

Ariz., was flying a naval transport plane at 10,000 feet some 30 miles east of Albuquerque, en route to the West Coast.

"I saw this tremendous explosion to the south of me, roughly 55 miles from my position," Lugo recalls. "My first impression was, like, the sun was coming up in the south. What a ball of fire! It was so bright it lit up the cockpit of the plane."

Lugo radioed Albuquerque. He got no explanation for the blast, but was told "don't fly south."

As the sun itself finally rose, rancher Dolly Onsrud of Oscuro woke up, looked out her window and saw a mushroom cloud rising from the other side of the mountains—right about where her cattle-grazing land had been before the U.S. Army took it over three years earlier.

She had been none too happy about giving up her 36 sections, and now it looked as if the government was blowing it up.

Like Onsrud, most ranchers who witnessed some aspect of the blast are the same ones who were moved off what became White Sands Missile Range. They are still bitter—bitter that the Army never returned the land, bitter that they weren't more generously compensated for giving up their ranches for what they believed was a patriotic duty. And, these days, they would much rather talk about their lost lands than about the first atomic bomb.

With the passage of half a century, these same people also find it remarkable that the government never warned them about an event that some scientists thought might set off a chain reaction and destroy all humanity.

The fact was, not many workers at Trinity knew for sure what they were working on. Retired teacher Grace Lucero of San Antonio said soldiers who came to the bar that her husband operated told him they were building a tower. "They said they didn't know what it was for," Lucero says. The tower, everyone later learned, steadied the bomb before it was detonated.

"No one knew what was going on out there," says Evelyn Fite Tune, who lives on a family ranch 24 miles west of Trinity. "And of course none of us ever heard of Los Alamos or the atomic bomb."

She and her late husband, Dean Fite, were away in Nevada when the blast went off. They couldn't tell from the news accounts of those days exactly where it happened.

"Finally, on the way back we went to a movie house in Denver and watched the newsreel," she says. "When they showed the hills around the blast area, my husband said 'Hell, that's our ranch!'"

Pat Withers lives south of Carrizozo. He is 86 now and has been a rancher all his life. His house is 300 yards from the black and hardened lava flow that's sometimes called the malpais.

"The explosion was loud enough that I jumped out of bed," he says. "I thought the malpais had blown up. It wasn't on fire, so I went back to bed."

Few ranchers had an experience to match that of William Wrye, whose house then and now is 20 miles northeast of Trinity.

Wrye and his wife, Helen, had been returning from a tiring trip to Amarillo the night before the explosion. "We got to Bingham (on U.S. 380) and there were eight or 10 vehicles and all kinds of lights shining up on the clouds. We were stopped by an MP and a flashing red light. After we told them who we were, they let us go on to the ranch. We were so tired we must have slept right through the blast."

"Next morning, we were eating breakfast when we saw a couple of soldiers with a little black box out by the stock tank, I went out there and asked what they were doing, and

they said they were looking for radioactivity. Well, we had no idea what radioactivity was back then. I told them we didn't even have the radio on."

"For four or five days after that, a white substance like flour settled on everything. It got on the posts of the corral and you couldn't see it real well in the daylight, but at night it would glow."

Before long, Wrye's whiskers stopped growing. Three or four months later, they came back, but they were white, then later, black.

Cattle in the area sprouted white hair along the side that had been exposed to the blast. Half the coat on Wrye's black cat turned white.

END OF INNOCENCE

Out at the north end of the Oscuro range, 30 miles from Trinity, rancher Bill Gallacher was 15 years old. He remembers the blast, that it lighted up the sky and the rooms in his house, much brighter than a bolt of lightning. His father, evidently man of few words who was just getting out of bed, simply said "Damm."

"It was a sort-of-sudden deal," Gallacher says, "especially before you've had your morning coffee."

Several ranchers say they never believed the Army cover story that an ammunition dump had blown up. But they didn't guess what it was until the devastation of bombs at Hiroshima and Nagasaki weeks later. Even then, they didn't guess the import of what had been wrought in their backyard.

Evelyn Fite Tune and her friends and neighbors visited the site soon after. "We found the hole, we picked up the glass, we climbed the twisted and melted parts of the tower," she says.

"All those people," she says, "grew up and got married and had kids. Nobody that I know of ever turned up sterile."

Back at the Wrye Ranch, Helen Wrye goes to the front door, gazing at the sweep of prairie and desert, the Oscuras looming to the south, 20 miles from here to Trinity. She speaks of this dawn of the atomic age, and she sounds wistful. "People weren't afraid of the government then," she says. "It was a time of innocence. People were trusting. We had never heard of an atomic bomb."

She is silhouetted against the sunlight of a bright spring day.

"It was a happy time to live," she says. "It was a happy time to live."

A-BOMB SCIENTISTS BEAR NO REGRETS

(By Patrick Armijo)

LOS ALAMOS.—The view from three Manhattan Project scientists was unanimous Thursday.

Questioned by Japanese journalists who wanted to know what they felt upon hearing about Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the three couldn't hide the pride they have in the work they did 50 years ago.

The retired scientists said their work on the bomb was vital to ending World War II—that bombing Hiroshima and Nagasaki was necessary to end prolonged fighting.

"It looked like very quickly it would be the end of the war, which otherwise who knew how long it would drag on?" Manhattan Project chemist John Balagna told Hiromasa Konishi of Japan America Television.

Konishi was at the Bradbury Science Museum with several other reporters from Japan, Britain and Australia to hear the Manhattan Project recollections of Balagna, L.D.P. "Perc" King and Joseph McKibben.

Balagna said the A-bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki kept someone from using the even more destructive hydrogen bomb in later years.

"The demonstration was so graphic, it put the fear of the Lord in everyone," he said. "That's what kept the Cold War cold."

He said he believes invading Japan would have resulted in more loss of life than the bombings.

The Japanese reporters' perspective differed.

"The director Steven Spielberg asked me why the cities were rebuilt and not kept as a memorial to genocide. It was like a genocide. The two bombs killed 200,000 people instantly," Konishi said.

Japan America Television was in Los Alamos working on stories for the 50th anniversary of the bombings.

Konishi said the bombing of Nagasaki, in particular, was "a difficult thing for the Japanese people to understand."

The Japanese still question the thinking behind the bombings, Konishi said, but his country for the past several years also has been coming to grips with its wartime "atrocities."

Itsuki Iwata, Los Angeles bureau chief for The Yomiuri Shibun, a Japanese newspaper, said he has conducted numerous interviews with the Manhattan scientists, and virtually all report they had few moral qualms about using the A-bomb.

"The view of the scientists is very much like the point of view you hear today. I think this is a very difficult thing for the scientists to talk about," Iwata said.

For King the problems people face today can't be superimposed onto 1945.

"We were terribly worried that Hitler had it (the bomb). It was the inspiration to work very long hours, six days a week," he said.

Balagna, who lost a brother in France about a month after D-Day, said, "My only regret is that we didn't finish in time to use it on Hitler."

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the incredibly enormous Federal debt is like the temperature outside—rising rapidly. As for the rising Federal debt, Congress had better get cracking—time is a-wasting and the debt is mushrooming and approaching the \$5 trillion level.

In the past, a lot of politicians talked a good game, when they were back home with the voters, about bringing Federal deficits and the Federal debt under control. But many of them regularly voted in support of bloated spending bills that rolled through the Senate like Tennyson's brook. So look at what has happened:

As of Friday, July 14, at the close of business, the Federal debt stood—down to the penny—at exactly \$4,933,039,330,339.52. This debt, remember, was run up by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, most citizens cannot conceive of a billion of anything, let alone a trillion. It may provide a bit of perspective to bear in mind that a billion seconds ago, the Cuban Missile Crisis was in progress. A billion minutes ago, the crucifixion of Jesus Christ had occurred not long before.

Which sort of puts it in perspective, does it not, that Congress has run up an incredible Federal debt totaling 4,808 of those billions—of dollars. In other words, the Federal debt, as I said earlier, stood this morning at opening time at four trillion, 933 billion, 39 million, 330 thousand, 339 dollars and 52

cents. It'll be even greater at closing time today.

STATE DEPARTMENT'S REFORM IS HISTORIC OPPORTUNITY

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the majority leader announced today his intentions to bring S. 908, the State Department Authorization Bill, to the Senate floor before the August recess.

As my colleagues are well aware, this bill proposes to reorganize the agencies of the executive branch charged with the conduct of America's foreign policy, saving needed Federal tax dollars in the process.

Before my colleagues rush to judgment on the efforts to restructure the State Department, I recommend they read John Bolton's June 25 op-ed piece in the Washington Times, "Quest for a Stronger Foreign Policy Hand."

Mr. President, John Bolton writes with authority on the purpose and past performance of the State Department because of his having served as Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development in the Reagan administration and as assistant Secretary of State in the Bush administration. Currently, John Bolton serves as the president of the National Policy Forum.

I urge Senators to take note of John Bolton's counsel. His advice regarding strengthening America's foreign policy hand is both sound and sorely needed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the June 25 op-ed piece in the Washington Times, "Quest for a Stronger Foreign Policy Hand", be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Times, June 25, 1995]
QUEST FOR A STRONGER FOREIGN POLICY HAND
(By John Bolton)

The House of Representatives has just adopted sweeping organizational changes in formulating American foreign policy. The Clinton administration has argued that the restructuring under debate—merging the Agency for International Development, the U.S. Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency into the State Department—are isolationist and unnecessary. Comparable legislation is now pending in the Senate.

Lost in the swirling and sometimes confusing arguments about reorganization is the principal point: How to strengthen the hand of the president in the conduct of foreign policy. Constitutionally, only the president can and should speak authoritatively for the United States in international matters.

The paramountcy of executive branch leadership in these affairs, however, has been repeatedly compromised by splitting, again and again, the president's authority among a multiplicity of agencies. Each agency develops its own "mission," its own political constituencies, and its own set of priorities, many or all of which may have little or no congruence with the wishes of the sitting president. The result, too often, has been interagency disagreements that retard if not entirely paralyze effective decision-making and policy implementation.

Over the years, therefore, the president's has been weakened, and his ability to act

firmly and decisively hampered. Now, in the early days of a post-Cold War era, it is precisely the right time to sweep away the bureaucratic remnants of the past, and the ossified "old thinking" they have come to embody. It is simply wrong to argue that the proponents of change are attempting to shift power between the branches. To the contrary, the proposals are intended to enhance presidential authority within his own often-unruly family.

Advocates of USIA's continued independence, for example, argue that its news and other functions should remain rigorously independent from the tainting touch of foreign policy considerations. AID's defenders assert that providing foreign economic assistance should serve as a poverty program rather than a support for vital U.S. interests. ACDA's champions believe that only its separateness will protect the Holy Grail of arms control. In fact, the secret agenda in all three cases is to insulate the sub-Cabinet agencies from effective control by the secretary of state, for fear that their respective missions will be "politicized." In this context, "politicized" means becoming consonant with U.S. national interests, which most Americans would simply take as a given, not as a problem.

Many who wish to preserve AID's separate-ness, such as Vice President Al Gore, do so because they support increased spending on international population control and environmental matters rather than fundamental economic policy reforms in developing countries. The vice president's preference for condoms and trees instead of markets notwithstanding, these policies will receive long-term political support in Congress only if they are tied to enhancing demonstrable U.S. foreign policy interests.

Changes in bureaucratic structures, however, do not require or even imply changes in budget levels or program priorities. Any such changes in these areas must stand or fall on their own merits, independently of which department or agency actually implements policies and programs. Disagreements on funding and program matters can be handled through the legislative amendment process, and will change over time in any event. Anyone who has actually served in the federal government knows that one of the few effective ways to capture the bureaucracy's attention is to threaten massive changes in its budget. Even so, efforts by opponents of reorganization to confuse structure and policy are simply obscurantist at best.

These are the tired arguments of inside-the-Beltway turf warriors. They deserve exactly as much weight as the voters gave to similar arguments on the domestic front in November. In fact, most breathtaking here is the opposition to reform agencies created up to 35 years ago, a pace that would imply roughly three bureaucratic reorganizations every century.

Nonetheless it is the centrality of enhancing the president's foreign policy authority that provides the inspiring vision to the reform proposals crafted by Rep. Benjamin Gilman, New York Republican, and Sens. Jesse Helms, North Carolina Republican, and Mitch McConnell, Kentucky Republican. Rising above the narrow political temptations occasioned by the split in control between democrats in the executive and Republicans in the legislative branches, they have crafted reorganization plans that transcend today's particular partisan wrangling. They have gained widespread support—including from distinguished career Foreign Service officers like former Secretary of State Larry Eagleberger. These may be sweeping proposals, but they are not extreme.

The reforms' directions, moreover, are decidedly internationalist in their implica-

tions. Reorganization opponents have repeatedly attempted to paint efforts to achieve sound policy-making and management as isolationist, but their ad hominem rhetoric is off the mark. By attempting to evoke dark memories of pre-World War II policies, they demonstrate that they are simply unable to appreciate why new international realities require new American structures.

It is precisely to make the United States more forceful, more dynamic and more adaptable that restructuring is so necessary. Thus, the real internationalists today in foreign affairs follow the lead of predecessors who were also not afraid of massive change in process and structure. Those internationalists who were "present at the creation" of U.S. policy and institutions in the aftermath of World War II would undoubtedly be cheerleaders for the reorganizations under discussion.

How the reorganizations are actually implemented and in what period of time they must be made operational are subjects for reasonable debate, as is the degree of flexibility the president and the secretary of state should be provided in reordering the combined agencies. Important as these questions may be, however, they are simply details in the larger vision of Messrs. Gilman, Helms and McConnell.

Moreover, no one should be confused that the proposals to fold USIA, AID and ACDA into the Department of State are preferred because of any illusion that the State Department is the unique repository of superior skill or efficiency. Phase two of the reorganization process should encompass a major re-examination of attitudinal, press and management issues within the department itself.

To step back now from the reform proposals out of timidity or indecision would be to miss an historic opportunity. Soon, the House of Representatives will complete consideration of the Gilman version of reorganization, where it deserves overwhelming approval, followed by immediate action by the Senate. What President Clinton ultimately does with the legislation when it reaches him will speak volumes about whether his "reinventing government" initiative is just one more disposable promise.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REFORM ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 343, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 343) to reform the regulatory process, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Dole amendment No. 1487, in the nature of a substitute.

Domenici amendment No. 1533 (to amendment No. 1487), to facilitate small business involvement in the regulatory development process.

Levin (for Glenn) amendment No. 1581 (to amendment No. 1487), in the nature of a substitute.