

Symphony Orchestra Hall and cochair of the Greater Detroit Inter-faith Roundtable of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. An English-American who also has Cornish, Irish, Dutch, and Scottish heritage, she is the widow of Richard VanDusen, former chairman of the Greater Detroit Chamber of Commerce. Holder of a 1949 bachelor's degree from Smith College, she has also been involved in numerous community organizations as a trustee of the Community Foundation for Southeastern Michigan and as a member of the governing boards of the Michigan Nature Conservancy and the World Wildlife Fund.

I know my Senate colleagues and the people of Michigan join me in congratulating these distinguished members of the metropolitan Detroit community. Their commitment to their communities and to public service is an example to us all. We thank them for their extraordinary efforts.●

#### TRIBUTE TO THE VOLUNTEERS OF HOSPICE CARE, INC.

● Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to acknowledge the volunteers of Hospice Care and their long-time commitment to care for people with life-threatening illnesses. Founded in 1981, Hospice Care, Inc., of Connecticut has been providing patients and their families with medical care and other support services that are crucial during difficult times. For over a decade these highly trained volunteers, along with the organization's professionals, have provided more than 2,000 patients and their loved ones with home care, inpatient care, and assistance whenever needed. Volunteers are also involved in administrative work, public awareness, fundraising, and act on the board of directors.

Many of the volunteers have been dedicated to the organization since its founding and will continue to give their time and energy to help their fellow residents of Connecticut. With their hard work and dedication they have provided important medical and moral support to those who are ill or suffer from the loss of a loved one. Through their selfless behavior the volunteers of Hospice Care Inc. have positively influenced the lives of many members of their communities.

I am proud to acknowledge the success and commitment of Hospice Care's volunteers. They have shown what can be achieved with private initiative and have thereby contributed to the welfare of Connecticut.●

#### COMMENDING REBECCA S. FINLEY

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am delighted today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the installation next month of Rebecca S. Finley, Pharm.D., M.S., as the president of the American Society of Health-System Pharmacists at the society's 52d annual meeting in Philadelphia.

ASHP is the 30,000-member national professional association that represents pharmacists who practice in hospitals, health maintenance organizations, long-term facilities, home care agencies, and other components of health care systems.

Early in her career, Dr. Finley made the professional commitment to practice, research, write, and teach pharmacy in the challenging field of clinical oncology. She currently directs the section of pharmacy services and is associate professor of oncology at the University of Maryland Cancer Center in Baltimore. She holds an appointment as associate professor in the department of clinical pharmacy at the university's school of pharmacy.

Dr. Finley received her bachelor of science and doctor of pharmacy degrees from the University of Cincinnati and a master of science in institutional pharmacy from the University of Maryland.

On behalf of my colleagues, Mr. President, I want to extend my best wishes to Dr. Finley in her tenure as president of ASHP. I look forward to working with her and the society on health care issues in the years to come.●

#### NOMINATION OF JOHN M. DEUTCH, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I thank my gallant friend from Nebraska. I rise in support of the position he has taken and also that of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Pennsylvania.

In the 103d Congress and then the 104th, I offered legislation that would basically break up the existing Central Intelligence Agency and return its component parts to the Department of Defense and the Department of State. This in the manner that the Office of Strategic Services was divided and parceled out at the end of World War II.

I had hoped to encourage a debate on the role of intelligence and of secrecy in American society. That debate has taken place. Some of the results, I think, can be seen in the nomination of a distinguished scientist and public servant, John Deutch, to this position.

This could not have been more clear in his testimony. He made a point, self-evident we would suppose, but not frequently to be encountered in a pronouncement of a potential DCI. He said:

Espionage does not rest comfortably in a democracy. Secrecy, which is essential to protect sources and methods, is not welcome in an open society. If our democracy is to support intelligence activities, the people must be confident that our law and rules will be respected.

It may have come as a surprise—although it ought not to have—in recent months and weeks, to find how many persons there are in this country who do not have confidence that our laws and rules will be respected; who see the

Government in conspiratorial modes, directed against the people in ways that could be of huge consequence to Americans.

Richard Hofstadter referred to this disposition when he spoke of "The Paranoid Style in American Politics." Thus, for example, the widespread belief that the CIA was somehow involved in the assassination of President Kennedy.

It is important to understand how deep this disposition is in our society. In 1956, even before Hofstadter spoke of it, Edward A. Shils of the University of Chicago—a great, great, social scientist, who has just passed away—published his book, "The Torment of Secrecy," in which he wrote:

The exfoliation and intertwining of the various patterns of belief that the world is dominated by unseen circles of conspirators, operating behind our backs, is one of the characteristic features of modern society.

Such a belief was very much a feature of the Bolshevik regime that took shape in Russia in 1917 and 1918. Hence the decision to help fund and fund in the United States a Communist Party, part of which would be clandestine. The recent discovery in the archives in Moscow that John Reed received a payment of 1,008,000 rubles in 1920. As soft money, that would be a very considerable sum today.

It is said that organizations in conflict become like one other. There is a degree to which we have emulated the Soviet model in our own intelligence services. A very powerful essay on this matter has just been written by Jefferson Morley in the Washington Post under the headline "Understanding Oklahoma" in an article entitled "Department of Secrecy: The Invisible Bureaucracy That Unites Alienated America in Suspicion."

I would refer also to Douglas Turner this weekend in the Buffalo News. I spoke of these concerns in an earlier statement on the Senate floor entitled "The Paranoid Style in American Politics," which I ask unanimous consent be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, what we have today is so much at variance with what was thought we would get. Allen Dulles was very much part of the foundation of postwar intelligence, having been in the OSS, serving with great distinction in Switzerland during World War II. Peter Grose, in his new biography, "Gentleman Spy: The Life of Allen Dulles," recounts the testimony Dulles gave before the Senate Armed Services Committee on April 25, 1947, as we were about to enact the National Security Act of 1947 which created a small coordinating body, the Central Intelligence Agency.

Personnel for a central intelligence agency, he argued, "need not be very numerous \* \* \*. The operation of the service must be neither flamboyant nor overshadowed with

the mystery and abracadabra which the amateur detective likes to assume." In a lecturing tone, he tried to tell the Senators how intelligence is actually assembled.

"Because of its glamour and mystery, overemphasis is generally placed on what is called secret intelligence, namely the intelligence that is obtained by secret means and by secret agents. \* \* \* In time of peace the bulk of intelligence can be obtained through overt channels, through our diplomatic and consular missions, and our military, naval and air attaches in the normal and proper course of their work. It can also be obtained through the world press, the radio, and through the many thousands of Americans, business and professional men and American residents of foreign countries, who are naturally and normally brought in touch with what is going on in those countries.

"A proper analysis of the intelligence obtainable by these overt, normal, and above-board means would supply us with over 80 percent, I should estimate, of the information required for the guidance of our national policy."

Mr. President, that did not happen. Instead, we entered upon a five-decade mode of secret analysis, analysis withheld from public scrutiny, which is the only way we can verify the truth of a hypothesis in natural science or in the social sciences.

The result was massive miscalculation. Nicholas Eberstadt in his wonderful new book, "The Tyranny of Numbers," writes "It is probably safe to say that the U.S. Government's attempt to describe the Soviet economy has been the largest single project in social science research ever undertaken." He said this in 1990, in testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations. "The largest single project in social science research ever undertaken," it was a calamity.

No one has been more forthright in this regard than Adm. Stansfield Turner in an article in Foreign Affairs at about that time. He said when it came to predicting the collapse of the Soviet Union, the corporate view of the intelligence community missed by a mile.

I can remember in the first years of the Kennedy administration meeting with Walt Rostow, chairman of the policy planning staff in the Department of State. As regards the Soviet Union, he said he was not one of those "6 percent forever people." But there it was, locked into our analysis. That is what the President knew.

In Richard Reeves' remarkable biography of John F. Kennedy, he records that the Agency told the President that by the year 2000 the GNP of the Soviet Union would be three times that of the United States. Again, that is what the President knew. Any number of economists might have disagreed. The great conservative theorists, Friedman, Hayek, Stigler, would never have thought any such thing. Important work done by Frank Holzman, at Tufts, and the Russian Research Center at Harvard disputed what little was public. But to no avail. The President knew otherwise, and others did not know what it was he knew.

The consequence was an extraordinary failure to foresee the central

geo political event of our time. A vast overdependence on military and similar outlays that leave us perilously close to economic instability ourselves.

I would like to close with a letter written me in 1991 by Dale W. Jorgenson, professor of economics at the Kennedy School of Government, in which he said:

I believe that the importance of economic intelligence is increasing greatly with the much-discussed globalization of the U.S. economy. However, the cloak-and-dagger model is even more inappropriate to our new economic situation than it was to the successful prosecution of the Cold War that has just concluded. The lessons for the future seem to me to be rather transparent. The U.S. Government needs to invest a lot more in international economic assessments. \* \* \* (I) should reject the CIA monopoly model and try to create the kind of intellectual competition that now prevails between CBO and OMB on domestic policy, aided by Brookings, AEI [American Enterprise Institute], the Urban Institute, the Kennedy School, and many others.

That is wise counsel. I have the confidence that John Deutch, as a scientist, will understand it. I am concerned, however, that the administration will not.

Mancur Olson, in his great book, "The Rise and Decline of Nations", asked: Why has it come about that the two nations whose institutions were destroyed in World War II, Germany and Japan, have had the most economic success since? Whereas Britain, not really much success at all; the United States—yes, but. He came up with a simple answer. Defeat wiped out all those choke points, all those rents, all those sharing agreements, all those veto structures that enable institutions to prevent things from happening. And we are seeing it in this our own Government today, 5 years after the Berlin wall came down. Nothing changes, or little changes.

Recall that 3 years before the wall came down the CIA reported that per capita GDP was higher in East Germany than in West Germany. I hope I take no liberty that I mentioned this once to Dr. Deutch and added, "Any taxi driver in Berlin could have told you that was not so." Dr. Deutch replied, "Any taxi driver in Washington." A most reassuring response.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas for her graciousness for allowing me to speak when in fact in alternation it would have been her turn.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From the Congressional Record, Apr. 25, 1995]

#### THE PARANOID STYLE IN AMERICAN POLITICS

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, as we think and, indeed, pray our way through the aftermath of the Oklahoma City bombing, asking how such a horror might have come about, and how others might be prevented, Senators could do well to step outside the chamber and look down the mall at the Washington Monument. It honors the Revolutionary general who once victorious, turned his army over to the Continental Congress and retired to his estates. Later, recalled to the highest office in the land, he served dutifully one

term, then a second but then on principle not a day longer. Thus was founded the first republic, the first democracy since the age of Greece and Rome.

There is not a more serene, confident, untroubled symbol of the nation in all the capital. Yet a brief glance will show that the color of the marble blocks of which the monument is constructed changes about a quarter of the way up. Thereby hangs a tale of another troubled time; not our first, just as, surely, this will not be our last.

As befitted a republic, the monument was started by a private charitable group, as we would now say, the Washington National Monument Society. Contributions came in cash, but also in blocks of marble, many with interior inscriptions which visitors willing to climb the steps can see to this day. A quarter of the way up, that is. For in 1852, Pope Pius IX donated a block of marble from the temple of Concord in Rome. Instantly, the American Party, or the Know-Nothings ("I know nothing," was their standard reply to queries about their platform) divined a Papist Plot. An installation of the Pope's block of marble would signal the Catholic Uprising. A fevered agitation began. As recorded by Ray Allen Billington in *The Protest Crusade, 1800-1860*:

"One pamphlet, *The Pope's Strategem: 'Rome to America!'* An Address to the Protestants of the United States, against placing the Pope's block of Marble in the Washington Monument (1852), urged Protestants to hold indignation meetings and contribute another block to be placed next to the Pope's 'bearing an inscription by which all men may see that we are awake to the hypocrisy and schemes of that designing, crafty, subtle, far seeing and far reaching Power, which is ever grasping after the whole World, to sway its iron scepter, with bloodstained hands, over the millions of its inhabitants.'"

One night early in March, 1854, a group of Know-Nothings broke into the storage sheds on the monument grounds and dragged the Pope's marble off towards the Potomac. Save for the occasional "sighting", as we have come to call such phenomena, it has never to be located since.

Work on the monument stopped. Years later, in 1876, Congress appropriated funds to complete the job, which the Corps of Engineers, under the leadership of Lieutenant Colonel Thomas I. Casey did with great flourish in time for the centennial observances of 1888.

Dread of Catholicism ran its course, if slowly. (Edward M. Stanton, then Secretary of War was convinced the assassination of President Lincoln was the result of a Catholic plot.) Other manias followed, all brilliantly describe in Richard Hofstadter's revelatory lecture "the Paranoid Style in American Politics" which he delivered as the Herbert Spencer Lecture at Oxford University within days of the assassination of John F. Kennedy. Which to this day remains a fertile source of conspiracy mongering. George Will cited Hofstadter's essay this past weekend on the television program "This Week with David Brinkley." He deals with the same subject matter in a superb column in this morning's Washington Post which has this bracing conclusion.

"It is reassuring to remember that paranoiacs have always been with us, but have never defined us."

I hope, Mr. President, as we proceed to consider legislation, if that is necessary, in response to the bombing, we would be mindful of a history in which we have often overreached, to our cost, and try to avoid such an overreaction.

We have seen superb performance of the FBI. What more any nation could ask of an

internal security group I cannot conceive. We have seen the effectiveness of our State troopers, of our local police forces, fire departments, instant nationwide cooperation which should reassure us rather than frighten us.

I would note in closing, Mr. President, that Pope John Paul II will be visiting the United States this coming October.

#### NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 51, S. 510.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 510) to extend the authorization for certain programs under the Native American Programs Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

#### SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS UNDER THE NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS ACT OF 1974.

(a) SECTION 816.—Section 816 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2992d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “for fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, and 1995.” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999.”;

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “for each of the fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996.” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999.”; and

(3) in subsection (e) by striking “\$2,000,000 for fiscal year 1993 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997.” and inserting “such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999.”.

(b) SECTION 803A(f)(1).—Section 803A(f)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2991b-1(f)(1)) is amended by striking “for each of the fiscal years 1992, 1993, and 1994, \$1,000,000” and inserting “such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 1996 through 1999.”.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee substitute amendment be agreed to, that the bill be deemed read a third time, passed, and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

So the bill (S. 510), as amended, was deemed read for the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 510

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS UNDER THE NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS ACT OF 1974.

(a) SECTION 816.—Section 816 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2992d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “for fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, and 1995.” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999.”;

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “for each of the fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996.” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999.”; and

(3) in subsection (e), by striking “\$2,000,000 for fiscal year 1993 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997.” and inserting “such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999.”.

(b) SECTION 803A(f)(1).—Section 803A(f)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2991b-1(f)(1)) is amended by striking “for each of the fiscal years 1992, 1993, and 1994, \$1,000,000” and inserting “such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 1996 through 1999.”.

#### MEASURE INDEFINITELY POSTPONED—SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that calendar No. 37, Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, be indefinitely postponed.

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

#### MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 790

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I understand that S. 790 introduced earlier today by Senators McCain and Levin is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHAFEE. I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 790) to provide for the modification or elimination of the Federal Reporting Requirements.

Mr. CHAFEE. I now ask for its second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read the second time on the next legislative day.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I request that the Senate go into executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—CONVENTION ON NUCLEAR SAFETY (TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 104-6)

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction

of secrecy be removed from the Convention of Nuclear Safety, Treaty Document Number 104-6, transmitted to the Senate by the President today; and the treaty considered as having been read the first time; referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and ordered that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message of the President is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

I transmit herewith, for Senate advice and consent to ratification, the Convention on Nuclear Safety done at Vienna on September 20, 1994. This Convention was adopted by a Diplomatic Conference convened by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in June 1994 and was opened for signature in Vienna on September 20, 1994, during the IAEA General Conference. Secretary of Energy O'Leary signed the Convention for the United States on that date. Also transmitted for the information of the Senate is the report of the Department of State concerning the Convention.

At the September 1991 General Conference of the IAEA, a resolution was adopted, with U.S. support, calling for the IAEA secretariat to develop elements for a possible International Convention on Nuclear Safety. From 1992 to 1994, the IAEA convened seven expert working group meetings, in which the United States participated. The IAEA Board of Governors approved a draft text at its meeting in February 1994, after which the IAEA convened a Diplomatic Conference attended by representatives of more than 80 countries in June 1994. The final text of the Convention resulted from that Conference.

The Convention establishes a legal obligation on the part of Parties to apply certain general safety principles to the construction, operation, and regulation of land-based civilian nuclear power plants under their jurisdiction. Parties to the Convention also agree to submit periodic reports on the steps they are taking to implement the obligations of the Convention. These reports will be reviewed and discussed at review meetings of the Parties, at which each Party will have an opportunity to discuss and seek clarification of reports submitted by other Parties.

The United States has initiated many steps to deal with nuclear safety, and has supported the effort to develop this Convention. With its obligatory reporting and review procedures, requiring Parties to demonstrate in