yet been felt in the Intelligence Committee in this case. Chairman Specter and I have tasked a single group of professional staff to support all committee members and all information which comes into the committee's hands will be shared equally with all members. This is the way we have always operated.

As for myself, I don't see the vice chairman's role to be an advocate of the administration. As we pursue questions, I will not be a Democratic Senator defending fellow Democrats, but rather a U.S. Senator following the facts wherever they lead and reaching a conclusion based on those facts. I am confident Chairman Specter feels the same way about his role.

I spoke of the Intelligence Committee's readiness to do a thorough job. Our thoroughness will be improved if we get all the relevant information from the administration. As many colleagues are aware, the committee has been denied the opportunity to read the intelligence oversight board's report on this case. The implication is clear that if we subpoena the report, the President will assert executive privilege.

The intelligence oversight board is wholly within the Executive Office of the President, so there may be legitimate executive privilege here. But if the report is off limits to Congress, then the administration should not cite the report as having determined that no covert action occurred. The administration can't have it both ways. They should either give Congress the report, or stop citing it as vindication.

An Associated Press story yesterday quoted a White House spokeswoman, Mary Ellen Glynn, saying, "the point is not to withhold information. The point is to protect sources." Mr. President, this rationale for denying information to Congress has no basis. The Intelligence Committee has received and stored the most highly classified material for years, and its record for protecting sources and methods is far better than that of the executive branch. So security is simply no excuse, and an invalid reason to deny information to Congress. My advice to the administration is, fully inform Congress.

The committee lacks all the facts, but on the basis of what we have, I do not see evidence of a covert action. But I stress that is a preliminary assessment and not a conclusion. I am open to the evidence. Certainly, if there was a covert action, Congress should have been informed, and the Intelligence Committee received no such information. If press reports are correct, in later 1994 CIA Director Woolsey sensed from information he was getting from CIA channels that a United States covert action, an action he and presumably other CIA personnel were not privy to, was in progress in Croatia. Director Woolsey reportedly came to the White House with his concerns. The Intelligence Committee needs to know what evidence was the basis of Director Woolsey's concerns. We also need to know why he did not share his concerns with the oversight committees.

Mr. President, my interest in getting to the bottom of this case is not based solely on the majority leader's request. In my view, if the press reports are correct, the United States chose a course of action in Croatia and Bosnia with very serious down-side risks. The Bosnian situation was and is exceptionally complex and presented few good options to policymakers. But our alignment with Iran, even if it was a passive and accidental alignment, was very dangerous. Every President since Jimmy Carter has declared a state of emergency with respect to Iran, and United States laws and Executive orders have embargoed imports from Iran, limited United States exports to Iran. banned United States trade and investment in Iran including the trading of Iranian oil overseas by United States companies or their foreign affiliates, and placed sanctions on persons or countries who supply Iran with any goods or technologies that could contribute to Iran getting destabilizing conventional weapons or any weapons of mass destruction technology. These laws and Executive orders are there for a reason: to contain and isolate a country which conducts and supports terrorism and attempts to proliferate nuclear and chemical weapons. A policy which depends on such an amoral country to arm the otherwise defenseless Bosnian Moslems is dangerous—not merely politically dangerous, but potentially threatening to our allies and eventually to our own forces, when they deployed a year later. To turn a blind eye to Iranian shipments is to turn a blind eye to the possibility of United States casualties at the hands of the very people we have allowed to be armed, especially with a United States deployment imminent.

Critics of this policy have to admit an inconvenient fact: risky as it was, the policy worked. Our allies did not pull their forces summarily out of the former Yugoslavia, which they might have done if we had unilaterally lifted the arms embargo. The Bosnian Moslems were not overwhelmed; in fact, they defended themselves creditably and even went on the offensive. The policy brought about a balance which made possible the Dayton Accords and the peace which IFOR is enforcing today.

But even though the administration's risky Bosnia policy has worked, at least so far, the Intelligence Committee is obligated to investigate whatever may have been the United States role in the Iranian arms shipment. I take that obligation very seriously, and I look forward to joining with my chairman in rendering a full report.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleagues

from Alaska and Georgia for yielding me a moment. I compliment my distinguished colleague from Nebraska for his eloquent statement. I think it is very important, as Senator KERREY has outlined, the bipartisan, nonpartisan nature of the Intelligence Committee being emphasized.

As Senator Kerrey, I approach this investigation with a total open mind and no predisposition and determination to see the inquiry is totally nonpolitical, bipartisan, nonpartisan, as we take a look at the shipment of Iranian arms to the Bosnian Moslems.

I thank my colleagues and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Alaska is recognized.

## IN THE SPIRIT OF EARTH DAY

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair and my colleague.

Mr. President, on the eve of Earth Day, I want to alert Members of legislation that I will be introducing to help raise funds from the private sector to support our national parks, particularly with regard to repair. In this regard, I think it is appropriate that we thank the thousands of people and organizations who are answering the call to help repair and preserve an important part of this Nation's past and future: the historic C&O Canal.

That canal extends 184 miles between Cumberland, MD, and Georgetown in the District of Columbia. The C&O Canal National Historic Park is a major recreation attraction and a part of our national heritage. As we know, the flooding of the Potomac River in the blizzard of 1996 has taken a heavy toll. Repairs require funds at a time when our Federal budget is already stretched to the hilt.

That is where the sweat and ingenuity of the private sector is going to come in. Let me tell you about it, because it is going to come in a big way.

In the spirit of Earth Day, which asks every one of us to do what he or she can to help make the Earth a better place, people and organizations are rising to the challenge and giving their money, time, and effort.

The National Parks and Conservation Association, with the help of WRC-TV Channel 4 and others, has organized and publicized tomorrow's March for Parks along the canal route. The purpose is to raise funds for the canal. These organizations have done an outstanding job on the project and thousands of dollars are already pouring in. They are doing a wonderful service to the Nation.

In an effort to keep these private donations coming in, I am today announcing the introduction of legislation which will help raise as much as \$100 million in each year in support of our national parks, specifically for repairs.

First, the legislation will revitalize and expand the scope of the operation of the National Park Foundation so it can work with the private sector to raise additional funds for parks. It would encourage business relationships similar to those engaged by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and the National Forest Foundation.

Second, it will grant the sort of authority already enjoyed by the U.S. Olympic Committee to sanction appropriate private sponsorship of the parks.

Third, each year publishing, advertising, movie making, and similar pursuits make use of the intellectual property and assets of our national parks with virtually no return to the parks. Reform is needed to enable the Park Service, through the National Park Foundation, to capture some of the potential income through licensing and other marketing agreements.

Fourth, the legislation will contain safeguards to negate improper commercialization of our parks, but it will allow new revenue-generated opportunities outside the parks in partnership

with the private sector.

The National Park Foundation was created by Congress in 1967 as an official nonprofit partner of the National Park Service. It serves as a vehicle for donors who want to contribute with the assurance that gifts will be carefully managed and used wholly and exclusively for the purpose specified by the donor. It is governed by a board of civic and distinguished leaders committed to helping the parks, with the Secretary of the Interior serving as chairman, and the Director of the Park Service serving as secretary. None of this is going to change, Mr. President.

During the last 5 years, the foundation has made over \$10 million in grants to our national parks, but the changes contained in my legislation will empower it to contribute much more for the repair and preservation of the C&O Canal and other elements of our park system.

Obviously, none of this will or should detract from the Federal Government's or the Park Service's responsibility to our parks. The goal is to augment that involvement with additional private funds, much like those currently being raised by the March for Parks, and I commend the Secretary of the Interior for his effort in this regard.

Finally, we need the private sector, including those for-profit organizations who have used the National Park Service facilities and property and given little or nothing in return to help sustain our parks for the future.

The private sector can help by providing additional funds for resource management and infrastructure repair required in our parks across the Nation.

The C&O Canal National Historical Park and our other park units across the Nation connect us to our past and provide us with a vision of the future. They are some of the most beautiful and historic parcels of land to be found. In the spirit of Earth Day and American generosity and philanthropy, it is

time for us to make the effort to meet the challenge.

Thanks to the NPCA, WRC-TV and the thousands of marchers and volunteers who tomorrow will be helping to show us the way. In the spirit of Earth Day, I ask for each Senator's help in passing this legislation to help our parks, and I commend our leader, Senator Dole, for supporting this.

I thank the Chair and thank my friend from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Georgia is recognized.

## A TRAGIC ASSAULT: DRUG USE AMONG TEENAGERS

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, this morning we gathered in the Senate Chamber to remember a very solemn moment in American history: the needless loss of 168 citizens in Oklahoma City. It reminds me of another tragic assault that goes on against the youth of our country on a day-to-day basis.

In the last 36 months, drug use among our teenagers 8 to 15 years of age has doubled, and we are in the midst of a new epidemic. What does that mean? That means that nearly 2 million—2 million—American youth have been ensnared in the assault by the drug lords of this hemisphere and their lives are potentially ruined, devastated and stunted.

Not only will their lives be impaired and ruined, but a chain of events will follow because as these youngsters are consumed by drugs, they are driven into a life of crime, an effect on our Nation which is immeasurable.

Of the 35,000 prisoners in Georgia this morning, 80 percent of them are there today because of drug-related offenses. The impact of this war, this assault on the youth of our country is having a devastating impact across the land as it drives crime, assault and battery, murder, theft, robbery, burglary.

Mr. President, I spent a few minutes with President Zedillo of Mexico not long ago. He said the drug war was the single greatest threat to his country. I said, "I agree with you, Mr. President, with one amendment. The drug war is the single greatest threat to this hemisphere of democracies, to all of our nations in this hemisphere of democracies."

Mr. President, I yield up to 10 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Iowa, the chairman of a drug task force and eminent figure in this issue and assault on the youth of our country. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

## PRESIDENT CLINTON'S JUDICIAL NOMINEES SOFT ON CRIME

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today we do remember what happened 1 year ago in Oklahoma City, a very horrible crime. People are concerned

about crime in America. People expect the Congress of the United States to do something about crime. We have this week taken a giant step by passing the antiterrorism bill that the President says he will sign.

So I rise this morning to talk about crime as the Senator from Georgia indicated. The war on drugs has a lot to do with the whole subject of crime, but I also want to make some reference to the negative effect that this administration has had on the Federal courts.

I think it is fair to say that President Clinton's judicial appointments communicate the President's vision of the kind of America that the President would like to have. I do not share his soft-on-crime vision. I do not think most Americans do. Mr. President, you can say that you are putting all the cops on the streets all you want, but unless you appoint Federal judges who will enforce the law and protect victims over criminals, all the cops in the world will not make any difference.

In regard to the appointments that the President made, I read with amusement in this morning's Washington Post where Vice President Gore attempted to defend President Clinton's record on judicial nominations. I believe that the Vice President's efforts fall far short. For instance, one of his primary arguments is that this administration's nominees have enjoyed more support from the American Bar Association than the last three administrations. Mr. President, this just goes to show how out of touch the Vice President is with the American people and with even the President's own appointees.

President Clinton has a powerful ally in his judicial jihad to protect criminals, and that happens to be the American Bar Association, because somehow the ABA mysteriously and without input from the American people set itself up as the ultimate arbiter of who should or should not be a judge. The ABA happens to share the President's own frightening vision of criminals' rights over victims' rights.

We just passed a very fair and balanced antiterrorism bill in this body. That bill contained habeas corpus reform, badly needed, to permit prisoners just one bite at the apple and to limit that bite in order to stop frivolous and successive postconviction appeals that allowed people to stay on death row for 10 to 15 years. Vice President Gore uses the ABA as a mantle to say that the President's judges are ideal appointees. Yet the American Bar Association strongly opposes these necessary anticrime provisions that were in the antiterrorism bill.

Unfortunately, I believe that the current administration has then done a disservice to the American people by gathering liberal activists from every coffee house and every street corner in America and nominating them to some of the most important and influential Federal courts in America.

Few Americans would dispute and few in this body dispute the fact that