

Indemnify California generators and transporters for any liability which might result from the necessity to transport California waste from coast to coast; and most importantly;

Hold California generators, including the University of California and other state entities, harmless from any federal or state cleanup related (Superfund or CERCLA) liability which they might potentially incur as a result of using a waste facility which is on a substantially less protective site than Ward Valley and which has already experienced tritium migration to groundwater.

If LLRW generators in your state have problems with storage or with use of Barnwell similar to those of California generators, I urge you to join with me in demanding similar relief.

Sincerely,

PETE WILSON.

WETLANDS AND THE NEW FARM BILL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the Senator from Indiana, Senator LUGAR, who is the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and who was a manager of the recent conference on H.R. 2854, the 1996 farm bill.

As the Senator from Indiana knows, we had a problem in Iowa in 1994 and 1995 with the Natural Resources Conservation Service delineating wetlands. It is my understanding that NRCS used aerial photography and soil surveys to review prior wetland delineations. In most cases, NRCS found additional wetland acreage on the farmland subject to this review.

This caused a lot of anxiety and uncertainty for these landowners. They had accepted the initial delineation, changed their farming practices accordingly and then, through no action of their own, received a new, more expansive delineation.

The Senator will recall that because of this situation I introduced a moratorium on new delineations until passage of the new farm bill. This moratorium passed the Senate by unanimous consent and was later accepted by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LUGAR. I would respond to my friend from Iowa that I am fully aware of the situation that he refers to in his State.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I am concerned that a change made to the Conference Report shortly before it was filed in the House may result in a similar situation occurring in the future. It is my understanding that the Conference Committee intended to give farmers certainty in dealing with wetlands. One way of accomplishing this goal was to allow prior delineations of wetlands to be changed only upon request of the farmer.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, this is also my understanding.

Mr. GRASSLEY. After the conferees met, while the legislative language carrying out the various agreements was being finalized, the Department of Agriculture suggested a technical cor-

rection to this provision. Section 322 of the bill amends section 1222 of the 1985 farm bill to say that "No person shall be adversely affected because of having taken an action based on a previous certified wetland delineation by the Secretary. The delineation shall not be subject to a subsequent wetland certification or delineation by the Secretary, unless requested by the person * * *."

My concern is that this could read to allow the Department to change delineations that have not yet been certified. I don't argue with this, per se. I am sure there is a need for granting NRCS this authority in some specific situations.

But again, I do not want a repeat of this situation in Iowa in 1994 and 1995. Specifically, I do not want the NRCS to use this language to conduct a massive review of wetland delineations. This will just cause further uncertainty and confusion in the farm community. It can only lead to ill will between our farmers and the NRCS and should be avoided at all cost.

Under the able leadership of Chairman LUGAR, we have made some very positive changes in the 1996 farm bill that will lead to a more cooperative relationship between farmers and the NRCS. I hope this progress will not be undermined by the provision I mentioned.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, we expect that the Department of Agriculture will be mindful of the need to balance the very legitimate concerns that the Senator from Iowa raises today with the desires of producers for certainty in the identification of wetlands. In addition, the rights of producers to appeal decisions should be protected. The Agriculture Committee will monitor developments as the Department develops regulations to carry out the provisions of the newly enacted farm bill, Public Law 104-127. I also encourage my colleague from Iowa and all concerned parties to contribute their input when the regulations are put out for comment.

In summary, while we realize that some administrative formalities will be necessary to give producers certainty regarding the boundaries of wetlands, we do not expect large-scale, wholesale reviews of existing wetland determinations as a result of the new legislation.

WHO NEEDS AMBASSADORS?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, Richard N. Gardner, the U.S. Ambassador to Spain, recently addressed the American Society of International Law on the subject, "Who Needs Ambassadors?"

Ambassador Gardner, who served in the Department of State under President Kennedy, as Ambassador to Italy under President Carter, and now as President Clinton's Ambassador to Spain, is among the Nation's most highly regarded experts on international relations, and is uniquely qualified to answer this important question.

Ambassador Gardner is rightly concerned about the fervor of some to slash our already small foreign policy budget because of the simplistic view that the Nation's foreign policy requirements are less significant than during the cold war.

Ambassador Gardner emphasizes that our foreign policy before the cold war was "trying to create a world in which the American people could be secure and prosperous and see their deeply held values of political and economic freedom increasingly realized in other parts of the world." He also reminds us that this is still the purpose of our foreign policy.

There is a tendency by some to suggest that there is a lesser need for a U.S. presence abroad, and that in an era of instantaneous information, a fax machine is all we need to conduct foreign policy. As Ambassador Gardner points out, however, our embassies serve many important functions, not least of which are to build bilateral and multilateral relationships for mutual benefit, serve as the eyes and ears of the President and the State Department, and carry out U.S. policy objectives abroad. As Ambassador Gardner notes: "Things don't happen just because we say so. Discussion and persuasion are necessary. Diplomacy by fax simply doesn't work."

The foreign policy budget of this country is only about 1 percent of our total budget. Yet some in Congress propose to reduce it even further. As Ambassador Gardner states, further cuts "will gravely undermine our ability to influence foreign governments and will severely diminish our leadership role in world affairs."

Global interdependence is a fact of life. The United States foreign policy is best served by actively engaging with other nations, rather than reacting at greater cost to events we don't see coming because we are trying to conduct foreign policy on the cheap.

Mr. President, I believe that my colleagues will be interested in Ambassador Gardner's remarks and I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHO NEEDS AMBASSADORS?

(By Richard N. Gardner)

I was tremendously honored and pleased when Edith Weiss asked me to be the banquet speaker at this year's ASIL meeting.

Honored because I know how many illustrious statesmen and scholars have preceded me in this role. Pleased because your invitation gives me the chance to return from my diplomatic assignment in Madrid to be with many old friends, such as my Columbia Law School colleagues Oscar Schachter, Louis Henkin and Lori Damrosch, and with President Edie Weiss who took one of my seminars some twenty years ago when she came to Columbia Law School as a Visiting Scholar.

Edie, your Presidency of this Society is a splendid recognition of your achievements as teacher, public servant, and scholar. My congratulations also to Charles Brower, your

President-elect, one of the world's leading experts in international arbitration, whose service as Judge in the Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal earned the admiration of us all.

This Society is now 90 years old. I came to my first annual meeting when the Society was just half its present age—in 1951, to be exact. I was in my third year at Yale Law School and had fallen under the hypnotic spell of Myres McDougal and Harold Lasswell. My exposure to them and to the other "greats" of your 1951 meeting persuaded me to make a career in international law. I have never regretted this decision.

Fourteen years after my first annual meeting, in 1965, you made me one of your two banquet speakers. The other banquet speaker was Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Louis Sohn was the Toastmaster and explained to me that I was on the program in case the Secretary of State didn't show up.

That did not in the least diminish my pleasure in being on that podium. I delivered a brief summary of what I'm sure was a rather too detailed lecture about U.N. decision-making procedure and power realities.

Secretary Rusk delivered his speech on Vietnam, which provoked a lively discussion period. I recall that one of the questions to the Secretary was about the possible role of fact-finding in the Vietnamese conflict. It was asked by a young international lawyer named Thomas Franck. At the end of the evening Secretary Rusk asked me: "Who is that young man? I think he'll go far."

When President Jimmy Carter appointed me U.S. ambassador to Italy, my son—then 13 years old—said, "Dad, you mean you're going to be ambassador to Italy, and also get paid for it?" Thanks to President Clinton, I'm now one of only three Americans in history who have been privileged to serve as ambassador in both Rome and Madrid. I feel very fortunate, indeed, to be in Madrid, although I'm also pleased that I am being paid for it.

But I also come to you as a deeply troubled ambassador. I am troubled by the lack of understanding in our country today about our foreign policy priorities and the vital role of our embassies in implementing them. I sometimes think that what our ambassadors and embassies do is one of our country's best kept secrets.

During the Cold War there was also confusion and ignorance, but at least there was bipartisan consensus on the need for American leadership in defending freedom in the world against Soviet aggression and the spread of totalitarian communism.

Much of my work as ambassador to Italy was dominated by this overriding priority. At a time when some Italian leaders were flirting with the compromesso storico—a government alliance between Christian Democrats and an Italian Communist Party still largely oriented toward Moscow—I was able to play a modest role in making sure the Italians understood why the United States opposed the entry of Communist parties into the governments of NATO allies.

When the Soviet Union began threatening Europe by deploying its SS-20 missiles, it was vitally important for NATO to respond by deploying the Pershing 2 and cruise missiles. It soon became clear that the deployment could not occur without a favorable decision by Italy. Our embassy in Rome was able to persuade an Italian Socialist Party with a history of hostility to NATO to do an about-face and vote for the cruise missile deployment in the Italian Parliament along with the Christian Democrats and the small non-communist lay parties.

Some years later Mikhail Gorbachev said it was the NATO decision to deploy the Pershing and cruise missiles—not the Strategic Defense Initiative as some have claimed—

that helped bring him to the realization that his country had to move from a policy based on military threats to one of accommodation with the West.

So at the height of the Cold War, it did not take a genius to understand the need for strong U.S. leadership in the world and for effective ambassadors and embassies in support of that leadership.

Today, however, there is no single unifying threat to help justify and define a world role for the United States. As a result, we are witnessing devastating reductions in the State Department budget which covers the cost of our embassies overseas.

Hence the title of my speech tonight, "Who Needs Ambassadors?" I am sure this audience needs no lecture on the subject. But let's face it—the world view of the people in this room is not the world view of most Americans.

The constructive international engagement we all believe in will continue to be at risk until we all do a better job of explaining its financial requirements to the American people and the Congress.

Now that there is no longer a Soviet Union and a Communist threat, what is our foreign policy all about? And what is the current need for ambassadors and embassies?

We need to give simple and understandable answers to these questions, showing how foreign policy and diplomacy impact on the values, interests and daily lives of ordinary Americans. In giving my own answers tonight, I'll be saying many things you will find obvious. But as Adlai Stevenson once said: "Mankind needs repetition of the obvious more than elucidation of the obscure." This is particularly true in this new world of complexity and unprecedented change.

A common refrain heard today is that American foreign policy lacks a single unifying goal and a coherent strategy for achieving it. But precisely because the post Cold War world is so complex, so rapidly evolving, and characterized by so many diverse threats to our interests, it is difficult to encapsulate in one sentence or one paragraph a definition of American foreign policy that has global application.

Perhaps we should start by recalling what our foreign policy was all about before there was a Cold War. It was about trying to create a world in which the American people could be secure and prosperous and see their deeply held values of political and economic freedom increasingly realized in other parts of the world. Well, that is still the purpose of our foreign policy today.

Presidents Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman, with broad bipartisan support from Republicans like Wendell Wilkie and Arthur Vandenberg, sought to implement these high purposes with a policy of practical internationalism, which I define as working with other countries in bilateral, regional and global institutions to advance common interests in peace, welfare and human rights.

Our postwar "founding fathers" in both political parties understood the importance of military power and the need to act alone if necessary in defense of U.S. interests. But they also gave us the United Nations, the Bretton Woods organizations, GATT, the Marshall Plan, NATO and the Point Four program as indispensable instruments for achieving our national purposes in close cooperation with others.

Why did they do these things?

Because they understood the growing interdependence between conditions in our country and conditions in our global neighborhood.

Because they understood that our best chance to shape the world environment to promote our national security and welfare was to share costs and risks with other nations in international institutions.

And because they understood that our national interest in the long run would best be served by realizing the benefits of reciprocity and stability only achievable through the development of international law.

Listening to much of our public debate, I sometimes think that all this history has been forgotten, that we are suffering from a kind of collective amnesia. I submit that the basic case for American world leadership today is essentially the same as it was before the Cold War began. It is a very different world, of course, but the fact of our interdependence remains. Obviously, in every major respect, it has grown.

In his address to Freedom House last October, President Clinton spelled out for Americans why a strong U.S. leadership role in the world is intimately related to the quality of their daily lives:

"The once bright line between domestic and foreign policy is blurring. If I could do anything to change the speech patterns of those of us in public life, I would almost like to stop hearing people talk about foreign policy and domestic policy, and instead start discussing economic policy, security policy, environmental policy—you name it.

"Our personal, family, and national security is affected by our policy on terrorism at home and abroad. Our personal, family and national prosperity is affected by our policy on market economics at home and abroad. Our personal, family and national future is affected by our policies on the environment at home and abroad. The common good at home is simply not separate from our efforts to advance the common good around the world. They must be one and the same if we are to be truly secure in the world of the 21st century."

What are the specific foreign policy priorities in the Clinton Administration? In a recent speech at Harvard's Kennedy School, Secretary of State Warren Christopher identified three to which we are giving special emphasis—pursuing peace in regions of vital interest, confronting the new transnational security threats, and promoting open markets and prosperity.

The broad lines of American policy in these three priority areas are necessarily hammered out in Washington. But our embassies constitute an essential part of the delivery system through which those policies are implemented in particular regions and countries.

This includes not only such vital multilateral embassies as our missions to the UN in New York, Geneva and Vienna, and to NATO and the European Union in Brussels, but also our embassies in the more than 180 countries with which we maintain diplomatic relations.

Americans have fallen into the habit of thinking that ambassadors and embassies have become irrelevant luxuries, obsolete frills in an age of instant communications. We make the mistake of thinking that if a sound foreign policy decision is approved at the State Department or the White House, it does not much matter how it is carried out in the field.

This is a dangerous illusion indulged in by no other major country. Things don't happen just because we say so. Discussion and persuasion are necessary. Diplomacy by fax simply doesn't work.

Ambassadors today need to perform multiple roles. They should be the "eyes and ears" of the President and Secretary of State; advocates of our country's foreign policy in the upper reaches of the host government; resourceful negotiators in bilateral and multilateral diplomacy. They need to build personal relationships of mutual trust with key overseas decision-makers in government and the private sector. They should

also radiate American values as intellectual, educational and cultural emissaries, communicating what our country stands for to interest groups and intellectual leaders as well as to the public at large.

In a previous age of diplomacy, U.S. ambassadors spent most of their time dealing with bilateral issues between the United States and the host country. Bilateral issues are still important—assuring access to host country military bases, promoting sales of U.S. products, stimulating educational and cultural exchanges are some notable examples. And every embassy has the obligation to report on and analyze political and economic developments in the host country that may impact on U.S. interests.

But most of the work of our ambassadors and embassies today is devoted to regional and global issues—indeed, to acting upon the three key priorities identified by Secretary Christopher in his Kennedy School speech. Let me give you some examples based on my experience in Madrid and with my fellow ambassadors in Europe:

On the first priority: pursuing peace in regions of vital interest:

We are working with our host countries to fashion common policies on the continued transformation of NATO, Partnership for Peace, NATO enlargement, and NATO-Russia relations.

After having secured host country support for the military and diplomatic measures that brought an end to the fighting in Bosnia, we are now working to assure the implementation of the civilian side of the Dayton Agreement, notably economic reconstruction, free elections, the resettlement of refugees, and the prosecution of war crimes.

We are working with host governments to restore momentum to the endangered Middle East peace process by mobilizing international action against the Hamas terrorists and their supporters, providing technical assistance and economic aid to the Palestinian authority, encouraging the vital Syrian-Israeli negotiations, and promoting regional Middle East economic development.

We have been consulting with key European governments such as Spain as well as with the EU Commission in Brussels on how to achieve a peaceful transition to democracy in Cuba.

Although they share this common objective, the Europeans generally oppose the U.S. embargo and the Helms-Burton legislation, while doing nothing to limit investment in Cuba by their citizens. Our embassies are increasingly busy trying to promote allied unity on measures that will increase the pressure on Castro to end his repressive regime.

On the second priority: confronting the new transnational threat:

Having worked successfully with our host governments for the unconditional and indefinite extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty—a major diplomatic achievement—we are focusing now on building support for a Comprehensive Test Ban Agreement, on keeping weapons of mass destruction out of the hands of countries like Iran, Iraq and Libya, and on securing needed European financial contributions for the Korean Energy Development Organization, an essential vehicle for terminating North Korea's nuclear weapons program.

We are working to strengthen bilateral and multilateral arrangements to assure the identification, extradition and prosecution of persons engaged in drug trafficking, organized crime, terrorism and alien smuggling, and we are building European support for new institutions to train law enforcement officers in former Communist countries, such as the International Law Enforcement Academy in Budapest.

And we are giving a new priority in our diplomacy to the protection of the global environment, coordinating our negotiating positions and assistance programs on such issues as population, climate change, ozone depletion, desertification, and marine pollution. For we have learned that environmental initiatives can be vitally important to our goals of prosperity and security: negotiations on water resources are central to the Middle East peace process, and a Haiti denuded of its forests will have a hard time supporting a stable democracy and keeping its people from flooding our shores.

On the third priority: promoting open markets and prosperity:

Having worked with our host countries to bring a successful conclusion to the Uruguay Round, we are now busily engaged in discussing left-over questions like market access for audiovisuals, telecommunications, and bio-engineered foods, and new issues like trade and labor standards, trade and environment, and trade and competition policy.

We are also encouraging the enlargement of the European Union to Central and Eastern Europe and we are reporting carefully on the prospects of the European Monetary Union by the target date of 1999 and on the implications of an EMU for U.S. interests.

You can see from this still incomplete catalogue of our activities that our embassies in Europe are in a very real sense global embassies engaged on global as well as on bilateral and regional problems. You might even say we are busy carrying out the foreign policy of the president and the Secretary of State from "platform Europe."

In carrying out this rich global foreign policy agenda we will be greatly assisted by the agreement that was reached in Madrid last December between President Clinton, Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez and President Jacques Santer of the European Commission on the "New Transatlantic Agenda" and its accompanying "U.S.-EU Action Plan."

These documents were a major achievement of Spain's EU presidency. They represent an historic breakthrough in U.S. relations with the European Union, moving those relations beyond consultation to common action on almost all of the foreign policy questions I cited earlier and many others I have no time to mention.

A senior-level group from the United States, the European Commission and the EU Presidency country (currently Italy) is responsible for monitoring progress on this large agenda and modifying it as necessary.

Just as our embassy in Madrid had a special role in U.S.-EU diplomacy during Spain's EU Presidency, Embassy Rome now has special responsibilities. The action will pass to Embassy Dublin when Ireland takes the EU presidency in the second half of the year.

The Madrid documents commit the U.S. and the EU to building a new "Transatlantic Marketplace." We have agreed to undertake a study on the reduction or elimination of tariffs and non-tariff barriers between the two sides of the Atlantic. Even as the study proceeds, we will be looking at things that can be done rather promptly, such as eliminating investment restrictions, duplicative testing and certification requirement, and conflicting regulations. This means more work not only in Brussels and Washington but in each of our embassies.

We will also be following closely the EU's Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) that is now opening in Turin. The common foreign and security policy provided for in the Maastricht Treaty is still a work in progress. Although the EU provides substantial economic aid and takes important regional trade initiatives, it has so far proved unable to deal with urgent security crises like those in the former Yugoslavia and the Aegean.

The IGC offers an opportunity to revise EU institutions and procedures so that a common foreign and security policy can be made to work in an EU whose membership could grow from 15 to 27 in the decade ahead. We hope that opportunity will be seized.

What changes the IGC should make in the Maastricht Treaty is exclusively for the EU countries to decide, but the United States is not indifferent to the outcome. We believe our interests are served by continuing progress toward European political as well as economic unity, which will make Europe a more effective partner for the United States in world affairs.

I have tried to provide a sense of what U.S. foreign policy is all about in 1996, especially in Europe, and of the critical role that ambassadors and embassies play. I have chosen examples from Europe both because Europe plays a global role and because Europe is currently my vantage point, but you would undoubtedly learn about a rich menu of activity from my ambassadorial colleagues in other key regions of the world if they were here with us tonight.

The question that remains to be answered is whether the American people and the Congress are willing to provide the financial resources to make all this activity possible. The politics of our national budget situation has ominous implications for our foreign policy in general and our international diplomacy in particular.

Let us begin with some very round numbers. We have a Gross Domestic Product of about \$7 trillion and a federal budget of about \$1.6 trillion. Nearly \$1.1 trillion of that \$1.6 trillion goes to mandatory payments—the so-called entitlement programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, and social security and also federal pensions and interest on the national debt. The remaining \$500 billion divides about equally between the defense budget and civilian discretionary spending—which account for some \$250 billion each.

Of the \$250 billion of civilian discretionary spending, about \$20 billion used to be devoted on the average of years to international affairs—the so-called 150 account. This account includes our assessed and voluntary payments to the UN, our bilateral aid and contributions to the international financial institutions, the U.S. Information Agency's broadcasting and educational exchange programs, and the State Department budget.

Congressional spending cuts have now brought the international affairs account down to about \$17 billion annually—about 1 percent of our total budget. Taking inflation into account, this \$17 billion is nearly a 50 percent reduction in real terms from the level of a decade ago. For Fiscal Year 1997, the Congressional leadership proposes a cut to \$15.7 billion. Its 7-year plan to balance the budget would bring international affairs spending down to \$12.5 billion a year by 2002.

Keep in mind that about \$5 billion of the 150 account goes to Israel and Egypt—rightly so, in my opinion, because of the priority we accord to Middle East peace. So under the Congressional balanced budget scenario only \$7.5 billion would be left four years from now for all of our other international spending.

These actual and prospective cuts in our international affairs account are devastating. Among other things, they mean:

That we cannot pay our legally owing dues to the United Nations system, thus severely undermining the world organization's work for peace and compromising our efforts for UN reform.

That we cannot pay our fair share of voluntary contributions to UN agencies and international financial institutions to assist the world's poor and promote free markets, economic growth, environmental protection and population stabilization;

That we must drastically cut back the reach of the Voice of America and the size of our Fulbright and International Visitor programs, all of them important vehicles for influencing foreign opinion about the United States;

That we will have insufficient funds to respond to aid requirements in Bosnia, Haiti, the Middle East, the former Communist countries and in any new crises where our national interests are at stake;

That we will have fewer and smaller offices to respond to the 2 million requests we receive each year for assistance to Americans overseas and to safeguard our borders through the visa process.

And that we will be unable to maintain a world-class diplomatic establishment as the delivery vehicle for our foreign policy.

A final word on this critical last point. The money which Congress makes available to maintain the State Department and our overseas embassies and consulates is now down to about \$2.5 billion a year. As the international affairs account continues to go down, we face the prospect of further cuts. The budget crunch has been exacerbated by the need to find money to pay for our new embassies in the newly independent countries of the former Soviet Union.

In our major European embassies, we have already reduced State Department positions by 25 percent since Fiscal Year 1995. We have been told to prepare for cuts of 40 percent or more from the 1995 base over the next two or three years.

In our Madrid embassy, to take an example, this will leave us with something like three political and three economic officers besides the ambassador and deputy chief of mission to perform our essential daily diplomatic work of advocacy, representation and reporting in the broad range of vitally important areas I have enumerated. Our other embassies face similarly devastating reductions.

I have to tell you that cuts of this magnitude will gravely undermine our ability to influence foreign governments and will severely diminish our leadership role in world affairs. They will also have detrimental consequences for our intelligence capabilities since embassy reporting is the critical overt components of U.S. intelligence collection. In expressing these concerns I believe I am representing the views of the overwhelming majority of our career and non-career ambassadors.

I know this conclusion will be greeted with incredulity by people who see hundreds of people in each of our major embassies overseas. What is not generally realized is that 80 percent of more of these people are from agencies other than the State Department. They are from the Department of Defense, Commerce and Agriculture, the Drug Enforcement Administration and the FBI, the IRS and the Social Security Administration, and so forth. And most of the 20 percent that is the reduced State Department component of the embassies is performing either consular work or administrative tasks in support of the largely non-State diplomatic mission.

Do not misunderstand me. The non-State component of an embassy is very important to our overseas interests. But the agendas of the non-State agencies are narrow and specialized. As the State Department component is slashed in relation to other agencies, it inevitably eviscerates our core diplomatic mission and diminishes the capacity of an ambassador to direct and coordinate the varied elements of his embassy in pursuit of a coherent foreign policy. Moreover, the drastic reduction in foreign service positions discourages the entry of talented young people and forces the selection out of many senior

officers with experience and skills we can ill afford to lose.

Under the pressure of Congressional budget cuts, the State Department is eliminating 13 diplomatic posts, including consulates in such important European cities as Stuttgart, Zurich, Bilbao and Bordeaux. The Bordeaux Consulate dated back to the time of George Washington. Try explaining to the French that we cannot afford a consulate there now when we were able to afford one then when we were a nation of 3 million people.

The consulates I have mentioned not only provided important services to American residents and tourists, they were political lookout posts, export promotion platforms, and centers for interaction with regional leaders in a Europe where regions are assuming growing importance. Now they will all be gone.

Closing the 13 posts is estimated to save about \$9 million a year, one quarter of the cost of an F-16 fighter plane. Bilbao, for example, cost \$200,000 a year. A B-2 bomber costs about \$2,000 million. I remind you that \$2 billion pays nearly all the salaries and expenses of running the State Department—including our foreign embassies—for a year.

Let us be clear about what is going on. The commendable desire to balance our national budget, the acute allergy of the American people to tax increases (indeed, their desire for tax reductions), the explosion of entitlement costs with our aging population, and the need to maintain a strong national defense, all combine to force a drastic curtailment of the civilian discretionary spending which is the principal public vehicle for domestic and international investments essential to our country's future.

Having no effective constituency, spending on international affairs is taking a particularly severe hit within the civilian discretionary account and with it the money needed for our diplomatic establishment. The President and the Secretary of State are doing their best to correct this state of affairs, but they will need greater support from the Congress and the general public than has been manifest so far if this problem is to be properly resolved.

I submit that it will not be resolved until there is a recognition that the international affairs budget is in a very real sense a national security budget—because diplomacy is our first line of national defense. The failure to build solid international relationships and treat the causes of conflict today will surely mean costly military interventions tomorrow.

As a unique fraternity of international lawyers you know all this. I'm restating the obvious tonight because what is obvious to us does not seem obvious to our body politic. And let's not forget that you can't advance the cause of international law without international diplomacy.

Along with other constituencies adversely affected by the hollowing out of our foreign affairs capability—businessmen, arms controllers, environmentalists, citizen groups concerned about human rights, disease, poverty, crime, drugs and terrorism—you must make your voices heard in the Congress and the mass media.

I close this lugubrious discourse with a story. Danielle and I recently invited two bright third graders from the American School of Madrid to be overnight guests in our residence. During dinner Danielle asked one of them, a precocious little boy of 8, if he knew what ambassadors do.

The little boy looked puzzled for a moment, then smiled and said, "Save the world."

As you can imagine, I was pleased by that answer. But then the little boy thought some more and asked: "Just how do you save the world?"

I don't claim that ambassadors save the world. But until our country can answer the question "Who needs ambassadors?"—and who needs embassies—we will be heading for big trouble.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 6:01 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution making corrections to Public Law 104-134.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-2361. A communication from the Executive Director of the National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Inspector General for fiscal year 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2362. A communication from the Executive Director of the National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the internal controls and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2363. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1995; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2364. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the budget summary for International Narcotics Control Program for fiscal year 1996; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2365. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2366. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2367. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2369. A communication from the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1995; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2370. A communication from the President of the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the audit for fiscal year 1995; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2371. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the Montgomery GI Bill for fiscal year 1995; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2372. A communication from the Chief of the Drug and Chemical Evaluation Section of the Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting,