

Exon-Hatfield amendment by the opponents that what the true findings of the JASON report are might study it, might change their minds.

I hope certain Members will reconsider their positions in light of this clarification and vote to overturn the committee provisions at some time in the future.

To protect that possibility I must re-emphasize once again that I will do everything reasonably within my power to make certain that that is not authorized, the \$50 million is not authorized as the JASON committee and others say it is not necessary. It is a waste of money.

So I thought I had the obligation tonight, since I just found out about this, to advise the Senate and especially the two leaders of the Appropriations Committee, whom I have great respect for, because I did not want to blindside them.

I yield the floor.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 9, 1995]

#### PHYSICISTS SAY SMALL NUCLEAR TESTS BACKED BY SENATE ARE UNNECESSARY

(By R. Jeffrey Smith)

A group of eminent U.S. physicists and nuclear weapons designers has concluded that the military has neither a "present nor anticipated" need for the small nuclear weapons tests that a Senate majority voted last week to spend \$50 million to prepare for.

The scientific group concluded after a six-week study for the Department of Energy that conducting the small explosions would not add measurably to the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, which the scientists said has been solidly established by more than 1,000 test nuclear explosions.

"The United States can, today, have high confidence in the safety, reliability, and performance margins of the nuclear weapons that are designated to remain in the enduring stockpile," said a summary of the group's report. It was signed by several of the country's veteran bomb designers under the auspices of JASONS, a group of academic scientists who consult for the government on national problems.

The report, which has been presented to Secretary of Defense William J. Perry, Secretary of Energy Hazel R. O'Leary and other top administration officials, was issued during a growing debate in Congress and within the administration over the merits of additional nuclear testing.

The Clinton administration has been unable for months to decide whether to propose additional nuclear tests, due to disagreement between testing proponents at the Pentagon and opponents at the Energy Department, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the office of the White House science adviser.

On Friday, the Senate voted 56 to 44 to keep \$50 million to prepare for so-called hydronuclear tests, even though the administration has said it does not plan to conduct any during 1996.

Proponents of additional nuclear testing, largely from the Republican majority, have argued that more explosions are needed to ensure that weapons remain safe and reliable. The administration, in negotiations being conducted in Geneva on a global accord barring all nuclear testing, has similarly insisted on the right to continue setting off extremely small-scale nuclear explosions for the purpose of maintaining the U.S. arsenal.

The group's report was endorsed by four of the principal designers of the U.S. nuclear arsenal: John Kammerdiener and John Richter of the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico, Robert Peurifoy of the Sandia National Laboratories in New Mexico, and Seymour Sack of the Livermore National Laboratory in California.

The 14-member group also included noted Princeton physicist Freeman Dyson, IBM scientist Richard Garwin, University of California physicist Marshal Rosenbluth and Stanford physicist Sidney Drell, each of whom has worked on aspects of U.S. nuclear weaponry for more than three decades.

Besides challenging the merits of the hydronuclear tests, which would have an explosive yield equivalent to about 4 pounds of TNT, the report also challenges the prevailing Pentagon view that conducting larger nuclear explosions is also essential to ensuring that U.S. nuclear weapons will continue to operate.

It states that while such tests would doubtless provide interesting data, the country should pursue other, better routes to maintaining the nuclear arsenal, such as supporting an extensive program of weapons surveillance and a "significant industrial infrastructure" to maintain aging weapons components.

The summary stated that the group's detailed findings "are consistent with [a] U.S. agreement to enter into a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) of unending duration" provided that the treaty allows the country to withdraw if warranted by "supreme national interest."

"I believe that this study represents the views of a very diverse and experienced scientific community," said Drell, the panel's chairman.

Mr. STEVENS. We are awaiting temporarily for what we would call the wrap-up.

So I ask, as in morning business, Mr. President, to make this statement.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

(During today's session of the Senate, the following morning business was transacted.)

#### COMMUNITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, while efforts to address the needs of our less-developed communities have often come up short, innovation from the private sector has been instrumental in locating problems and providing successful solutions. Past experience shows that successful community development can only be achieved through an equal partnership between the public and private sector.

Each year, on behalf of the Federal Housing Finance Board [FHFB] and Federal Home Loan Bank System [FHLBS], 12 financial institutions from around the country are recognized for exemplary efforts in the revitalization of America's communities. I am pleased to announce that three financial institutions in Montana that are part of Glacier Bancorp, Inc. have been chosen by the Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle to receive the Community Partnership Award for 1995. They include Glacier Bank, F.S.B. of Kali-

spell, the First National Bank of Whitefish, and the First National Bank of Eureka.

Glacier Bank and its two affiliates were recognized for developing innovative ways of using the Affordable Housing Program [AHP] and the Community Investment Program [CIP] funds to create homeownership opportunities for low- and moderate-income families, and for working with numerous non-profit partners and local governments to help meet community needs.

These institutions hold \$84 million in regular advances and have used Federal Home Loan Bank funding programs to assemble a full range of single and multifamily loan products, many of which would not have been possible without FHLB funding. In addition, they also used advances to match fund their FHA/VA loans and developed a portfolio loan product called BOB that is also funded with advances.

While using the Affordable Housing Program, Glacier Bancorp, Inc., and its institutions have sponsored three successful AHP projects receiving \$301,000 in targeted grants. Glacier Bank and the city of Kalispell are responsible for devising an innovative financing package to preserve an apartment complex in downtown Kalispell for very low-income and homeless individuals. Under the same program, Glacier Bank was awarded AHP funds for a homeownership project to help low- and moderate-income households purchase homes in distressed neighborhoods. Without Glacier's commitment to relax their underwriting standards for these homes, the project would not have been possible. These projects will create affordable housing for 64 households.

Under the Community Investment Program, the institutions have used \$17 million in CIP funds for homeowner programs benefiting 3000 households.

These examples of civic responsibility and the spirit of community are only a few of Glacier Bancorp, Inc. efforts to create affordable housing for less developed communities. This institutions' achievements should serve as a reminder of what is possible when the private sector acts locally in an innovative alliance with the Government.

#### INCOME TAX TREATIES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, today I rise to share my thoughts about several income tax treaties now pending before the Senate. I'm very much opposed to the income tax treaties that are now awaiting action in the Senate. But my opposition stems more from the Treasury Department's stated interpretation of the pending treaties than the actual language in the treaties themselves.

Treasury Department officials interpret one article in each of these treaties as preventing the United States from scrapping its outdated arm's length enforcement approach on corporate income tax and replacing it