must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude.'' Isn't it about time that Congress heeded the wise words of the author of the Declaration of Independence?

JUSTICE FLORENCE K. MURRAY—40 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise to share with my colleagues the good news of a major landmark in Rhode Island history and in the life of Justice Florence Kerins Murray. This month we celebrated the 40th anniversary of her appointment as the first woman justice in Rhode Island history.

I have known and admired Justice Murray for much of my life, and I would like to share some of the many highlights of this remarkable woman's dramatic career with you.

She was born in Newport on October 21, 1916, educated in Newport public schools and received her B.A. from Syracuse University. After a brief teaching career at the Prudence Island School, she earned her LL.B. in 1942 from Boston University Law School and was admitted to the Massachusetts Bar.

With World War II in progress, Justice Murray enlisted in the Women's Army Corps, and was commissioned as a second lieutenant in 1942. Serving in a variety of posts she left the corps as a lieutenant colonel at war's end, only to be recalled to duty for a special assignment in 1947.

Returning to Rhode Island, she sat for the State bar, was admitted, and practiced law alone and in association with her husband, Paul F. Murray, to whom she was married in 1943 at St. Mary's Church, Newport. They are the parents of a son, Paul M. Murray.

She began her distinguished political career in 1948, serving simultaneously on the Newport School Committee and in the Rhode Island State Senate until 1956. She focused on issues ranging from the welfare of children and youth to facilities for the elderly.

In 1956, Florence Murray was appointed by Governor Dennis J. Roberts as an associate justice of the Rhode Island Superior Court, the first woman justice in Rhode Island history.

Twenty-two years later she became the first woman presiding justice of that court. In 1979, she was elected to her present position on the Rhode Island Supreme Court, one of the first women to serve on a State court of last resort in the United States.

Justice Murray's career is marked by service and leadership in the regional and national Trial Judges Association, and the National Judicial College—where she served as chair of the board of directors of the college.

The recipient of numerous awards for outstanding service, including nine honorary doctorates, Justice Murray was honored at a ceremony 6 years ago in which the Newport County Courthouse was rededicated as the Florence Kerins Murray Judicial Complex.

Once again, it was a first. The program notes from the ceremony state the rededication ''marks the first time that a major court facility in the United States has been designated in honor of a woman jurist.''

Justice Murray is truly a wonderful, remarkable individual who has earned her place in the history of both Rhode Island and the Nation. I know that I reflect the thoughts of countless Rhode Islanders as we wish her well on the 40th anniversary of her appointment as a Rhode Island State Justice.

VIETNAM HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this past Saturday was Vietnam Human Rights Day, and I join in urging all Members of the Senate to express their support for it. Six years ago, on May 11, 1990, one of Vietnam's foremost human rights advocates, Dr. Nguyen Dan Que, published the Manifesto of the Non-Violent Movement for Human Rights in Vietnam. Vietnam Human Rights Day marks that historic occasion. The manifesto calls on the Vietnamese Government to respect basic human rights, establish a multiparty system of government, and allow free and fair elections.

Tragically, Dr. Que's appeal led to his arrest and imprisonment in 1990. He was sentenced to 20 years of hard labor, and he has spent the past 2 years in solitary confinement.

Last November, Dr. Que and Prof. Doan Viet Hoat, a leading Vietnamese dissident who has also been imprisoned, were recipients of the Robert F. Kennedy Human Rights Award. At that time, I called on the Vietnamese Government to release Dr. Que and Professor Hoat and all political prisoners in Vietnam. Today, 6 months later, Dr. Que and Professor Hoat and other political prisoners remain in prison, and their plight and the future of human rights in Vietnam remain bleak.

I take this opportunity on Vietnam Human Rights Day to call on the Government of Vietnam to respect fundamental human rights and release their political prisoners. The people of Vietnam have waited too long for these basic changes to take place.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE FUTURE OF THE ATLANTIC ALLIANCE

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, this weekend there was an important conference in Prague, the Czech Republic, in which both Europeans and Americans discussed the future of the Atlantic alliance.

I wanted to report briefly on that and submit statements for the RECORD later.

First, let me ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an op-ed piece written by our colleague, the Senator from Mississippi, Senator COCHRAN, relating to the subject of missile defense.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 8, 1996]

UNREADY FOR ROGUE THREATS

(By Thad Cochran)

When it comes to thinking about ballistic missile defense (BMD), most opponents of defending America are mired in the logic of the Cold War. Critics would do well to consider new ideas, as their old logic is inadequate for the emerging security environment.

It was suggested in an op-ed piece by Michael Krepon [The Last 15 Minutes, March 27] that the START process of reducing the number of Russian nuclear weapons should be a preferred alternative to national missile defense. This argument is, in fact, a staple from the past. The ability to defend against Soviet missiles was considered anathema to achieving U.S.–Soviet strategic arms control agreements, and therefore it was sacrificed for the goal of reducing Soviet nuclear arms through negotiation.

This position, questionable at the time, now ignores reality. It misses one of the primary features of the changed world: the proliferation of missiles and nuclear weapons to rogue states outside the old East Bloc. The central point of the Defend America Act now before Congress is that American cities must be protected against those rogues now bent on acquiring long-range missiles and nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. The START process does not help us here—it doesn't even apply.

START II, ratified by the Senate with overwhelming bipartisan support, cannot and does not pretend to take a single missile or mass-destruction weapon out of the hands of countries such as North Korea, Iran and Libya. The Defend America Act calls for defenses against the limited missile arsenals existing and sought by such rogue states.

The notion is also put forward that we should focus on various multilateral and nonproliferation measures instead of national missile defense. Again, the old Cold War debating tactic of pitting diplomatic efforts against BMD shines through. And again, it does not fit the new world. We know that diplomatic efforts to prevent the spread of missile technology alone are inadequate to address the proliferation threat.

Despite some modest diplomatic successes, such as with the Missile Technology Control Regime, the list of countries acquiring missiles and mass-destruction weapons continues to grow. Rogue states have proven themselves capable of sidestepping our diplomatic nonproliferation measures. For example, inspections in Iraq, the world's most heavily inspected regime, have been on the ground for years, yet we are regularly surprised by new revelations of previously unknown Iraqi proliferation efforts.

Diplomatic efforts to help slow the pace of proliferation must continue. But nobody should be fooled into believing that arms control agreements alone can solve the problem; and nobody should be fooled by the old Cold War argument that missile defense must be sacrificed to pursue various arms control efforts. This is not an either/or choice, as the critics would like us to believe.