We know that our large Polish audience has been especially anxious to have access to objective, accurate information because they are only getting heavily censored news from the official and controlled Polish government media. For that

reason, we at the VOA felt a particular obligation to the Polish people, and have made a special effort to devote expanded coverage and reporting of the events.

But the Soviet Union has decided that the Polish people cannot be trusted to hear the facts about Pope John Paul's visit. Not only have the Soviets continued to jam our regular broadcasts to Poland, they are jamming our special coverage of the Pope's visit as well. They have apparently concluded that it is in the Soviets' interest that the Polish people shall not receive the message the Pope has brought to Poland. This proposition is odious, patronizing, and in flagrant disregard of international agreements: odious, because the Pope stands for human dignity, patronizing because it places in the hands of a foreign power what is rightfully a decision of the Polish people, and in flagrant disregard of international agreements because, by jamming, the Soviet Union is violating the Helsinki Accords which it signed in 1975. It also is a violation of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights.

We will continue to broadcast the news—and the truth—about the Pope's visit to Poland. We know that some of our broadcasts and the broadcasts of other Western stations are getting through to listeners in Poland. Soviet jamming only makes the Polish people more intent on hearing the truth. No amount of jamming can stifle this desire.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the second incident was the recent Soviet downing of Korean Air Lines flight 007 with 269 civilians on board. The Soviet Government actually withheld the news of this tragedy for several days, feeding Soviet citizens only bits and pieces about a flight lost at sea. It is inconceivable for U.S. citizens, who can turn daily to numerous periodicals, newspapers, radio and TV news reports, to imagine this restriction on the fundamental right of freedom of the press.

Fortunately, jamming is never completely effective despite the intensity of the effort. Powerful transmitters, favorable atmospheric conditions and even the use of female broadcasters whose voice more easily penetrate the jamming screen allow Western nations' message of freedom and hope to reach millions. Nevertheless, jamming is a very significant hindrance. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from an article recently published in the June 1983 issue of Combroad, a British broadcasting publication, detailing the effects of jamming, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington Times, June 23, 1983]

SOVIETS JAM VOA ON POPE

(By George Archibald)

Soviet jamming of Voice of America broadcasts of Pope John Paul II's visit to Poland is "odious, patronizing and in flagrant disregard of international agreements," VOA Director Kenneth Tomlinson charged yesterday.

The Soviets have beamed noise interference to block radio reception throughout Poland of three hours of additional daily VOA coverage of the pope's appearances since the pontiff arrived in his communist-dominated homeland last week, Tomlinson reported.

VOA is providing live coverage of the pope's activities in Poland and rebroadcasting the pontiff's speeches, Tomlinson said.

He called the Soviet action to prevent Polish listeners from receiving the broadcasts "odious because the pope stands for human dignity patronizing because it places in the hands of a foreign power what is rightfully the decision of the Polish people and in flagrant disregard of international agreements because the Soviet Union by jamming is violating the Helsinki Accords which it signed in 1975."

Tomlinson said intelligence reports indicate that the Soviets are using four transmitters in their own country to broadcast a heavy "buzz saw" noise on each of four frequencies being used by VOA transmitters located at Woofferton, England; Kavala, Greece: Tangier, Morocco; and Munich, West Germany.

"The Soviets spend more to jam VOA broadcasts (into Poland and Bulgaria) than the Voice's entire budget (of $140 million)," Tomlinson noted. Heavy jamming of VOA's seven hours of regular weekly Polish broadcasts started with martial law rule in Poland in December 1981, he stated.

Tomlinson and State Department Counselor Edward J. Derwinski yesterday awarded a special commendation to the 19 members of VOA's Polish Service staff for their week-long coverage of the pope's visit. The commendation "carries the weight of a battlefield presidential unit citation," Tomlinson told the staff at the presentation.

Derwinski, whose grandparents were from Poland, said, "This week, the whole world is watching Poland. It's a pity the government there is doing its best to limit access to the news."

Tomlinson cited three international agreements that he maintained were violated by the Soviet jamming of VOA broadcasts.

The Helinski Accords state, "The participating states . . . make it their aim to facilitate freer and wider dissemination of information of all kinds."

The 1973 International Communication Convention, also signed by the Soviets, states, "All (broadcast transmitting) stations, whatever their purpose, must be established and operated in such a manner as not to cause harmful interference to the radio services or communications of other members."

The VOA director also pointed to the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which guarantees the right to "seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers."

[From Combroad, June 1983]

NEW WAR OF THE AIRWAVES

(By Douglas Muggeridge)

SERIOUS THREAT

The other major threat to international broadcasting—in fact the most serious threat of all—comes from what radio engineers call "harmful interference"—or in other words jamming. Since 1979, the incidence of jamming has increased significantly, not only affecting Europe but also in the Middle East and many other parts of the world. Now, jamming is something which we in the BBC have known for many years and it is by no means successful in stopping our voice being heard. The Soviet Union began jamming our Russian-language broadcasts as long ago as 1949 and it has continued ever since with significant breaks, when the Soviet Union was engaged in negotiation with the West, such as the signing of the Test Ban Treaty in 1963 and the opening of the Geneva talks in 1973 that led up to the Helsinki Conference.

In the early days, jamming was done by broadcasting a noise like a chain-saw on the same frequencies used by the BBC and other Western broadcasters. This type of jamming is now far less common than the superimposition of a distortion of a Soviet domestic radio programme upon the foreign broadcasts, a method which appers to have the advantage for the Russians of using less electricity. However, the Russians are still jamming on a vast scale, with local jamming stations apparently in all Soviet cities with a population of more than 200,000 people, as well as skywave jamming stations to cover rural areas and the jamming, from inside the Soviet borders, of BBC and other Western broadcasts directed to Poland and Afghanistan. Indeed, it is estimated that the amount of money the Soviet Union spends on jamming foreign broadcasts each year is equivalent to the entire annual budget of the BBC's External Services.

Now, some people in the West and certainly many in the Third World may argue that the Soviets are fully justified in jamming Western broadcasts in Russian, Polish and other East European languages, because such broadcasts are a relic of the Cold War. But, leaving aside the fact that Soviet broadcasts in English and other West European languages are not jammed in the West, the Cold War argument does not stand up even in Russian terms. The Soviets have always made it clear that they regard ideological competition, through media like radio broadcasts, as perfectly compatible with the policy of peaceful coexistence or detente. Their own use of world broadcasts has not in any way diminished since the end of the Cold War period. On the contrary, Soviet broadcasts have gone on increasing in the number of hours broadcast, the number of frequencies used and in their sophistication. In one of their backhanded compliments towards the BBC, the Russians now call their English language broadcasts the Moscow World Service and its format and style of presentation follows closely that of the BBC's World Service.

In 1981, the Russians justified the jamming of BBC Polish Service broadcasts by accusing us of trying to destabilise Poland at the behest of Western Intelligence agencies. Yet only two years before, in an interesting and unique Soviet monograph on the history and methods of the BBC, we were accused of what was termed "factological propaganda". This publication stated: "The abundance of genuine facts in BBC broadcasts will sometimes disconcert even those who are aware of their real aims. . . . This bias on the part of the BBC and other Western stations which adopt similar tactics can be uncovered only by means of specialized, lengthy and painstaking analysis." And there we really get to the heart of the Soviet paranoia, which leads to jamming. They jam the BBC in order to try to prevent us on their own admission from being widely heard and believed in Russia even by those who are aware of what the Soviets describe as our real aims. It is our credibility which is the ultimate affront to the men of the Kremlin.

Now this may smack of ideological competition and of course, it is. We in the BBC de-

plore jamming partly because its runs quite contrary to our belief in the principles of freedom of speech and the free dissemination of ideas. Indeed, these are principles which were embodied in the Helsinki Agreement, which states that: "the participating states note the expansion in the dissemination of information broadcast by radio, and express the hope for the continuation of this process, so as to meet the interests of mutual understanding among peoples." Since signing that agreement, the Soviet Union has entered a large number of qualifications which would appear to be designed to give some legitimacy to the practice of jamming. Where broadcasts do not positively meet the interests of mutual understanding, Moscow diplomats argue, then jamming may be justified. That is a curious but wholly typical way of the Russians putting the cart before the horse.

However, their latest move in this direction is even more curious. In September last year, the Supreme Soviet suddenly ratified a 46-year-old Convention of the former League of Nations "Concerning the Use of Broadcasting in the Cause of Peace". Britain in fact ratified the Convention in August 1937. But why should the Soviets have taken this old document out of the archives to ratify it in the Supreme Soviet now? The answer can only be that it has its place in the propaganda campaign that Moscow is mounting against foreign broadcasts, not only directed towards the Soviet Union, but also to the Soviet allies along its borders and much farther afield in the Third World. The aim is clearly to accuse Western international broadcasters of breaking the old League of Nations Convention and of using their broadcasts as war propaganda.

Arguments like these are doubly insidious. Taken together with Soviet radio attacks on the BBC for what they call attempts to destabilize left-wing governments in the Third World at the behest of the American Central Intelligence Agency and other Western intelligence agencies of which is in fact a very old charge that the Soviets apparently never get tired of repeating—they add a sort of grist to the campaign now being mounted against Western international broadcasters, because of our possession of frequencies and the sophistication of our news-gathering. At the same time, these Soviet arguments give a patina of idological respectability to the practice of jamming, which runs quite contrary to every international convention on broadcasting throughout the world. Monitoring carried out by our engineers in Britain, which is representative of conditions in Europe, shows that up to 80 per cent of the usable short-wave frequencies are affected by jamming during the evening, the peak listening time for Europeans. This is not necessarily because there are jamming signals on all these frequencies. The harmful effects of jamming can make listening on neighbouring frequencies very difficult or impossible, which is something our engineers describe as "adjacent channel interference". Indeed, in some of the frequency bands on Short Wave, jamming of a selected number of frequencies can render the whole wave band virtually unusable because of adjacent channel interference.

Another effect of jamming is often to cause considerable difficulty with the reception of other transmissions using the frequency being jammed, even when these other transmissions are great distances away. Together these by-products of jamming can have a harmful effect on the broadcasts of quite innocent or even friendly radio stations, and also of radio stations broadcasting on their domestic networks some distance away from the jammers.

IMMINENT BREAK-DOWN

So what we as international broadcasters face in the immediate term is the imminent break-down of law and order on the airwaves. The widespread use of jamming by the Soviet Union and other countries in many parts of the world is rapidly making a nonsense of all the international conventions for the orderly use of the airwaves. If one adds to that the aggressive policy of radio development which some countries adopted at the last World Administrative Radio Conference, and the strong possibility that this will be repealed at future conferences, then clearly one can see a time in the not-too-distant future when there will be chaos on the short-wave bands of world radio broadcasts, and when the law of the jungle, the domination of the most powerful transmitters, will prevail. Indeed, we have virtually reached that point already and what we face is even worse chaos.

Is this really what so many of the Third World nations desire, when they align themselves with a campaign designed to disrupt the system of international broadcasting that has grown up over the past half century? Do these nations really want to hasten the collapse of the whole system in their desire to share more fully themselves in the information revolution and in the benefits of the satellite age? The answer is, of course, no. They are being used; they are being swept up in a movement of generalised envy and resentment against the Western media. For them and for us, the position is becoming critical. Unless a new spirit of understanding and mutual benefit can be created in time to end jamming and to achieve serious and fruitful negotiation about the allocation of the broadcasting channels of the future, then chaos will reign. Such an outcome would indeed be a tragedy of historic dimensions, for radio is probably the most potent medium of communication in the modern world and its potential for international understanding, rather than for discord, has yet to be realised to the full. That is something the Soviet regime and many other governments around the world would do well to reflect on before it is too late.●

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this is a noncontroversial amendment that states the sense of the Senate and the sense of the Congress that the President urge the Soviet Government to cease its jamming of Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and Voice of American broadcasts.

The Reagan administration is appropriately concerned about the problem of jamming. On many occasions, and in various international forums, the United States has denounced jamming. I believe it is necessary that the Congress state its concern about this important foreign policy issue.

We must continue to use every available means, technical, legal, and diplomatic, to neutralize Soviet jammers. My amendment would take a significant step to statutorily recognize and resolve this problem.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am not sure I understood the nature of the amendment clearly. I have no objection to the Senator's offering it.

Mr. PERCY. The distinguished Senator's amendment states the sense of the Congress that the President shall urge the Government of the Soviet Union to terminate its jamming of broadcasts of Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and Voice of America.

Mr. BYRD. I think some of us might want to vote on that. We might want to vote yea.

I suggest that we carry that amendment over unless the Senator wants to order the yeas and nays now with the understanding that they will be had tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, it is my understanding that the amendment had been cleared on both sides. It is not my wish to have a rollcall vote.

Mr. BYRD. Well, Mr. President, I do not think there will be any objections on this side, but some of us may want a rollcall vote. I would. I would like to vote for the Senator's amendment.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, this is probably a good time to clarify where we are procedurally.

I have announced that there would be no more rollcall votes tonight. In order to implement that, it seems that the only practical way to do it is to ascertain if there is a demand for the yeas and nays, and if there is, to put that amendment over until tomorrow. I would rather not get the yeas and nays now, because I would rather not carry over a stacked vote until the second day.

I recommend to the managers and to the Senator from New Hampshire, if he is willing, that since apparently there is a desire for a rollcall vote—and, incidentally, a vote for this measure—he withdraw the amendment and permit us to offer it tomorrow, when we resume consideration of this measure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment. If Members want a rollcall vote, that is fine with me. I thought it was noncontroversial.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. PERCY. The Senator should be complimented.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I think it should be understood that the desire for a rollcall vote does not reflect the view that the amendment is controversial. I agree with the evaluation that it is a desirable amendment. I think it reflects a view that some Members want to be regarded as voting for.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I take it as a compliment.

Mr. BAKER. I think we are being killed by kindness. [Laughter.]

AMENDMENT NO. 2205

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Congress with respect to broadcasts of Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberty concerning Soviet religious persecution.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Humphrey) proposes an amendment numbered 2205.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 33, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

POLICY ON BROADCASTS OF RFE/RL, INCORPORATED AND VOICE OF AMERICA CONCERNING SOVIET RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

SEC. 303. It is the sense of the Congress that RFE/RL, Incorporated (commonly referred to as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty) and the Voice of America (VOA) are to be commended for their news and editorial coverage of the increasing religious persecution in the Soviet Union, including the declining levels of Jewish emigration, and are encouraged to intensify their efforts in this regard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. D'AMATO) be added as a cosponsor of this amendment.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the amendment I am offering expresses the sense of the Congress that Voice of America, Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe are to be commended for their news and editorial coverage of the appalling increase of religious persecution in the Soviet Union, including the plummeting levels of Jewish emigration. The amendment then encourages these networks to intensify their efforts in this regard.

The anti-Semitic campaign in the Soviet Union is expanding rapidly, as demonstrated by the April 1983 formation of the state-sanctioned "Anti-Zionist Committee." This committee, which has been highly publicized by the state-run press, states its aim as "exposing reactionary and aggressive Zionist policies that are intended to sow national discord among Soviet citizens." However, the formation of this committee is simply another way for the Soviet Government to legitimize its the growing anti-Semitism campaign. In fact, this committee is now expanding its work and is forming chapters in Soviet cities.

In June 1983, the book "The Class Essence of Zionism" by Lev Korneev, was published and received warm reviews from the official press. This book states that Jews everywhere are automatically part of a fifth column, as they have a dual loyalty, to Israel and their country of residence. The book is an attack on what it calls "Jewish bourgeoisie." Korneev also claims, unbelievably, that Jewish and Zionist organizations took part in the mass execution of Jews during World War II and helped Hitler seize power. Other articles by Korneev claim that the sales of Levi jeans are channeled directly to "Zionist militarists."

On July 17, 1983, four Jews who had gathered in a Moscow apartment for a sabbath observance were arrested by plainclothes police who said inviting a group to a flat for a religious purpose was illegal. Soviet law prohibits the gatherings of a religious group unless it has written permission and registration with the state. Teaching religion to young people also is forbidden. There are no rabbinical seminaries in the Soviet Union and Jews are systematically denied access to universities. The list of state sanctioned discriminatory practices against Jews in the Soviet Union is long.

Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union has declined to its lowest level since 1970. In 1979, 51,320 Jews were granted permission to emigrate while, in 1982, only 2,670 left. Through September 15, 1983, a mere 988 have emigrated. The anti-Zionist committee and Soviet officials claim that this is because that most Jews who wanted to leave already have and that Jewish emigration has come to an end. In fact, the Helsinki Commission reported that in 1982, 200,000 to 400,000 Soviet citizens wanted to emigrate, which includes many of the 2 million Jews living in that country.

The Voice of America and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty have been steadily reporting on this appalling phenomena. For instance, VOA August and September coverage of this religious persecution include reports on the committee of concerned scientist appeals on behalf of a Soviet refuznik, the Soviet crackdown in Latvia on believers, Anatoli Shcharansky's plight, the appeal on behalf of a Jewish rights activist at the artifical intelligence conference, religious reawakening in the Soviet Union, and the World Council of Churches featuring religious persecution in Afghanistan. RFE/RL has done comparable work on his important issue. My amendment commends the extensive work done by both broadcast networks.

Over the past several months, Members of the House and Senate have written numerous letters to Andropov protesting the increasing religious persecution in general and the declining levels of Jewish emigration in particular. Senators have visited the U.S.S.R. in person to express these concerns. Not surprisingly, these protests have been totally ignored.

Meanwhile, VOA and RFE/RL's potential as foreign policy tools have long been overlooked. Their combined audiences total approximately 150 million weekly, and their strong following is attested to by the Soviet Union's extensive jamming activities, which cost more than the combined budgets of RFE/RL and VOA annually. This amendment recognizes the networks' effectiveness by encouraging them to intensify activities against religious persecution in the Soviet Union whenever possible.

I look forward to my colleagues' support on this amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several items in connection with this matter.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 30, 1983]

SOVIET BOOK ASSAILS JEWS

(By Dusko Doder)

Moscow, June 29.—The recent publication here of a blatantly anti-Semitic book—charging, for example, that Zionists collaborated with the Nazis in the mass executions of the Holocaust—coincides with a fierce anti-Zionist and anti-Israeli propaganda drive designed to discourage Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union.

The book, which has been warmly reviewed in the official Communist press, comes after a Kremlin decision last fall to practically close off the Jewish exodus to Israel. According to figures compiled by western organizations, Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union dropped from a high of more than 51,000 in 1979 to 2,688 last year. In the first four months of this year only 421 Jews are known to have been allowed to emigrate.

In his preface to "The Class Essence of Zionism," Lev Korneev, who has a doctorate in history and is regarded as an expert on Zionism, recalls themes reminiscent of some of the most bitter periods of anti-Semitic sentiment of the Stalinist era, asserting that Jews in ancient times were involved in commerce and that "profit was their ideology."

This phrase provides the key to the understanding of the book, in which Korneev uses Marxist terminology of class struggle for a savage attack on the "Jewish bourgeoisie" in the Soviet Union and elsewhere.

Korneev claims that Jewish bankers and industrialists financed the mad monk Rasputin in an effort to influence the last czar, Nicholas II. He gives examples of Jews in other countries achieving prominence and occupying influential positions.

Jews everywhere, Korneev writes, are citizens of a Jewish nation, and that "automatically puts Jews in the role of a fifth column in any country"—a "double loyalty" that is exploited by imperialists, Jewish elites and Israeli secret service agencies.

Korneev's book and the accompanying anti-Zionist drive have pressed home this common theme of singling out the Jewish community as a people with "dual loyalties." Such a climate is widely viewed as being designed to make it more difficult for

Jews to assert their Jewishness and demand the right to emigrate to Israel.

How many of the 2 million Soviet citizens of Jewish background would like to emigrate is not known. For the past eight months, Soviet officials have insisted that most Jews who wanted to leave already have and that Jewish emigration has come to an end.

That argument was advanced recently by officials of an anti-Zionist committee set up in April to wage a propaganda war against Zionists and discourage Jews from applying to emigrate. There is currently a drive, reflected in letters to newspapers, to establish a committee to combat Zionism in Moscow.

The reason for the curtailment of Jewish emigration is believed to be the Kremlin's assessment that it was losing too many trained specialists while gaining nothing in return.

One aspect of the campaign is reflected in numerous articles claiming that Jewish emigres lead a desolate life in Israel and in the West and in accounts about would-be emigrants who changed their minds and decided to stay in the Soviet Union.

Historically, Russian Jewry has been subjected to various forms of repression, including forcible conversion, occupational and geographic restrictions and persistent attempts to "denationalize" Jewish culture.

While some czars such as Alexander I were relatively tolerant, others were fanatically anti-Semitic, notably Alexander III, under whose regime major programs were carried out.

Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state, opposed any form of anti-Semitism. His successor, Josef Stalin, disliked the Jews, and he established an "autonomous region" for them in Birobidzhan in the Soviet Far East. Toward the end of his life, Stalin was on the verge of launching an anti-Semitic campaign with the so-called "doctors' plot," an allegation that Jewish physicians were planning to poison him.

In recent years, anti-Semitism has been more subdued, despite Moscow's major anti-Zionist drive after the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. The distinctions between anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism, although blurred, were nevertheless observed.

"The Class Essence of Zionism," published here this spring, attempts to eliminate distinctions between anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism.

Its publication raises the question of how such a work that violates the Kremlin's stated policy toward nationalities and ethnic groups could have been published. But the fact that the book has received favorable reviews in the official press, including the government newspapers Izvestia and Sovetskaya Kultura, is indicative of the current climate created at least in part by the authorities.

Izvestia said the book would be received with "great interest" by the general reading public. Sovetskaya Kultura, an organ of the Central Committee, said the author's research was "interesting and convincing," and it praised him for writing a "necessary and courageous" volume.

In newspaper articles in recent months including one in Pionerskaya Pravada, a national newspaper for school children, Korneev has charged that Zionists are trying to turn all Jewish citizens into "traitors."

His articles also assert that all profits from the sales of Levi jeans are channeled directly to "Zionist militarists." He has charged that because the state uses its money for military purposes.

His book is a more ambitious attempt to substantiate this line of thinking. He goes systematically through Jewish history and religion purportedly examining Zionism in its social, economic and political context.

The Jews themselves, Korneev writes, are to be blamed for anti-Semitism. The reason for this allegedly rests on the explitation of gentile population by wealthy Jews all over the world rather than on racial or religious grounds.

However, the latter play a secondary role in the emergence of anti-Semitism, Korneev writes. He advances the argument that Russian anti-Semitism dates back to the Mongol period, when Genghis Khan and his successors ruled what is now the Soviet Union and allegedly used Jews as tax collectors, a task that the Jews carried out "ruthlessly," he adds.

He charges that pogroms of Jews in czarist Russia and the Ukraine frequently were started by the Jews themselves because "the Zionists wanted to have people emigrate to Palestine."

Korneev argues that "from the very beginning" of the Soviet state, international Zionism sought to undermine socialism, collaborating with anti-Soviet counterrevolutionary leaders.

He then claims that Jewish and Zionist organizations took part in the mass execution of Jews during World War II. The Zionist leadership, he charges, participated in the extermination of hundreds of thousands of non-Zionists and helped Hitler seize power in Germany.

"If it had not been for the Zionist-Nazi alliance, the number of victims, including Jewish victims in World War II, would have been smaller," he writes.

The book, published in an edition of 10,000 copies by a Kiev publishing house, has created a controversy among Soviet intellectuals.

At a recent press conference with the newly formed Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee, the question of Korneev's book was raised by western journalists, who asked how the committee regarded the book. The committee's deputy chairman, Samuel Zivs, a law professor, refused to discuss the book and asserted that the Soviet government is against any form of nationalism and anti-Semitism.

Another committee member, Yuri Koleshnikov, said, however: "This committee in the future will fight against wild and wrong accusations in books which have been written by a few authors and unfortunately have been permitted to be published."

[From the New York Times, Aug. 22, 1983]

AIDING SOVIET JEWS

(By Orrin G. Hatch)

WASHINGTON.—For years, Soviet leaders have used Soviet Jews as pawns or "bargaining chips" in a geopolitical game. Currently, the Kremlin seems to be "punishing" the United States by reducing Jewish emigration to a trickle, and intensifying an anti-Semitic campaign. A key theme of the strategy is to try to convince the American Jewish community to lay the blame for this dismal state of affairs on the White House—presumably because President Reagan is not concerned about human rights. There is only one problem with this strategy: Jewish leaders are not falling for it.

In fact, the Administration and Republicans and Democrats in Congress are deeply concerned abut human rights issues, and we are united on such matters as Soviet Jews. In March, 74 Senators signed a letter to Yuri V. Andropov expressing concern abut the plight of Soviet Jews, and 100 Senators recently signed letters to Soviet and American officials calling for the release of Dr. Iosif Begun, a Moscow Hebrew teacher and "refusenik."

I believe that the Jewish community realizes that the Administration has placed this issue high on its priority list. For instance, Jerry Goodman, executive director of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, was quoted as having said: " Our assessment of the Reagan Administration is that their pronouncements are very good. We have been assured that this issue is a priority in terms of bilateral relations between the two countries." Theodore Mann, immediate past chairman of the conference, has praised President Reagan for ignoring Soviet protests and meeting with Iosif Mendelevich, a former Jewish prisoner of conscience, and Mrs. Avital Shcharansky, wife of the imprisoned Anatoly Shcharansky. The President promised Mrs. Shcharansky that he would do everything possible to secure the release of her husband and for others who are imprisoned for their religious beliefs.

The Administration has taken other positive steps: The President, Vice President Bush and other officials have met with Jewish delegations to express their concern. Secretary of State George P. Shultz particularly emphasized human rights matters, including those of Soviet Jews, in his meeting with the Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko, last September.

Characteristically, Moscow is reacting by getting tough. Just after the third World Conference on Soviet Jewry held in Israel last March, it announced formation of an "Anti-Zionist Committee," which, alarmingly, is getting a foothold in cities and towns across the Soviet Union. This is not surprising. There are no rabbinical seminaries in the Soviet Union. It is illegal to teach Hebrew privately. Jews are denied access to universities and systematically discriminated against in the workplace. The media are filled with anti-Semitic propaganda blaming Jews for every evil under the sun—even accusing Jews of collusion with the Nazis in the Holocaust. Through all of these means, the Soviet leaders are attempting to commit religious and cultural genocide against the Jewish people.

Coinciding with this increased anti-Semitism, levels of Soviet Jewish emigration have plunged since the record high of 1979, when more than 51,000 Jews were allowed to emigrate. The "Anti-Zionist Committee" has a pat explanation: It claims that all Jews who want to leave have done so—despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary.

In view of the overall situation, I believe that the Administration and Congress need to get even tougher on the issue of Soviet Jews. We need to convince Moscow that we consider this issue a fundamental stumbling block on the path of improved relations. One way to send a signal is to hold firm on the Jackson-Vanik Amendment vis-a-vis the Soviet Union; that amendment, which links most-favored-nation status with emigration policies, should not be relaxed.

The United States must convey its deep concern over the persecution of Soviet Jews at every opportunity that we get—such as during negotiations over grain, fishing and maritime, rights, and especially at the proposed Reagan-Andropov summit meeting, that may take place in the coming year.

This is not just a "Jewish issue" or an "American issue" or even "Western issue."

It is a fundamental matter of human rights that are recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Helsinki Final Act.

America simply cannot ignore the reprehensible treatment of thousands of Soviet Jews, as well as others who are being persecuted for their religious beliefs and are virtually being held hostage in their own country.

(Orrin G. Hatch of Utah is vice chairman for foreign policy of the Republicans' Senate steering committee.)

VOICE OF AMERICA COVERAGE OF JEWISH EMIGRATION AND SOVIET RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

The Voice of America gives regular and full coverage to Jewish emigration and Soviet religious persecution including many central and service originated scripts.

Examples of coverage of Jewish emigration and Soviet religious persecution from the first of 1983 include:

JANUARY

Ordination by Pope John Paul II of two Czechoslovak bishops in exile who will minister to Czechoslovak refugees and exiles throughout the world.

Lithuanian priest charged by officials.

FEBRUARY

Soviet Dissident Crackdown.

MARCH

Soviet dissident Senderov sentencing.

Reports of new harassments and unjustified investigation of human rights activists in Czechoslovakia, including persecution of priests and other religious workers.

Arrival to New York of Romanian religious dissident, Ioan Teodosiu.

APRIL

Coverage of all major events associated with the American Jewish Holocaust Survivors gathering in Washington.

Coverage of press conference of Romanian dissident on religious freedom.

MAY

Reports on the protest notes sent to Czechoslovakian officials against persecution and harassment of religious leaders in that country.

Events and reaction to arrest of Lithuanian religious rights activists.

JUNE

Feature on religion and freedom.

Feature on Andrei Sakharov.

Correspondent report on Pentecostalists.

Correspondent report on Soviet Jews.

JULY

Close-up of ceremonies connected with dedication of the Czech National Chapel in the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington.

Correspondent report on Pentecostalists.

August and September coverage of Jewish emigration and religious persecution include:

Solzhenitsyn in defense of two priests in the USSR.

Appeal to the Christians of the world in defense of Fr. Gleb Yakunin from a prisoner in a Soviet Labor Camp.

The World Council of Churches and the question of Religious Rights.

"Church of the Russians" program on Orthodox Church in Russia.

World Council of Churches report from Vancouver.

US press on USSR: Russian Protests raised at Church Council.

Scientists in support of suppressed.

A hundred mathematicians appeal on behalf of Jewish activist.

Report on "The Plight of Soviet Jews."

Report on special conference of Concerned Scientist.

Committee in connection with the 70th anniversary of the Jewish activist and refusenik, Alexander Lerner.

Backgrounder on World of Council of Churches featuring religious persecution in Afghanistan.

Problems in discussing persecution of believers at World Council of Churches meeting.

Report on Ida Milgrom's plea on behalf of her son, Anatoli Shcharansky.

Complete "Religion in our Life" program dedicated to the WCC and the problem of religious persecution.

Review of an article from "Forward" on the persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union.

Report on Committee of Concerned Scientist appeals on behalf of a refusnik trying to emigrate from Soviet Union.

Report on persecution of the Church in Czechoslovakia.

Appeal on behalf of Jewish rights activist at the Artificial Intelligence Conference.

Soviet crackdown in Latvia on believers.

Soviet Psychiatric Abuse—dealing with psychiatric treatment of religious believers among others.

Report on the Committee for the Defense of Believers' Rights in the USSR.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I say to the distinguished majority leader that I am content to proceed with a voice vote, but I do want to say for the record that I do vote for the amendment.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I understand now that there is no request for a rollcall vote on the first amendment, so if the managers are willing, I guess we can go back to that one and dispose of it by voice vote.

Is the Senator from New Hampshire agreeable to that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is satisfactory to me, yes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2204

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator resubmit his first amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I resubmit the first amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the second amendment is set aside.

The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment (No. 2204) was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2205

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the second amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BYRD. What does the second amendment do?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It expresses the sense of Congress that Voice of America, Radio Liberty, and Radio Free Europe are to be commended for their news and editorial coverage of the appalling increase of religious persecution in the Soviet Union.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the second amendment (No. 2205).

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

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I commend my distinguished colleague. I have been the staunchest defender of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe for 16½ years.

The Soviets probably spend more money jamming it, trying to jam it, than we do transmitting it. Certainly, there is a meaning to explain the increasing religious persecution of the Soviet Union, the declining level of Jewish emigration—and the reason, of course, is the punishment meted out to those who wish to apply for visas. Their sons are suddenly taken out of college; they are sent into the military force.

We have heard this firsthand from dissidents in the Soviet Union who had the courage to meet with us there—the threats of persecution they were subjected to, the humiliation in their neighborhoods, the way the pressure of the state was brought upon them just for the audacity they had to apply for a visa to leave.

Then, of course, the Government had the audacity to say to us: "We just don't have any more applications available." Of course, they do not. I said I would pay for an ad in Pravda: "Wanted: Applications to immigrate to Israel or to leave the Soviet Union," and they rejected that offer.

I commend the distinguished Senator for his amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his cosponsorship.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, we are ready to accept the amendment.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, we accept the amendment. It is a very good amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2205) was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PERCY. I thank my distinguished colleagues for two very worthy amendments.

AMENDMENT NO. 2206

(Purpose: To modify the bidding practice of the Foreign Buildings Office Act of 1926)

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as folows:

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) proposes an amendment numbered 2206.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 24, after line 19, insert the following new section:

SEC. 122. The Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended, is further amended by adding a new section 11 thereto as follows:

(A) Contracts, including lease-back or other agreements the purpose of which is to obtain the construction, alteration or repair of buildings and grounds abroad, when estimated to or as awarded exceed $2,000,000, (including contract alternatives and contingencies):

(1) Shall be limited to (a) American-owned bidders and (b) bidders from countries which permit or agree to permit equal access to American bidders for comparable projects;

(2) For purposes of determining competitive status, bids qualifying under subsection (1)(a) shall be reduced by ten per centum thereof.

(B) Bidder qualification under this section shall be determined on the basis of nationality of ownership, the burden of which shall be on any prospective bidder; qualification under subsection (1)(a) shall require ownership in excess of fifty percent by U.S. citizens or permanent residents or have been incorporated in the United States for more than three years and employ United States citizens in more than half its permanent full-time positions in the United States. Determinations under this Section shall be committed to the discretion of the Secretary.

(C) Contracts for construction, alteration or repair in the United States for or on behalf of any Foreign Mission as defined in the Foreign Missions Act of 1982 may, pursuant to the authority of that Act, only be awarded to or performed by a company qualifying under Section A(1) above: *Provided*, That nothing therein shall preclude work to be performed by nationals of the Sending State otherwise granted the right of entry for that purpose by the Secretary.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the U.S. Department of State operates embassies and consulates around the world valued at over $5 billion. The responsibility for maintaining current facilities and building new ones rests with the Foreign Buildings Office (FBO) of the State Department. The FBO derives its authority from the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended. This act grants the FBO great leeway in the manner in which it procures its construction services. Recently, the FBO used that latitude to select a non-U.S. contractor to construct a new Embassy complex in Cairo, Egypt, while ignoring the availability of a highly qualified U.S. contractor who was within 12 percent of the lowest bidder. It is my belief that the FBO should be required to take into consideration the comparative building processes used by other countries in connection with their building projects abroad in awarding U.S. building contracts. Therefore, I am offering an amendment which: First, requires that all building projects of the United States over $2 million under the Foreign Buildings Office be awarded to U.S. bidders or bidders from countries which permit equal access to American bidders for comparable projects; second, provides for a 10-percent preference for U.S. bidders; and third, provides that within the United States, exceptions can be granted under country-by-country agreements.

This amendment may help U.S. balance of payments, tax revenues, role of U.S. building materials and services, and may create jobs for U.S. companies.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I have studied this amendment. It does have a certain negative impact on the taxpayer, because it increases the percentage of an American builder from 10 percent to 12 percent, but on balance it is good and justified, and I support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2206) was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2207

(Purpose: To establish a Baltic Division in Radio Liberty)

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) proposes an amendment numbered 2207.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 33, after line 20, add the following new section:

BALTIC DIVISION

SEC. 304. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 301 may be used unless—

(1) the Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian radio services of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty are organized as a separate division within Radio Liberty; and

(2) that they begin broadcasts under a name which would accurately reflect United States policy of not recognizing the illegal incorporation of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, in 1975, the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian radio services began broadcasts to the Baltic States as a part of Radio Liberty. Their operations and broadcasts as a part of Radio Liberty can be improved with specific changes in organization and broadcast identification.

The Estonian American National Council, the American Latvian Association, the Lithuanian American Council, Estonian World Council, World Federation of Free Latvians, the Supreme Committee for the Liberation of Lithuania, and the Joint Baltic American National Committee have agreed that the Baltic broadcasts of Radio Liberty must be organized as a separate division within Radio Liberty answering only to the Director of RL, and second, that the Baltic radios broadcast under a title which accurately reflects U.S. policy not to recognize the incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

Uniting the three Baltic services as one division would be a matter of simple changes in administrative routing. These changes would permit the Baltic services to concentrate on their specific needs, such as recruitment of personnel and language training, without being administratively locked with the other nationality services of Radio Liberty.

Changing the broadcast identification to a title that focuses on the Baltic States would have a psychological and political impact on its listeners and serve to underscore U.S. Baltic policy. For example, using a title such as "Radio Baltic Republics" would reinforce the distinct identity of the Baltic States and separate them from the rest of the Soviet Union.

The necessary changes can be made within existing budgetary stipulations and would not require additional funding.

The Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian radio services of Radio Liberty represent an informational lifeline to each of the Baltic States. It is time to enhance the already existing elements and make the Baltic services the effective division which, with the appropriate changes, it can quickly become.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this is a good amendment. It combines three branches not under a single entity. They would be under a single entity, and this would give a certain amount of heart to the people of those countries. I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2207) was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2208

(Purpose: To create a U.S.-India Endowment out of excess U.S.-owned Indian rupees)

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) proposes an amendment numbered 2208.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Page 48, after line 17, insert the following new title:

TITLE VII—UNITED STATES-INDIA ENDOWMENT FOR CULTURAL, EDUCATIONAL, AND SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 701. This title may be cited as the "United States-India Endowment for Cultural, Educational, and Scientific Cooperation Act".

THE ENDOWMENT

SEC. 702. The President is authorized to enter into an agreement with the Government of India providing for the establishment of a United States-India Endowment for Cultural, Educational, and Scientific Cooperation (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Endowment") which would provide grants and other assistance for exchanges of persons for cultural, educational, and scientific purposes and for programs for joint scientific cooperation.

USE OF EXCESS UNITED STATES OWNED RUPEES TO CAPITALIZE THE ENDOWMENT

SEC. 703. Subject to applicable requirements concerning reimbursement to the Treasury for United States owned foreign currencies, the President may make available to the Endowment, for use in carrying out the agreement authorized by section 702, up to the equivalent of $250,000,000 in foreign currencies owned to the United States by the Government of India. Such use may include investment in order to generate interest which would be retained by the Endowment and used to support exchange and research programs pursuant to that agreement.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, in order to provide a more enduring basis for the relations between the United States and India, the world's two largest democracies, I am proposing to establish a permanent United States-India Endowment for Cultural, Educational, and Scientific Cooperation.

To serve as the initial capital of the endowment, up to $250 million equivalent may be drawn from the rupee funds currently available to the U.S. Government in India under the United States-India agreement of 1974 and in accordance with the provisions of that agreement prior to the expected depletion of funds several years hence.

Bearing in mind the extensive exchanges and research already supported by those rupee funds over the past several decades, the endowment would provide grants and other assistance to activities in the cultural, educational, and scientific realms. Particular emphasis would be placed on fields whose contributions can be made by talented individuals in both countries and where existing institutional links can be reinforced and new ones established.

Subject to the appropriate laws of India, the endowment would be incorporated there as well as in the United States and contributions would be sought from the private sectors in both countries to supplement Government contributions. The endowment's activities would be financed primarily by drawing on interest earned on its capital.

Responsibility for administering the endowment would rest with a board, the American members of which would be nominated by the Secretary of State and the Indian members by the Government of India. In choosing the American members due regard would be paid to the exchange and research programs currently existing.

Since the inception of U.S. assistance to India in 1950, more than 32 billion rupees have been generated from U.S. Public Law 480 agricultural sales and rupee-repayable dollar loans. These vast rupee deposits have provided a valuable source of funds for local operations and exchange programs in the areas of science, technology, culture, and education.

Toward the end of the 1960's, however, the rapid accumulation of U.S.-owned rupees became a matter of concern adversely affecting our relations with India. The sheer magnitude of the U.S. holdings created a situation in which U.S. Government decisions could have a destabilizing effect on India's monetary policy. In 1971, the United States ceased its practice of accepting local currency in payment for new Public Law 480 loans; but the rupee balances in India continued to grow as old loans fell due.

To deal with this problem, then U.S. Ambassador Pat Moynihan initiated negotiations with the Indian Government in February 1974 leading to an agreement, under which: (a) the Indian Government repaid all outstanding rupee obligations, including principal and interest, (b) rupees equivalent to $2.2 billion were then granted by the United States to India for various economic development projects; and (c) the United States retained its claim on rupees equivalent to $1.1 billion for various local currency expenses anticipated over a period of 14 to 24 years.

Of the $1.1 billion rupee equivalent retained by the United States, a portion was placed in three U.S. banks in the form of certificates of deposit yielding interest at 8½-10 percent. As of August 31, 1982, those deposits were valued at $112 million; with interest continuing to accumulate, it is estimated that they will amount to about $140.4 million by November 1984 when the last certificate reaches maturity.

The remainder of the $1.1 billion was left basically as a claim by the U.S. Government on the Reserve Bank of India. It earns no interest. In fact, it does not even exist, strictly speaking, but must be budgeted by the Indians each year in an amount determined by U.S. Government requirements on an annual basis. It is from the noninterest-bearing Indian-held account that U.S. local currency needs, running at about $60-$70 million per year, have been funded. The remaining balance stood at $388 million as of August 31, 1982, and currently amounts to roughly $320 million.

A portion of the annual U.S. local currency expenditures—about $9 million equivalent in fiscal year 1982—are drawn through so-called special foreign currency appropriations to fund a variety of educational, cultural, and scientific exchange programs of value to both countries. These programs are administered by some 15 U.S. Government agencies including the National Bureau of Standards, the Smithsonian Institution, Health and Human Services, the National Science Foundation, the Library of Congress, and others. USIA, for example, uses SFC funding for such activities as the Fulbright Commission, the American Studies Resources Center in Hyderabad, and the American Institute of Indian Studies.

Mr. President, in brief, Ambassador Harry Barnes, the U.S. Ambassador to India, has asked us to consider a proposal to create a United States-Indian endowment out of excess U.S.-owned Indian rupees. We have a very large supply of excess Indian rupees.

It would be, in my judgment, a very useful way to utilize these rupees.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I agree with the description of the amendment. It seems a good amendment and I urge its support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, what will the rupees be spent for?

Mr. PERCY. They are just sitting there now. They would be used to create an endowment and be used for the purpose of strengthening, improving objectives and purposes of America's presence in India and our relationship with India.

Instead of having local Indian currency unusable by us, this amendment puts it to use in a form that will advance the national foreign policy interests of the United States and our relationship with India.

Mr. BYRD. How does India feel about this?

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I assume that Ambassador Barnes has discussed this with India. I have not had a specific indication from him to that effect. But I will make sure on tomorrow, before the final passage of this bill, that it has been approved by India and that they look with favor on it.

Mr. BYRD. How has India responded with respect to the shooting down of the Korean plane?

Mr. PERCY. Well, I think that India has made appropriate statements. I am not really positive of that. Me feeling has been that virtually every country has, except two votes were cast by the satellite countries of the Soviet Union. Certainly, India is not in that category.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I think, in answer to the question of the minority leader, India condemned the shooting down of the plane but did not condemn the Soviet Union for doing it.

Mr. BYRD. That was my understanding.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PERCY. I am happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I was afraid we would do this. We have nine amendments and, frankly, except for the two managers, whom I trust absolutely, none of us really know what are in them. I really urge that the managers consider that we can probably do this a lot faster tomorrow, especially if our staffs try to find out any further points of clarification that need to be considered.

So I hope the managers would agree at this time that we might discontinue for the evening and begin tomorrow as soon as the markup of the Foreign Relations Committee is completed.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wonder if the majority leader would bear with me. There are three little noncontroversial amendments of my own, of which I am very familiar.

Mr. BAKER. Is this an amendment of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, this is my own amendment, but Senators PELL and MOYNIHAN, our former Ambassador to India, have asked to be added as cosponsors. I ask unanimous consent that they be added as cosponsors.

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

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I hope, with the condition that we would find out and determine that overnight, we could adopt this amendment now.

Mr. BYRD. Not now. I do not know that there would be any opposition to it, but I think we ought to have a few more Senators on the floor when we are voting on some of these amendments, at least.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to temporarily withdraw the amendment. It will be offered again tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to withdraw the amendment. The amendment is so withdrawn.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I really renew my request. I understand the Senator from Rhode Island has amendments, but so does the Senator from Illinois. It has been a long day, and I think it is time to quit. I hope the Senators will agree to that.

Mr. PERCY. Senators always agree with the leadership on procedural questions, particularly when we go home.

Mr. BAKER. Would that it were so.

Mr. President, I thank all Senators for their cooperation. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will not interrupt the Senator. I just wanted to thank him for doing what I think is the best thing. I wish to thank Mr. PERCY and Mr. PELL, also.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I was disturbed to hear some of my colleagues suggest here today that we shift some of the funds out of the Fulbright exchange program.

I hope my colleagues will resist any effort to take as much as $1 away from this noble and effective program.

The record of the program speaks for itself and needs little defense from me. But let me just remind my colleagues of what the program stands for and what it has achieved.

After World War II, Senator J. William Fulbright introduced legislation authorizing our Government to use proceeds from the sale of surplus war property to finance the exchange of students and teachers. That program has expanded in funding and scope over the years, but its goal remains unchanged: To promote understanding between nations and to create or strengthen ties on an individual as well as governmental level.

I do not think we should underestimate the value of personal contact among the citizens of different nations. It destroys misconceptions, eliminates prejudices, and creates bonds of friendship and understanding.

The Soviets understand these benefits, and that is why they and their allies have stepped up their efforts in this area far beyond anything the United States has ever done.

Two years ago when the Senate was discussing the funding of international exchange programs, the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. WEICKER, made a magnificent speech, in which he described the exchange program sponsored by the Cubans. Senator WEICKER described a visit to Cuba, where he saw 600 Namibian high school students receiving an education—or should we say indoctrination—at the hands of that Soviet satellite. I believe that it it is safe to say that those students will return to their native country as strong friends of the Soviet-Cuban system. I don't how many Namibian students we have here in the United States, but I daresay that there are not many.

My colleagues should not speak of reducing Fulbright funding; instead, we should be offering amendments to increase that funding. Let me say how pleased I am that the Congress voted 2 years ago to double USIA's international exchange programs by 1986.

Make no mistake: International exchange programs are in our best interest, especially if we use them to expose young people from nondemocracies to our institutions. Democracy must be observed and experienced to be understood and appreciated. We take many of the blessings of democracy for granted, but the workings of our systems will make a lasting impression on a young student who has not been exposed to the freedoms that we enjoy.

The investment we make in these programs now will reap an outstanding return later. If you need proof, let me point out that a 1980 survey showed that 33 heads of state and 378 cabinet-level ministers had studied or visited in the United States under the aegis of our educational exchange programs. Among those participants we find such leaders as Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Great Britain, President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania, former Chancellor Bruno Kreisky of Austria, former Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany, and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi of India.

The Fulbright program has a special place in my heart because of my personal admiration for the former Senator from Arkansas and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who had the foresight 35 years ago to establish the framework that would result in so many links between this country and leaders abroad.

Senators should look at the record and resist any efforts to cut back our international exchange programs.

SYRIA-LIBYA AMENDMENTS

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to identify myself with the amendments offered by Senator PROXMIRE which deny foreign aid funds to Syria and add Libya and Syria to the list of nations and groups which are not to be allowed to benefit from U.S.-funded international organizations because of support for terrorism.

Syria continues to refuse to leave Lebanese territory and daily presses

deeper into that beleaguered nation. In addition, Syria proudly trumpets its faithful support for all factions of the P.L.O., a fact which alone displays Syria's unworthiness to receive even 1 cent of American funds. Syria also has proven itself to be a brutal and callous oppressor of its own people.

American marines have died in Lebanon, carrying out the role of peacemakers. Were Syria not ruthlessly pressing in upon the Lebanese, those marines would not have died; no peace force would even be necessary. Syria must never be rewarded indirectly for its direct assault on Lebanese sovereignty and world peace. Thus, Mr. PROXMIRE is to be commended for offering the amendment which stops any and all aid to Syria.

It is equally commendable to add Libya and Syria to the list of nations not to benefit from U.S.-funded international organizations. Libya and Syria have in recent years developed national policies in support of terrorism throughout the world. Libya, besides admitting openly its funding of various groups dedicated to international politics and violence, has been implicated in assassination plots against the President of the United States. What an outrage. Thankfully, our security network short-circuited that outrageous plan.

Unfortunately, many critics of Libya throughout the world did not have any warning before their lives were snuffed out by Libyan assassins. In addition, many innocent bystanders have been killed or maimed during Libyan-funded terrorist actions. Libya and Syria should never benefit from the smallest amounts of U.S. taxpayers' dollars.

Lastly, both Libya and Syria have made as a cornerstone of their foreign policy the stated goal of annihilating Israel. Such a blatantly subversive policy against a crucial U.S. ally should by itself solidify our support for any amendment which stifles Libya and Syria.●

PROGRAM

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, tomorrow at the hour of 10 a.m., I intend to ask the Senate to turn to the consideration of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, S. 869.

Mr. President, as I said earlier, whether that matter is disposed of or not, at about 1 p.m. tomorrow, it will be the intention of the leadership on this side to ask the Senate to resume consideration of the pending measure, which is S. 1342, the State authorization bill.

RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I think that we have done all we can for this day.

I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate now stand in recess until the hour of 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 9:05 p.m., the Senate recessed until Friday, September 23, 1983, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 22, 1983:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Peter Jon de Vos, of Florida, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Republic of Mozambique.

AMBASSADOR

Millicent Fenwick, of New Jersey, for the rank of Ambassador during the tenure of her service as U.S. Representative to the Food and Agriculture Organizations in Rome.

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

Chester A. Crocker, an Assistant Secretary of State, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation for a term of 2 years.

Francis Stephen Ruddy, an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation for a term of 2 years.

Patsy Baker Blackshear, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation for a term of 4 years.

Charles G. Wells, of Illinois, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation for a term of 4 years.

William F. Pickard, of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation for a term of 6 years.

BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING

Joseph Lane Kirkland, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board for International Broadcasting for a term expiring April 28, 1984 (new position).

Arch L. Madsen, of Utah, to be a member of the Board for International Broadcasting for a term expiring April 28, 1984 (new position).

James Albert Michener, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Board for International Broadcasting for a term expiring April 28, 1984 (new position).

Clair W. Burgener, of California, to be a member of the Board for International Broadcasting for a term expiring April 28, 1985 (new position).

Malcolm Forbes, Jr., of New Jersey, to be a member of the Board for International Broadcasting for a term expiring April 28, 1986.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Henry F. Schickling, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 1985.

The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Katherine D. Ortega, of New Mexico, to be Treasurer of the United States.