

shock wave that propels most of the star outward, propels it at very high speed."

Most days, he said, he spends about four hours studying the nature of the exploding stars, which are known as supernovas. Occasionally, he works up to six hours.

Theoretic physics is a quintessential young man's field, where geniuses often peak at the age of 30, like athletes. Very few make significant contributions at 50. But at 90, Dr. Bethe, a living legend among his peers, is still going strong. "Here's my latest paper," he said with a grin, displaying it proudly on his cluttered desk. "It has been accepted by *The Astrophysical Journal*." The main point, he said, "is that it's easy to get the supernova to expel the outside material," eliminating the problems theorists once encountered.

Dr. Bethe is not interrupting his research to write memoirs. Instead, a biographer is at work. "It's much easier to have a biographer," he remarked, "and he writes much better than I do."

The back of his office door, in an easy-to-view position, held a poster of the Matterhorn. For nearly a half century, a small town at the foot of the great Swiss mountain has been a vacation spot for Dr. Bethe and his wife, Rose Ewald, whom he met in Germany and married in 1939 while the two were newcomers to the United States.

"I couldn't live without her," he said.

His hair askew, his eyes agleam, Dr. Bethe looked a bit like an aged wizard on the verge of disappearing in a puff of smoke. He seemed at ease with his many lives over many decades and appeared to have reconciled his early work on the bomb with his current push to eliminate it. For him, doing the right thing in different periods of history seemed to call for different kinds of actions.

"I am a very happy person," he said with a relaxed smile. "I wouldn't want to change what I did during my life."

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS,
Washington, DC, April 25, 1997.

President WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
The White House, Washington, DC.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As the Director of the Theoretical Division at Los Alamos, I participated at the most senior level in the World War II Manhattan Project that produced the first atomic weapons. Now, at age 90, I am one of the few remaining senior project participants. And I have followed closely, and participated in, the major issues of the nuclear arms race and disarmament during the last half century. I ask to be permitted to express a related opinion.

It seems that the time has come for our Nation to declare that it is not working, in any way, to develop further weapons of mass destruction of any kind. In particular, this means not financing work looking toward the possibility of new designs for nuclear weapons. And it certainly means not working on new types of nuclear weapons, such as pure-fusion weapons.

The United States already possesses a very wide range of different designs of nuclear weapons and needs no more. Further, it is our own splendid weapons laboratories that are, by far and without any question, the most likely to succeed in such nuclear inventions. Since any new types of weapons would, in time, spread to others and present a threat to us, it is logical for us not to pioneer further in this field.

In some cases, such as pure-fusion weapons, success is unlikely. But even reports of our seeking to invent them could be, from a political point of view, very damaging to our national image and to our effort to maintain a world-wide campaign for nuclear disarmament. Do you, for example, want scientists in laboratories under your Administration trying to invent nuclear weapons so efficient, compared to conventional weapons, that someday, if an unlikely success were

achieved, they would be a new option for terrorists?

This matter is sure to be raised in conjunction with the Senate's review of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, because that Treaty raises the question of what experiments are, and what experiments are not, permitted. In my judgment, the time has come to cease all physical experiments, no matter how small their yield, whose primary purpose is to design new types of nuclear weapons, as opposed to developing peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Indeed, if I were President, I would not fund computational experiments, or even creative thought designed to produce new categories of nuclear weapons. After all, the big secret about the atomic bomb was that it *could* be done. Why should taxpayers pay to learn new such secrets—secrets that will eventually leak—even and especially if we do not plan, ourselves, to implement the secrets?

In effect, the President of the United States, the laboratory directors, and the atomic scientists in the laboratories should all adopt the stance of the "Atomic Scientists' Appeal to Colleagues," which was promulgated two years ago, to "cease and desist from work creating, developing, improving and manufacturing further nuclear weapons—and, for that matter, other weapons of potential mass destruction such as chemical and biological weapons."

I fully support the Science-based Stockpile Stewardship program, which ensures that the existing nuclear weapons remain fully operative. This is a challenging program to fulfill in the absence of nuclear tests. But neither it nor any of the other Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Safeguards require the laboratories to engage in creative work or physical or computational experiments on the design of new types of nuclear weapons, and they should not do so.

In particular, the basic capability to resume nuclear test activities can and will be maintained, under the Stockpile Stewardship program, without attempting to design new types of nuclear weapons. And even if the Department of Energy is charged to "maintain capability to design, fabricate and certify new warheads"—which I do not believe is necessary—this also would not require or justify research into new types of nuclear weapons.

The underlying purpose of a complete cessation of nuclear testing mandated by the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is to prevent new nuclear weapons from emerging and this certainly suggests doing everything we can to prevent new categories of nuclear weapons from being discovered. It is in our national and global interest to stand true to this underlying purpose.

Accordingly, I hope you will review this matter personally to satisfy yourself that no nuclear weapons design work is being done, under the cover of your Safeguards or other policies, that you would not certify as absolutely required. Perhaps, in conjunction with the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty hearings in the Senate, you might consider making a suitable pronouncement along these lines, to discipline the bureaucracy, and to reassure the world that America is vigilant in its desire to ensure that new kinds of nuclear weapons are not created.

Sincerely,

HANS A. BETHE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, DC, June 2, 1997.

Prof. HANS BETHE,
Federation of American Scientists, Washington, DC.

DEAR PROFESSOR BETHE: Thank you for sharing your thoughts on nuclear weapons with me, and for the tremendous service you have rendered this nation and the world for well over half a century. Your efforts to de-

velop the atomic bomb during a grave period of national emergency, and your subsequent courageous and principled efforts in support of international agreements to control the awesome destructive power of these weapons, have made our country more secure and the entire world a safer place.

I am fully committed to securing the ratification, entry into force and effective implementation of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). By banning all nuclear explosions, the CTBT will constrain the development and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and end the development of advanced new types of nuclear weapons. In this way, the Treaty will contribute to the process of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear proliferation, and it will strengthen international peace and security.

I appreciate your support for the Science-based Stockpile Stewardship Program. The objective of this program is to ensure that our existing nuclear weapons remain safe and reliable in the absence of nuclear testing. As you are aware, my support for the CTBT is conditioned upon such a program, including the conduct of a broad range of effective and continuing experimental programs. I have also directed that the United States maintain the basic capability to resume nuclear test activities prohibited by the CTBT in the unlikely event that the United States should need to withdraw from this treaty. These precautions notwithstanding, I remain confident that the CTBT points us toward a new century in which the roles and risks of nuclear weapons can be further reduced, and ultimately eliminated.

Thank you again for sharing your views with me as we work to lift the nuclear backdrop that has darkened the world's stage for far too long.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.●

MEASURE RETURNED TO THE CALENDAR—S. 903

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 903 be placed back on the calendar.

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

AUTHORIZING SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL REPRESENTATION

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 101, submitted earlier today by Senators LOTT and DASCHLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 101) to authorize representation of Members, officers, and an employee of the Senate in the case of *Douglas R. Page v. Richard Shelby, et al.*

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

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, a resident of California has, for the second time in the past several years, filed a lawsuit in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia challenging the constitutionality of

rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate. Under rule XXII, debate on a pending matter may be limited by a vote of three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn or, in the case of an amendment to a Senate rule, a vote of two-thirds of the Senators voting, a quorum being present.

The plaintiffs has named as defendants in this action all Members of the Senate, together with the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms, the Parliamentarian, and two executive branch officials. He seeks a declaration that rule XXII is unconstitutional and a court order rewriting rule XXII to permit a simple majority of a quorum to limit debate in the Senate.

With respect to a prior action filed by the same plaintiff also challenging rule XXII, Senate Resolution 150 of the 103d Congress authorized the Senate Legal Counsel to defend Senators named as defendants in that action. With respect to the plaintiff's prior challenge, the district court dismissed the suit for lack of standing. On appeal to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, the appellate court vacated the district court's decision and ordered the plaintiff's complaint dismissed as moot. In his complaint, the plaintiff had sought to present his alleged injury as frustration of the majority party's legislative program by the minority. The appellate court noted that the intervening change in the control of the Senate after the 1994 election had mooted his allegations of injury.

The plaintiff's new action alleges an injury independent of party control, as well as adding non-Member defendants. The new action is subject to the same grounds for dismissal as was the previous action.

Over the years, the Senate has vigorously debated the merits of rule XXII. That debate has included the question that the plaintiff seeks to present to the court in the instant action of whether a majority of the Senate should be permitted to end debate. The resolution of this issue under our constitutional system, Mr. President, is best decided in the Senate and not in the courts.

The resolution at the desk would authorize the Senate Legal Counsel to represent the Members, officers, and an employee of the Senate who have been named as defendants in this case and to move to dismiss the complaint.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 101) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 101

Whereas, in the case of *Douglas R. Page v. Richard Shelby, et al.*, C.A. No. 97-0068, pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the plaintiff has named all Members of the Senate, and the Secretary, the Sergeant at Arms, and the Parliamentarian, of the Senate, as defendants;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(1), the Senate may direct its counsel to defend Members, officers, and employees of the Senate in civil actions relating to their official responsibilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is directed to represent the Members, officers, and employee of the Senate who are defendants in the case of *Douglas R. Page v. Richard Shelby, et al.*

COMMENDING THE STATE OF COLORADO FOR ITS EFFORTS REGARDING THE DENVER SUMMIT OF EIGHT

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of Senate Resolution 81, and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The resolution will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 81) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the political and economic importance of the Denver Summit of Eight and commending the State of Colorado for its outstanding efforts in ensuring success of this historic event.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HELMS. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 81) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 81

Whereas this is the first Economic Summit to be held in the United States since the 1990 Economic Summit was held in Houston, Texas;

Whereas on May 29, 1996, the State of Colorado was announced as the host of the Group of Seven Economic Summit, to be held on June 20 through 22, 1997;

Whereas the Economic Summit is an annual meeting that brings together the leaders of the world's 7 most economically successful democracies: Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, and the United States;

Whereas this is the first Economic Summit to include the transitioning economy of Russia, which has resulted in a new reference to the Economic Summit as the Denver Summit of Eight;

Whereas the central location of Denver among the summit members, with Europe to

the east, Japan to the west, and central Canada to the north, enables the residents of Colorado to serve as a central pillar supporting the international bridge of friendship and prosperity;

Whereas the selection of the State of Colorado and the Denver metropolitan region as the host of the Summit of Eight reflects the region's growing economic importance in the international community;

Whereas Colorado has distinguished itself as an ideal site for the Summit of Eight because of its leading industries of telecommunications, aerospace, biotechnology, high technology, health care, education, agriculture, recreation, and tourism;

Whereas Colorado's dedicated law enforcement officers, firefighters, emergency medical technicians, and other public servants are able and committed to provide vital support to the Summit of Eight; and

Whereas the Summit of Eight promises to be 1 of the more significant summits of recent years, with results that will benefit the larger world community, including progress toward relieving international debt, supporting the economic development of Russia and the Ukraine, paving the way to increased efficiencies in international commercial transactions by reducing the regulatory barriers to electronic banking, and minimizing destabilizing factors in the world's financial markets: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses its appreciation to the citizens of Colorado and the Denver metropolitan region for hosting the Summit of Eight; and

(2) accords recognition of the hospitality to be provided by the people of Colorado and the Denver metropolitan region.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 1997

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 10 a.m., Wednesday, June 18. I further ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, immediately following the Chaplain's prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted, and that the Senate then be in a period of morning business until 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes, with the following exceptions: Senator SESSIONS, 60 minutes; Senator DORGAN, 10 minutes; Senator KERRY of Massachusetts, 15 minutes.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Armed Services Committee has filed the DOD authorization bill. It is the leader's intention to ask consent to turn to that bill at 12 noon on Wednesday. It is the leader's hope that Senators will grant the consent so the Senate can begin debate on this very important piece of legislation. Also, the Senate may be asked to consider the intelligence authorization bill. Therefore, votes can be expected to occur throughout the session of the Senate on Wednesday.