

the consequences to us as a society, as a civilization, and what it says about a society that, under the mantle of law, allows such a procedure to take place. Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

Mr. PELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

#### THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS, THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, during my last days in Congress, I wish to state my unequivocal support of the restoration of funds to the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. These fine agencies have sustained disproportionate and unreasonable cuts over the past 2 years, and the erosion must stop.

As coauthor of the legislation that created the endowments 31 years ago, I have felt like a proud father as both endowments have served the guiding principles upon which they were conceived. Overall, their programs have been remarkably successful. There has been overwhelming evidence of the positive impact of the arts and humanities on education, the economy, urban renewal, and cultural pride. It is important that two endowments are funded sufficiently to be able to continue their worthwhile and extremely effective endeavors to improve the quality of life for all Americans.

Mr. President, I am by no means alone today in favor of continued Federal funding for the arts and humanities. There is a strong bipartisan commitment. Earlier, Senator JEFFORDS and I circulated a letter signed by 31 Members that expressed their support of appropriations for the NEA, NEH, and IMS in fiscal year 1997 at current or slightly increased levels, and I ask that the letter be included in the RECORD. Other Members have spoken with us subsequently regarding their support.

The American public remains solidly and strongly behind Federal support for the arts and humanities. A recent Harris poll found that a 61 percent majority of Americans—to 37 percent saying “no”—would be willing to be taxed \$5 more in order to pay for Federal financial support for the arts. These people believe the arts to be important and would sorely miss them if they were not there.

In Rhode Island, the restored Humanities funding means quite literally survival for an extremely important project that provides fascinating information to all Americans, not just the residents of my State. With NEH funding, the Rhode Island Historical Society is reassembling the Papers of Nathanael Greene from over 100 libraries and collections scattered around the country, and is currently preparing the 10th of a total of 13 planned volumes. Nathanael Greene, you will recall was a Rhode Islander sent by George Wash-

ington to liberate the South—a task he accomplished with distinction. If work on the Papers stops now, it will be the history of Georgia and the Carolinas that would not be published. Interestingly, while Greene was alive, Congress promised to publish his daily letters and orders. How poignant that we fulfill this promise now.

As I enter my last days as a U.S. Senator—36 years among wonderful colleagues—I urge Congress to support the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute of Museum Services at a level where they can fulfill their potential and continue to bring American culture to all Americans. I hope to hear that the issues that are preventing the reauthorization of the programs of these agencies will be resolved amicably in the 105th Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE.

Washington, DC, June 18, 1996.

Senator SLADE GORTON,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR SLADE: As the appropriations process for fiscal year 1997 begins in the Senate, we wanted to take a moment to share with you our strong commitment to supporting continued funding for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and the Institute for Museum Services (IMS). As you know, this issue of continued federal funding for the arts and humanities is one of great importance to us—one which was successfully resolved last year, in large part due to your leadership in working out the differences between the House and the Senate.

As you recall, last July, the Labor and Human Resource Committee passed a bill to reauthorize the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities and the Institute for Museum and Library Services—by a vote of 12-4. This strong show of bi-partisan support, we believe, demonstrates a continued sentiment on the part of the Senate to fund these agencies. Therefore, we strongly support your efforts to include appropriations for the NEA, NEH and IMS for the upcoming fiscal year and hope that we might see an increase over last fiscal year's appropriations for these agencies—enabling each one to continue the important job of making the arts and humanities more accessible to people all across our nation.

We recognize that you will face many difficult decisions in the weeks ahead, and ask only that you continue to keep in mind the positive and valuable effect that arts and humanities projects have in all of our respective States. The Senate's commitment to federal support will ensure that arts and humanities programs, activities and exhibitions will continue to be available in local communities—engaging and educating individuals of all ages—in addition to making an enormous contribution to expanding and enriching our nation's cultural heritage and artistic traditions.

We are grateful for your support of the reauthorization of the National Endowments as well as your leadership in managing the Interior Appropriations bill last year, and

look forward to working with you again this year.

Sincerely,

Jim Jeffords, John Chafee, Al Simpson, Bill Frist, Jay Rockefeller, Barbara A. Mikulski, Frank R. Lautenberg, Paul D. Wellstone, Carol Moseley-Braun, Claiborne Pell, John Glenn, —, Barbara Boxer, J. Lieberman, John Breaux, Bill Bradley, —, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Carl Levin, Bob Kerry, Wendell H. Ford, —, Charles S. Robb, Olympia J. Snowe, —, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher J. Dodd, Ron Wyden, Daniel K. Akaka, —, Thomas A. Daschle

#### HOW THE UNITED NATIONS BENEFITS AMERICANS: THE U.N. ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, last week, the 51st session of the U.N. General Assembly convened in New York City. To recognize the occasion, I spoke on the floor of the Senate to highlight some of the many benefits that the United Nations brings to the American public. The United Nation has furthered American national interests by working to promote peace and democracy, to protect human rights, to strengthen international stability, and to foster cooperation between states on a wide range of important issues. Today I wish to focus on one of these important issues—an area where the United Nations has made significant advances by enabling countries to work together and to find common solutions to common problems. Today I wish to discuss the unique role of the U.N. Environment Programme.

The 1972 U.N. Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm was the catalyst for the creation of the U.N. Environment Programme [or UNEP]. As a participant in those meetings, I eagerly supported the effort to integrate human development and the protection of the environment as two equally important goals to the international community. The establishment of UNEP ensured that all countries would have access to technical information and skills in order to develop and improve national environmental policy. UNEP has also served as a valuable forum for reaching international and regional consensus on laws and operational standards that reinforce cooperative efforts to achieve long-term sustainable development.

Because of its unique role within the United Nations as the only agency with the mandate to make environmental concerns the top priority, UNEP has facilitated U.S. policy initiative in the environmental field. As Secretary of State Warren Christopher noted in an address at Stanford University last April:

The environment has a profound impact on our national interests in two ways: First, environmental forces transcend borders and oceans to threaten directly the health, prosperity and jobs of American citizens. Second, addressing natural resource issues is frequently critical to achieving political and economic stability, and to pursuing our strategic goals around the world.

I wholeheartedly agree with Secretary Christopher that the United States must view environmental problems from a global perspective. The actions of one state inevitably affect the well-being of the citizens of its neighbors. The United States cannot afford to ignore the overpopulation, or the pollution, or the deforestation occurring in other countries because the consequences could be devastating right here at home.

That is why the United States has participated in and supported U.N. agencies like UNEP. It is in our own best interests to work together with other states to protect the international environment. Under the leadership of UNEP over the last 20 years, the international community has agreed upon several international conventions which directly further U.S. environmental objectives. These conventions include the 1973 Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species [or CITES] which prohibits or regulates trade in some 35,000 endangered species; the 1985 Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the 1987 Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, which have led to a 77 percent drop in global CFC emissions since 1988—saving millions of lives through the prevention of skin cancer—and the 1992 UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, which commits industrialized countries to reducing their emissions of greenhouse gases by the year 2000. These are but a few examples of international cooperation led by UNEP which have benefited U.S. citizens.

Despite these tangible benefits, however, I am concerned that the survival of UNEP is in jeopardy today. At a time when our Government's financial constraints are increasing, the United States should be looking for ways to increase cooperation with other states in order to avoid bearing the cost of acting alone. While I support the calls for making U.N. agencies more efficient and effective, it is important that the United States continue to play a leading role in promoting international environmental cooperation by supporting UNEP. The Clinton administration should persist in its efforts to streamline the programs and personnel of UNEP while making some real financial commitments at the upcoming meeting of the governing council in January. Equally important, the decision on the leadership of UNEP should be given high priority for United States attention during the next month.

This is a critical moment for UNEP as the agency's financial crisis has reached a point where many of its important programs may no longer be viable. Given the recent decrease in financial and political support for UNEP from its member states, the international community must decide whether or not environmental concerns are still a priority on the international agenda. If the answer is yes, then all

member states must commit themselves to both reforming and financially supporting UNEP. We have seen 20 years of impressive progress in the environmental field that has often been achieved through the expertise and leadership of UNEP. With so much at stake, it would be a tragedy to allow this organization to founder today.

#### WORLD LEADERS SIGN TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I was fortunate to be in New York at the United Nations yesterday with President Clinton for the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

I can report to you that there is a tremendous sense of gratification of achievement in the United Nations with regard to this treaty. It was finally approved last week by an overwhelming majority of the Members in a 158-to-3 vote.

I will be serving this fall at the United Nations as a Member of the United States delegation. Fifty-one years ago, I had the honor of serving on the International Secretariat of the San Francisco Conference that drew up the United Nations' Charter. I was one of those flushed with youthful enthusiasm with regard to the potential future of the United Nations. In the years since, there have been excellent achievements and some disappointments. I must say that I rank the united effort that led to the comprehensive test ban as one of the paramount successes.

President Clinton has been able to bring to fruition an effort begun more than three decades ago by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy. The first test ban was negotiated under the direct and forceful leadership of President Kennedy, who drew upon the workable aspects of the Russian position in order to help bring about the Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963, which restricted nuclear testing to underground environments.

The next test ban treaty came in 1974 under President Nixon's leadership, when the Threshold Test Ban Treaty was negotiated. The companion Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty was signed in 1976 in the Ford administration.

President Carter attempted to achieve agreement on a comprehensive test ban, but lacked sufficient time to do so. President Clinton played a leading role in bringing the comprehensive test ban, which represents the culmination of those earlier efforts, to conclusion this summer.

Under this treaty, the parties will be obligated not to conduct any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion. This very strong prohibition is a direct result of President Clinton's forward-thinking decision on August 11, 1995, not to agree to any exceptions to this ban, but instead to negotiate a true zero yield comprehensive test ban treaty.

Bringing this to fruition was a very high priority of Secretary of State Warren Christopher and ACDA Director John Holum. It involved years of painstaking work at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva by Ambassador Stephen Ledogar and his delegation and in Washington by the backstopping team led by Dr. Pierce Corden of the Arm Control and Disarmament Agency.

There is no question in my mind that this treaty from this date forward will constrain the qualitative development of nuclear weapons. International controls and the inspection regime will become active upon entry into force. It will serve to ban the development of advanced new types of nuclear weapons and it will serve to demonstrate to the world that the declared nuclear powers—United States, Great Britain, France, Russia, and China—are truly committed to control their nuclear arsenals and genuinely desire to contribute to the prevention of nuclear proliferation.

This treaty truly represents a significant step toward nuclear disarmament.

Mr. President, we would be deluding ourselves if we thought that gaining Senate advice and consent to a comprehensive test ban treaty is going to be easy. It will not be. Once the treaty is submitted by the President, the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which I have been chairman or ranking member since 1981, will hold thorough and wide-ranging hearings. It is a process that I would enjoy very much, but will instead be viewing from a distance as a retired Senator.

The degree of contentiousness that is possible can be seen in the simple fact that the treaty was achieved by a Democratic President with the support of his party and is rejected in the Republican Party platform adopted this summer.

I hope that the hearings to be held by the Committee on Foreign Relations will serve to bring the sides together and will serve to assuage the fears and concerns of those who fear the possible consequences to our national security of a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing.

I believe that, since nuclear weapons design clearly is a mature science, we do not need further testing to assure that our scientists have done their work well and that we can move into a future without nuclear testing secure in the knowledge that we have a fine and reliable nuclear arsenal deterrent that will serve us well so long as we rely upon nuclear weapons to protect us.

Experts will testify that there are no safety and reliability issues that would necessitate further testing. Experts will also assure us that the restraints that this treaty will place on other nations are very much in our national security interests. Moreover, I would expect there will be expert testimony from the intelligence community that will provide the necessary reassurance to the Senate.