

It is easy to understand why, because, as Senator DORGAN read from the letters of young people, they were saying to their parents, "Gee, will you hold it against me if I don't go into farming?" Well, it is pretty hard to justify going into farming. It is pretty hard to justify staying on the family farm because we, as a country, have said, as a matter of policy, "We're not going to be there for you." Our competitors are going to spend \$50 billion a year supporting their producers, and we are going to spend one-tenth as much. So we say, "You go into the fight, but you go unarmed."

Mr. President, we can do better than that. America is better than that. And the loss to this country will be incalculable if we push an entire generation of farmers off the land. I know that at some point we will wake up and we will say, "Gee, we have a program to get people back out there." And what will it cost us then, as we realize it makes no sense to push everybody into the cities of America, that instead we ought to have people spread out across the land?

But right now we are headed on a collision course with economic reality. And that reality is: Our farmers are at such a disadvantage that they cannot survive. So that is the question that is before the body tonight. And that is the question that is going to be before the body tomorrow. Are we going to do something to help these family farmers through this valley of extraordinarily low prices and natural disasters or are we just going to let them go? I pray that we respond and help family farm agriculture survive in this country. It is right at the heart of what makes this country strong.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The Senator from New Mexico.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement, the Senate will now proceed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 4060.

Mr. DOMENICI. Under the unanimous consent agreement, there are other Senators who have time on this bill. I do not know if they are going to use their time. I am informed I can yield—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will withhold for one moment. The report will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes on the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4060), have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by all of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of September 25, 1998.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico and Senator REID control 10 minutes jointly.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I will try to stay within 5 minutes. I thank the Senate which will be adopting the conference report. It is a good report.

We will put a statement in that identifies some of the very new approaches to better governance. We do not have that completely in the Department yet, but we have some new ideas that we are imposing on the Department that will permit it to be run a little better than in the past.

I want to change to another subject, and that is the Tennessee Valley Authority and the \$75 million that was, this year, put in the President's budget for the nonpower aspects of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. President, I hope that nobody is trying to make political hay out of the fact that the U.S. House of Representatives would not fund the \$75 million for the TVA in this year's appropriations bill, and as a consequence we did not fund it. Let me tell you why the House would not fund it, and make sure that the RECORD is replete with the background information that the U.S. House had last year and this year regarding the \$75 million.

First of all, there is a gentleman, who I do not know, named Craven Crowell—Chairman Craven Crowell. I think he was appointed to the board by the Clinton-Gore administration in 1993.

In 1997, meeting with Members of Congress and the administration, the Chairman argued that TVA's so-called "nonpower programs," which include flood control and navigation on the Tennessee River, as well as management of some unique resources on the Land Between the Lakes National Recreation Area, indicated that these nonpower programs should be transferred to other Federal agencies, leaving the Tennessee Valley Authority to focus solely on the production of electrical power.

Less than 1 month later, this very proposal to no longer fund that kind of activity because it should be transferred to other Federal agencies found its way into the 1998 budget request. The TVA Chairman had made an interesting proposal just a couple of weeks prior, and already it had been incorporated into the administration's budget. There is no way that that would have happened if people in the administration had not been aware of what Chairman Crowell was planning to propose, and if they had not given him the green light to do that.

I would like to incorporate in the RECORD a news release dated February 6, 1997, "President's Budget Supports Ending TVA Appropriations." I ask

unanimous consent that the news release be printed in the RECORD.

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

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET SUPPORTS ENDING TVA APPROPRIATIONS

TVA's request for \$106 million in federal funding for 1998 and its proposal to eliminate all taxpayer funding of TVA's appropriated programs by Fiscal Year 1999 received support from the Clinton Administration today in the President's budget submitted to Congress.

"We very much appreciate the administration's support of this funding level for 1998 and the proposal to phase out all federal funding of appropriated programs by Fiscal Year 1999," TVA Chairman Craven Crowell said at a news conference in Knoxville.

The President's budget also directs TVA and the Army Corps of Engineers to complete a joint study by September 1, 1997, on the integration of TVA and Corps activities to improve the operation of the Tennessee and Cumberland river systems.

"Future cooperation between TVA and the Corps could be the linchpin that makes it possible to end all federal funding for TVA's appropriated programs," Crowell said. "We believe more cooperation between TVA and the Corps would be a win-win situation for both of us and would greatly reduce expenditures of tax dollars."

As noted in the President's budget, TVA will work with Congress, state and local governments and other interested parties in a major effort to find alternate ways to fund, organize and manage the taxpayer-funded programs.

Crowell also said that a 17-member task force has been formed to work out the details of the proposal. Kate Jackson, executive vice president of the Resource Group, will chair the task force, which includes representatives from all parts of TVA.

In his 1998 budget, the President recommends the same level of funding TVA received in 1997. The budget recommendation includes \$81.5 million for water and land stewardship; \$7.9 million for Land Between The Lakes, an increase of nearly \$2 million over this year's funding; \$6.6 million for a feasibility study on a proposed new navigation lock at Chickamauga Dam; \$6 million for the TVA Environmental Research Center in Muscle Shoals; and \$4 million for economic development.

Funding requests for the Environmental Research Center and economic development are down \$9 million and \$11 million, respectively, reflecting TVA's previously announced plan to phase out appropriated funds for those activities.

TVA uses federal funds to manage the Tennessee River system, maintain 11,000 miles of shoreline and 420,000 acres of public land, conduct environmental research and promote economic development.

The federally appropriated funds are separate from TVA's power budget which is financed from power sales. Revenues from power sales totaled almost \$5.7 billion in 1996. TVA provides power to 160 distributors who serve nearly 8 million customers in seven southeastern states.

The 1998 fiscal year begins Oct. 1, 1997, and ends Sept. 30, 1998.

Mr. DOMENICI. This is a TVA release that suggests that Chairman Crowell and others have decided that they do not need the \$75 million and that other Federal agencies are going to take over. And the U.S. House had this release, had the proposal to eliminate Federal funding of TVA's appropriated programs in January of 1997.

Mr. President, what has happened is that after doing this, and leaving the distinct impression with the U.S. House Subcommittee on Appropriations that they were not going to need the money anymore, and surely were not going to need it for the 1999 appropriations bill, they have changed their mind. That is, both the Chairman down there in the Tennessee Valley Authority area and the White House. They now want the money, after going through all of this that I have just discussed with the Senate.

Let me tell you, what they did by proposing this was to get all of those in the surrounding areas who do not necessarily agree with the TVA to join in saying they do not need the money. And there are private power companies who clearly do not think TVA needs this nonpower money. But both the administration and the Chairman, Chairman Crowell, had indicated they do not need the money.

Mr. President, in spite of that, because the administration changed its mind, and the Senators from Tennessee and from Kentucky and others came to me and said, "Well, we know we said we don't need the funding anymore, but will you fund it another time for us?" I did. The Senate approved.

Mr. President, what has happened is the U.S. House said no, and, frankly, there is no way to change their mind because what they throw back at us is, we were just told in 1997 that that was the last year we needed that subsidy, that \$75 million.

Frankly, if there is any blame to go around, it does not lie with the Senators, who did everything humanly possible. They got the Senate to fund it, they encouraged me to hold it, they even met with Members of the House to tell them to put it back in, but what they got was what we might have expected.

You just told us last year you don't need it anymore. The chairman down there issued this plan saying we don't need it. The President's budget said we don't need it.

Now, if there is any reason that we didn't get it, it is because of that, not because of partisan politics. There are no Democrats on the committee who went to conference with me who are in favor of that. No one in the House is in favor of it, because you tell the House, and apparently this is how it works over there; it is not too bad. It sounds like the way you would behave. Tell the House this is the last year we are funding TVA \$75 million, and they aren't too sure you want to fund it anyway. You do it and then you come around and change your mind after you have had this exhaustive plan and this commission appointed so that you won't have to have this money. You come along and say, as I said, we need it in another year, and they are saying the House will not vote for it another year, we can stay here until Hades gets a little cool, but we will not approve it because you told us you don't need it,

and now we have too much support against it and it will not be funded.

I am very hopeful for those who wanted to point fingers either at this Senator because he is Republican or some of the other Senators from the Tennessee Valley area. It is not their fault. Frankly, I don't think it is the committee's fault. It is just one of those things where, the way the House argued the case, you can't make them change their mind. And what they said was pretty logical. They had some good points. I know the occupant of the Chair served in the House. When you tell the House committee you are not going to fund it one single year beyond this one and come back and say, after all those plans and us getting money out of you, we need another year, it is not easy.

Nonetheless, I want to say I am trying, because the Tennessee Valley Authority has some very expensive interests on some outstanding long-term obligations, bonds and indebtedness, that they know they have to refinance, and in the process of refinancing, there would be a change in the interest rates. Obviously, it would be better and they would save money. We are trying to put together an amendment that would be taken care of as part of overall appropriations which would give them some interest rebate. So to the extent that this would help offset what they now think will be a big void because of the \$75 million, we will try that.

It actually has strong support from a number of Senators, including the Tennessee Senators, that we try to do this. I say to the people there, I am going to try to do this with their help and with the help of Chairman STEVENS and others here in the U.S. Senate who I think will understand this issue and have understood it and will try to help us.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this last week the Conference on the Energy and Water Development Appropriations concluded and has provided \$21,332,135 for the programs, projects and activities of the Department of Energy, Army Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and other independent agencies. I would like to say that I generally support the Conference Report which Chairman DOMENICI recommend to the Senate today.

Just as a balanced bill cannot accommodate all the priorities and projects of Members of Congress, neither could this conference report. Nevertheless, it is because of the scope of this bill, providing vital services of the Department of Energy and the many water projects around the nation that the Senate needs to support the Conference Report.

For instance, the Department of Energy's breadth of responsibilities range from activities in nonproliferation to fissile materials disposition and from the projects in solar and renewable resources to the clean up of defense facilities such as Savannah River, Oak Ridge and Hanford.

Specifically, in the Defense part of the bill, we were told that the Stockpile Stewardship Management, the program that provides safety and reli-

ability of the nuclear stockpile, needed \$4.5 billion, yet even as we are providing it \$4.4 billion we are increasing our oversight of construction projects to prevent waste and mismanagement. Without the Stockpile Stewardship program we would not have the ability to be able to verify to the President that the nuclear stockpile is safe and reliable and we would be living under continued testing of nuclear weapons.

In the Nondefense work at the Department of Energy, the Office of Science (formerly known as Energy Research) has facilitated many projects in science that will have practical impacts on the future of our society including the treatment of cancer, the isolation of diseased genes, and the tracing of contaminants in soils. I would note the vast research effort being made in the Fusion Energy Sciences. The Department has tried to cover its bases by funding different types of fusion energy research, but it eventually will have to make choices to focus on the most feasible technologies and the Conferees have provided this research almost \$230 million.

We, as a subcommittee and Conference, were placed in an impossible dilemma regarding the funding of water projects and, in particular, the construction projects of the Corps of Engineers. The Conferees recognize the value of the civil works program in protecting lives and property throughout the United States and in preserving commercial trade in our ports and harbors; but we simply were not given the funds to reflect the importance of the Corps projects. Consequently, while the Conferees provided \$1.429 billion in Corps Construction, there were many construction projects that could not receive the funding that they needed. This is unfortunate since the Corps has many projects around the United States that will now be hindered by uncertain schedules and planning that may become useless. On the other hand, projects such as the Chicago Shoreline, the Kill Van Kull Channel in New York and New Jersey, Charleston Harbor and Virginia Beach, among many others, were able to receive enough to address their emergency circumstances. The dredging of the ports and harbors along both the Atlantic and Pacific coastlines as well as the harbors in the Gulf of Mexico is no small task and responsibility for the Corps. On an annual basis, the U.S. ports and harbors handle an estimated \$600 billion in international cargo generating over \$150 billion in tax revenue. There are small navigation projects totaling \$6 million; but there are larger projects that require an even greater commitment. It is unfortunate that, because of the funding dilemmas that we faced, water projects that are vital to communities and industries around the nation will now be stalled and mired in uncertainty. The administration should take note of the many criticisms of the budget request for the Army Corps of Engineers and recognize the essential role it has throughout the nation.

Another major agency under the jurisdiction of this appropriation is the Bureau of Reclamation, whose historical responsibility to manage the precious waters in the West extends back to the Newland Project in Nevada. I will not subscribe to any notion that

the Bureau is obsolete or unneeded and will oppose any effort to minimize the Bureau's role in water preservation. It's responsibility of reclaiming water and reusing it in communities is as needed now as ever. In the first half of the century, dams were built in managing the water systems, now we must be focusing on other reuse methods like desalination systems.

Throughout the arid West the Bureau has assisted in the use and management of water and has even facilitated the cooperation of community interests such as the CALFED Bay Delta Project in California which received \$75 million to continue its management of the Delta system which means that agriculture, environmental, and industry are cooperating in unprecedented ways. There are reclamation and water supply projects from Arizona to Idaho and from Washington to New Mexico. The communities benefit from new sources of water such as the community in Montana that will no longer have to haul their water for miles in pickup

trucks so that their homes can have water. This was the goal of the Bureau of Reclamation when it was founded: to provide the homes and communities throughout the West with water and it remains the goal today.

Mr. President, this conference report does not satisfy everybody, nor does it do justice to the many water projects that need our support, but it is the best the conference could arrive at with the funding allocations that we were given. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to support this Conference Report. And I thank the staff of the Energy and Water Subcommittee for their hard work and diligence throughout the process: Alex Flint, David Gwaltney, Gregory Daines, Lashwanda Leftwich, Elizabeth Blevins and Bob Perret on my personal staff.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, H.R. 5060, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1999, complies with the Budget Act's section 302(b) allocation of budget authority and outlays.

The conference report provides \$20.9 billion in budget authority and \$13.0 billion in new outlays to fund the civil programs of the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, certain independent agencies, and most of the activities of the Department of Energy. When outlays from prior year budget authority and other actions are taken into account, this bill provides a total of \$20.7 billion in outlays.

For defense discretionary programs, the conference report is below its allocation by \$11 million in budget authority and \$1 million in outlays. The conference report also is below its non-defense discretionary allocation by \$20 million in budget authority and \$46 million in outlays.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Budget Committee scoring of this conference report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

H.R. 4060, ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS, 1999, SPENDING COMPARISONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

(Fiscal year 1999, in millions of dollars)

	Defense	Non-defense	Crime	Man-datory	Total
Conference Report:					
Budget authority	12,019	8,889	20,908
Outlays	11,819	8,853	20,672
Senate 302(b) allocation:					
Budget authority	12,030	8,909	20,939
Outlays	11,820	8,899	20,719
1998 level:					
Budget authority	11,680	8,999	20,679
Outlays	11,675	9,008	20,683
President's request:					
Budget authority	12,298	9,003	21,301
Outlays	11,875	9,150	21,025
House-passed bill:					
Budget authority	11,934	8,719	20,653
Outlays	11,171	8,742	20,513
Senate-passed bill:					
Budget authority	12,030	8,912	20,942
Outlays	11,818	8,896	20,714
Conference Report Compared To:					
Senate 302(b) allocation:					
Budget authority	-11	-20	-31
Outlays	-1	-46	-47
1998 level:					
Budget authority	339	-110	229
Outlays	144	-155	-11
President's request					
Budget authority	-279	-114	-393
Outlays	-56	-297	-353
House-passed bill:					
Budget authority	85	170	255
Outlays	48	111	159
Senate-passed bill:					
Budget authority	-11	-23	-34
Outlays	1	-43	-42

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with current scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, fellow Senators, I rise today with my colleague, Senator MACK, to discuss the status of the Kissimmee River Restoration project in the state of Florida. This project is a land acquisition and canal backfilling project. It was authorized by Congress in the Water Resources Development Act of 1992. The state of Florida has spent approximately \$95 million in land acquisition and restoration evaluation. The state of Florida has met all of the necessary schedule requirements defined in the Project Cooperation Agreement with the Corps to keep this project on schedule.

To date, the state's expenditures far exceed the federal contribution—a situation that occurred by design. The state of Florida has front-loaded the land acquisition costs and the federal government is supposed to back-load construction costs.

Mr. MACK. The first backfilling contract is scheduled to be awarded on March 30, 1999. For this contract to be awarded, the Corps has indicated that between \$22 and \$23 million must be appropriated for this project. Today we are reviewing an Energy and Water appropriations bill that includes only \$8 million for the Kissimmee River project.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have been involved in the Kissimmee River project since my days as Governor of the state of Florida. This project is the first step in a long series of individual projects that seek to restore the Florida Everglades to a state as close to their natural state as possible. The results of this backfill contract will be visible to the naked eye. This first contract would backfill 9 miles of the Kissimmee Canal; restoring approximately 16 square miles of restored river/floodplain ecosystem and 17 miles of river

channel. Not only will this have important ecological benefits, but it will also make an important contribution to increasing water storage capacity and improving water quality north of Lake Okechobee.

Mr. MACK. The Kissimmee River restoration project is at a critical phase. With the current funding levels in the 1999 Energy and Water appropriations bill, this project will not move forward. We both understand the difficult nature of funding decisions in these times of tight budgets, but we also recognize the responsibility of the federal government to meet its costshare requirements with the state of Florida and fund the construction phase of this project.

Mr. GRAHAM. Today, I ask the Chair and Ranking Member of the Senate Energy and Water Appropriations Committee, Senators DOMENICI and REID, of

your intentions for the future of the Kissimmee project.

Senator MACK and I remain committed to forward progress on the Kissimmee River restoration. We would like to work with the committee to identify potential reprogramming opportunities within the Army Corps budget that might allow forward progress on this project which is so critical to Everglades restoration.

We would also like to work with the committee during the fiscal year 2000 appropriations process to ensure that the Kissimmee River restoration is funded at appropriate levels.

Mr. DOMENICI. I recognize the importance of this project to the state of Florida, and I look forward to working with the Senators from Florida to identify any potential funding alternatives or reprogramming options for the Kissimmee River project. We will work together in the next year to include appropriate funding levels for the Kissimmee River restoration project in the fiscal year 2000 appropriations bill.

Mr. REID. I would like to echo the comments of Senator DOMENICI by stating my support for the Kissimmee River restoration project. I, too, look forward to working with both Senators GRAHAM and MACK in the next week to identify any funding or reprogramming opportunities for the Kissimmee River project.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I rise to engage the chairman of the Subcommittee, Senator DOMENICI, in a brief colloquy. It has come to my attention that, due to some confusion regarding the funding of an on-going Section 1135 ecosystem restoration project of a similar name, the conference report to accompany the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill eliminated funding for the Duwamish and Green River Basin study. Would the chairman agree that neither the Committee nor the conferees are opposed to the ongoing Duwamish and Green River Basin study?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington is correct. There has been some confusion regarding this study and the funding for the Green-Duwamish ecosystem restoration project under the Section 1135 program.

Mr. GORTON. Would the Chairman also agree that the Corps of Engineers should seek a reprogramming of funds to keep this important project on schedule and, if sought, would the chairman be inclined to approve such a request?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I agree that, if appropriate, the Corps of Engineers should seek to reprogram funds to keep this study moving forward. I am not aware of any opposition to the project and do not anticipate a problem with a reprogramming request.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the Chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee, for the outstanding work he has done on this bill. This is an extremely tough bill covering a diverse range of issues

from our nation's nuclear defenses, to scientific research to water projects impacting each and every state. He has done a superb job in balancing these needs. I wish to especially thank him for recognizing the special needs for Positron Emission Tomography work at the Medical University of South Carolina in Charleston, South Carolina.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I appreciate his interest in this bill and in medical research. The Subcommittee appreciated the Senator bringing the Medical University of South Carolina's needs to the Committee's attention last year and he has again made a convincing case for them this year.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Cancer rates in South Carolina are some of the highest in the nation, with more than 17,000 new cases diagnosed and more than 8,100 deaths each year. The funding in this bill is critical to our efforts to combat cancer in South Carolina as well as the nation and I thank the Senator.

In closing, there may be some slight confusion regarding the funds for the Medical University of South Carolina. I want to make sure everyone understands these funds are to build upon last year's efforts and are to be used to design and construct an expansion of the Medical University of South Carolina's cancer research center to provide space for Positron Emission Tomography treatment. Is that your understanding?

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator from South Carolina is correct. I thank him for clarifying this matter.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I have read and agree with the subcommittee's views on improving the efficiency of Nuclear Regulation Commission regulation. There is significant evidence that different, but equally protective, approaches to regulation could result in more efficient regulatory practices.

As I am sure the Senator from New Mexico is aware, there are some areas within the Commission's purview that will be challenged to keep up with the growing workload even in the face of significant improvements in efficiency. An example is the Spent Fuel Project Office (SFPO) which is responsible for approving domestic use new dual purpose canister systems for the safe storage and transportation of spent nuclear fuel; ensuring the safety of existing technologies that have been deployed throughout the nuclear energy industry as needs for out-of-pool storage have emerged; reviewing and approving cask technologies necessary to support high priority non-proliferation activities of the United States, including the DOE Foreign Research Reactor Spent Fuel Receipt Program; reviewing and approving the transportation technologies for nuclear materials other than spent fuel; and reviewing and ap-

proving or providing support to a host of other spent fuel storage and transportation initiatives sponsored by either the federal government or private interests.

Does the Chairman agree with me that this plays an important role and does he believe that the agency recognizes the importance of the office's work?

Mr. DOMENICI. I agree with the Senator's observations. The licensing of technologies to handle the storage and transportation of various types of spent fuel is one of the few areas within the Commission's budget in which the demand for regulatory activity is clearly increasing.

In addition, I hope the agency will examine further management initiatives, such as those currently under review, that might be necessary in the short term to address existing budget constraints and to ensure that the resources that are available are being utilized to maximize the likelihood of succession review of application for new technologies.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia that the Commission should continue to monitor the workload of the SFPO to ensure that adequate resources are available to meet demand for application reviews.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, all time is yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

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

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

SENATE TASK FORCE ON PLUTONIUM DISPOSITION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, the end of the Cold War served to greatly reduce the threat of global instability, but the world is far from being a safe place today. Challenges to continued world peace—from increased terrorist activities to display of nuclear weapon capabilities by new countries—seem to occur weekly. To date, we have not had to face the dreaded combination of terrorists with nuclear arms, but that possibility must be considered as we evaluate new terrorist threats.

Designs for crude nuclear weapons, potentially more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb, are readily available today. The only hurdle for terrorists to overcome is acquisition of the plutonium or highly enriched uranium needed to build the weapon.

Senator PETE DOMENICI, my colleague from New Mexico, has grappled with these issues for many years. He