

and whereabouts of U.S. weapons grade material have been made public, potentially greatly increasing the risk of terrorist operations aimed at stealing or exposing Americans to attack with such materials. Incredibly, Clinton administration budgets have significantly reduced the funding available for securing and protecting such sites.

In fact, the 1997 Energy Department annual report on the Status of Safeguards and Security concluded that there is a \$157 million shortfall in these accounts. Ironically, that almost exactly equals the amount contributed by the Department of Energy to the so-called cooperative treaty reduction, or Nunn-Lugar, program that is being spent ostensibly to improve the safety and security of former Soviet nuclear weapons and materials.

THE CUBAN NUCLEAR DANGER

Last but not least in this illustrative listing of the challenges facing the next Secretary of Energy is another nuclear issue confronting this Nation—the prospect that one or both of the two defective nuclear reactors being built by Fidel Castro in Juragua, Cuba, will be brought online and then fail catastrophically. Should that happen, millions of Americans living downwind could be exposed to lethal levels of radioactive fallout.

On September 11, 1995, Secretary O'Leary confirmed this danger in a letter to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator HELMS. She wrote:

If construction [of these reactors] were resumed and the reactors completed, their poor construction and lack of regulatory oversight, and uncertainties about the qualification and experience of its operators would pose serious safety risks. Written answers accompanying the O'Leary letter in response to questions posed by Senator HELMS about the Cuban nuclear program cited the following concerns: "the quality of civil construction, the condition of critical reactor components, the regulatory structure and nuclear operating base, the plant staff training programs and industrial infrastructure in Cuba required to support operation and maintenance of nuclear power plants."

The O'Leary Energy Department even went so far as to state:

If a poorly designed, defectively constructed nuclear reactor began operation in Cuba, there would be an unacceptably high possibility that a large accidental release of radioactive material would occur. Dependent on the meteorological conditions at the time of a major accident, people on the U.S. mainland could be exposed to significant airborne (radioactive) contamination.

In response to questions I posed to Secretary Peña during his confirmation hearing before this committee, I have been advised that he subscribes to the positions taken in the September 1995 O'Leary letter to Senator HELMS. The trouble is that Mrs. O'Leary took no perceptible steps to address the menace posed by Castro's nuclear project.

This may have been due to the Department's view, as evidenced in some of the answers to Senator HELMS' questions, that the Soviet VVER-440 (Model

318) design might prove to be safe, after all—notwithstanding the fact that one has never been constructed or operated before. Alternatively, Mrs. O'Leary may have been satisfied, as suggested by other answers, that the levels of radiation from a Cuban meltdown would only contaminate the U.S. food supply—not directly harm the American people. Yet another explanation could be the O'Leary team's evident willingness to accept Russian claims that the Juragua reactors are designed to withstand seismic shocks up to 7 on the Richter scale. The response to Senator HELMS that Mr. Peña has endorsed did not take note of the fact that there was a 7.0 magnitude quake in the nearby Caribbean Plate in 1995.

Mr. President, I am concerned that Fidel Castro's nuclear ambitions could pose a significant threat to the United States. Others who have warned of this danger include: the General Accounting Office, the House International Relations Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, NBC News and several Cuban defectors who had first-hand experience with the dismal quality control and safety aspects of the Juragua project. It is astounding—and unacceptable—that preventing such a danger from materializing is not a top priority for the leadership of the Department of Energy and the executive branch more generally.

CONCLUSION

I would conclude by recommending to Secretary Peña that he carefully study, and try to emulate, the leadership of the first Secretary of Energy, James Schlesinger. Dr. Schlesinger brought to his position extraordinary experience and first-hand knowledge of the national security dimensions of the job. As a former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Director of Central Intelligence and Secretary of Defense and by dint of his work in the private sector at the RAND and Mitre Corp., he was exceptionally well equipped to address the nuclear weapons-related issues of the day.

It was largely to Dr. Schlesinger's credit that the antinuclear agenda of an earlier Democratic administration did not result in an ill-advised Comprehensive Test Ban. Secretary Schlesinger saw to it that the best professional advice—not the politically correct or coerced assertions—of those charged with certifying the Nation's nuclear arsenal were presented faithfully to the President and the Congress. It was clear that the considered judgment of the directors of the nuclear weapons laboratories and other responsible experts was that a small number of low-yield tests would be required each year to avoid reaching the point where confident weapon certification was no longer possible.

As a result, the case was convincingly made that such tests were the essential last step in the scientific process—the experimental validation of the hypothesis that our weapons would work as designed. It was documented

that many of the problems that appeared sooner or later in one-third of all designs deployed would never have been discovered if testing has not continued after the weapons were deployed. And it was established that without periodic testing, it would be impossible over time to retain the skilled design physicists and engineers responsible for daily judgments about the Nation's nuclear weapons. In the face of these compelling arguments, President Carter ultimately abandoned the idea of a zero-yield Comprehensive Test Ban.

We are now confronted with another President committed to a zero-yield CTB. Indeed, the Senate will shortly be asked to consider such a treaty negotiated by the Clinton administration. I believe it is imperative, as the debate on the CTBT gets underway, that the next Secretary of Energy provide his subordinates in the Department and its laboratories with the same opportunity for honest, unpoliticized analysis and testimony as was afforded by Dr. Schlesinger nearly 20 years ago.

I am hopeful that Secretary Peña will take these comments as they are meant—as an illustrative list of issues which must have his attention. I also hope he will understand the importance of these national security matters to Members of Congress and that Federico Peña will ensure that an environment is recreated in the Department of Energy in which national security responsibilities and rigorous scientific practice are given primacy over dubious arms control agendas and wishful thinking.

If the vote today were on the Clinton energy policy, it would be a resounding "no." Mr. Peña is not an architect of the policy—yet. It is my hope that when Mr. Peña next appears before us he will demonstrate a willingness to lead and not be an apologist for a continued failed policy.

PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise to address recent revelations concerning partial birth abortion. I also rise to draw my colleagues' attention to the letter sent to President Clinton by a group of American Roman Catholic leaders and read this past Sunday by Cardinal Adam Maida at the Blessed Sacrament Cathedral in Detroit. That letter urged the President to ensure respect for all human rights—including those of the unborn—and called our attention to the misinformation distributed by some of those defending partial birth abortion.

Mr. President, the abortion issue has been a difficult and divisive one for this country. But the unfortunate procedure of partial birth abortion need not be. The vast majority of Americans, even those who do not share my

own strongly pro-life convictions, oppose partial birth abortion. This overwhelming opposition helped produce legislation during the last Congress that would have banned that morally troubling procedure. Unfortunately, that legislation was vetoed by President Clinton. Now it turns out that that veto was based in part on inaccurate information.

Mr. President, those who sought to defend partial birth abortion did so on the grounds that it was rare, undertaken only in cases of severe fetal deformity and strictly a late-term procedure. These arguments served to make the procedure seem less morally troubling to some in the pro-choice camp. But it turns out that these supposedly mitigating factors do not exist. Ron Fitzsimmons, executive director of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers, is quoted in the February 26 New York Times as saying that he "lied through [his] teeth" in making each of these claims.

It turns out, Mr. President, that literally thousands of partial birth abortions are performed in this country every year. It also turns out that the vast majority of these regrettable procedures are undertaken voluntarily—aborting perfectly healthy unborn children. And it turns out that partial birth abortions are being carried out on mothers in their second trimester of pregnancy.

I know that abortion is an issue that raises troubling issues for many people. I know that I cannot help but take a strong pro-life position, because of my faith and because of my own personal experiences. My experience, having witnessed the births of my three children and having just had a nephew born 12 weeks premature, tells me that the loss of an unborn life is a great tragedy. My nephew was born during a time in his mother's pregnancy when many unborn children are still subject to partial birth abortion.

I know that not everyone shares the pro-life position. But in my view it is clear that any reservations about restricting abortion need not and should not apply to partial birth abortion. The fact that the defenders of this procedure felt it necessary to mislead the public, Members of this body and the President, shows how little support their position really commands. Regardless of where one stands in the broader abortion debate, then, all of us should be able to see partial birth abortion for what it is: an unjustifiable and wholly unnecessary tragedy.

Mr. President, it is my sincere hope that we will return as quickly as possible to the issue of partial birth abortion. It is also my hope that my colleagues will keep in mind this incident as they consider the factors supposedly mitigating this unfortunate procedure, and vote to end it once and for all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Detroit News appear in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Detroit News, Mar. 10, 1997]

IN DETROIT: MAIDA, OTHER CARDINALS URGE
BAN ON PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTIONS

(By Oralandar Brand-Williams)

Cardinal Adam Maida urged President Clinton to reconsider a ban on partial-birth abortions during a public reading Sunday of a letter sent to the president by a group of U.S. Roman Catholic leaders.

"The public learned that partial-birth abortions are performed not a few hundred times a year, but thousands of times each year," Maida said during mass at Blessed Sacrament Cathedral in Detroit.

Last April, Clinton vetoed a bill that would have banned the controversial procedure in which a fetus is partially extracted, feet-first, from the birth canal. The brain is then suctioned out.

Critics call the procedure infanticide.

Congress failed to override Clinton's veto.

The letter to Clinton was also read Sunday by the six other American cardinals who also lead archdioceses in the United States and the head of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. All signed the letter with Maida, which Clinton received Friday.

"Mr. President, you are in a unique position to ensure respect for all human rights, including the right to me which is denied to infants who are brutally killed in partial-birth abortion," urged the letter.

The letter asks Clinton to acknowledge that he was misled about partial-birth abortion, and urges him to ask Congress to pass a bill banning them. The letter also seeks a pledge that Clinton will sign it into law.

Two weeks ago, Ron Fitzsimmons, executive director of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers, said he intentionally misled the public in previous remarks about the procedure. Fitzsimmons said he feared that if the truth were known about the frequency of partial-birth abortions, it would damage the cause of abortion rights.

Blessed Sacrament parishioner Canary Erving of Highland Park said she supports Maida's efforts to get a ban on partial-birth abortions.

"It's important that we keep our children," Erving said. "If you have to have it and give it away, it's better than destroying the life."

DR. ERNEST S. GRIFFITH

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the father of the Congressional Research Service, Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, who recently passed away at the age of 100.

Dr. Griffith came to the Legislative Reference Service—now the Congressional Research Service—in 1940, at a time when the U.S. political landscape was dominated largely by the executive branch. Legislation was enacted based on information provided by the President, with little opportunity for independent research and analysis by the Congress. Indeed, with an average of only two or three personal assistants per Member and a mere handful of committee staff, Members of Congress had nowhere to turn for accurate, reliable research and analysis. Nowhere, that is, until Ernest Griffith assumed the reins of the Legislative Reference Service.

Fueled by his belief that "the Congress of the United States is the

world's best hope of representative government," Dr. Griffith dedicated himself to transforming the fledgling LRS into a vital source of objective, non-partisan information and analysis for Members of Congress and their staffs. He recruited experts in disciplines ranging from tax policy to transportation, and greatly expanded the services offered by the LRS. He also appointed senior specialists who, under the terms of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, could be called upon by congressional committees at a moment's notice to work on important legislative initiatives. These senior specialists laid the foundation for our modern legislative information infrastructure, and, in so doing, with others enabled the legislative branch to reassert itself as the Nation's first branch of Government.

When asked to describe his greatest achievement as the Director of the LRS, Dr. Griffith once responded: "I think I am proudest of the fact that we have operated independently of the executive branch in a technical age." Mr. President, I too am proud of Dr. Griffith's achievement in this area. It is something of which we should all be proud.

Dr. Griffith left the LRS in 1958 to become the founding dean of the American University School of International Service. A Rhodes scholar, he received his undergraduate education at Hamilton College and his Ph.D. from Oxford University. He taught economics at Princeton and government at Harvard, and was the undergraduate dean at Syracuse University before moving to Washington in 1935.

Among his many academic distinctions, Dr. Griffith was a Fulbright visiting professor at Oxford. He also lectured at New York, Birmingham, and Manchester Universities, Swarthmore College, the University of Oslo, and the University College of Swansea. He was visiting professor at the International Christian University and Rykko University in Japan, and lectured on American Government in Turkey and Brazil. He was professor of American Government at Alice Lloyd College in Kentucky in his middle eighties.

In his spare time, Dr. Griffith taught Sunday school and served as a delegate to the Third World Council of Churches. He founded the Pioneers, a forerunner of the Cub Scouts, and chaired the Council of Social Agencies, a predecessor of the United Way. He chaired the policy board of an inter-university training center for Peace Corps volunteers, was vice president of the American Political Science Association and president of the National Academy of Economics and Political Science. He climbed mountains into his nineties.

Mr. President, it is with great sadness that we bid farewell to Ernest Griffith, who was memorialized last Saturday at the Metropolitan Memorial United Methodist Church here in Washington. He was a pioneering public servant, a brilliant student of