

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

Mr. RUDMAN. Mr. President, before we go to third reading, I just want to thank members of the staff on both sides for their extraordinary work during the last number of months getting this bill to the floor.

I do not believe there are further amendments.

I wonder if my friend from South Carolina has anything to say before we go to third reading.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, we have only a minute, so I want to say, right to the point, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has come right in and taken over from our distinguished chairman, Senator PAUL LAXALT, and in a short time, mastered the bill and done an outstanding job. It is a privilege to work with him. I compliment him particularly and his staff, Rick Spees, John Shank, and Santal Manos and, of course, our good staff, Warren Kane. I thank him very much.

Mr. RUDMAN. Mr. President, let me say to my good friend from South Carolina that working on this committee with Senator HOLLINGS as ranking member is not only a pleasure, but often a delight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be offered? If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] would vote "yea."

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAXALT). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 275 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Abdnor	Garn	McConnell
Andrews	Glenn	Meicher
Armstrong	Goldwater	Metzenbaum
Baucus	Gore	Mitchell
Bingaman	Gorton	Moynihan
Boren	Grassley	Murkowski
Boschwitz	Harkin	Nunn
Bradley	Hart	Packwood
Bumpers	Hatch	Pell
Burdick	Hawkins	Pressler
Byrd	Hecht	Pryor
Chafee	Helms	Quayle
Chiles	Hollings	Riegle
Cochran	Inouye	Rockefeller
Cohen	Kassebaum	Rudman
Cranston	Kasten	Sarbanes
D'Amato	Kennedy	Sasser
Danforth	Kerry	Simon
Denton	Lautenberg	Simpson
Dixon	Laxalt	Specter
Dodd	Leahy	Stafford
Dole	Levin	Stennis
Domenici	Long	Stevens
Durenberger	Lugar	Thurmond
Eagleton	Mathias	Trible
East	Matsunaga	Warner
Evans	Mattingly	Weicker
Ford	McClure	Wilson

NAYS—10

Exon	Humphrey	Symms
Gramm	Nickles	Zorinsky
Heflin	Proxmire	
Helms	Roth	

NOT VOTING—6

Bentsen	DeConcini	Johnston
Biden	Hatfield	Wallop

So the bill (H.R. 2965), as amended, was passed.

Mr. RUDMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. RUDMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer [Mr. LAXALT] appointed Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUE, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. CHILES, and Mr. LAUTENBERG conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. RUDMAN. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the majority leader and Democratic leader for assisting the subcommittee in getting this bill finally considered and voted on.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I also thank our distinguished minority leader here, along with the majority leader, and appreciate the help they gave us.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, if we could have order, I might be able to alert my colleagues what may happen the remainder of the day.

As I understand the pending business—what is the pending business?

AGRICULTURE, FOOD, TRADE, AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 1985

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the pending business.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1714) to expand export markets for United States agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, continue food assistance to low-income households, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Dole motion to recommit the bill, with instructions to report back forthwith, with Dole Amendment No. 939, dealing with intermediate export credits.

Dole Amendment No. 940 (to Amendment No. 939), of a perfecting nature.

Mr. DOLE. And there is a pending amendment?

AMENDMENT NO. 940

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment of the majority leader is No. 940.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it is my hope we can get an expression of interest in this amendment. For that reason I am going to move to table my own amendment and vote against the tabling motion.

I think it is time we find out. It is time the American farmers find out precisely what we have in mind for agriculture this year. We have been up and down this hill dozens of times in the last several months. There is no reason we should not express our views on whether we are willing to support a particular program or whether we just want more time, whether we want to kill a program, whether we want to participate, and I think we need a vote so we can determine where we go from here.

If in fact the motion to recommit is tabled, then that would indicate there is not enough support for this approach. It would mean going back into each program one at a time and taking a look at wheat, cotton, dairy, sugar, peanuts, soybeans, rice, and all the other commodity programs one at a time. It would mean taking a look at payment limitations, reducing the maximum amount with reference to all crops, whether it is wheat, whether it is sugar, or whatever it might be. It would mean taking a look at some cap on loans. Under the present sugar programs you can borrow up to \$4 million. That is the loan limit. Should it be that high? Some people do not think so.

Either we are going to get a farm bill or we are not going to get a farm bill. I happen to believe there are a number of us on both sides of the aisle who want a farm bill.

There has always been a bipartisan coalition around here when it came to

agriculture. That may be one reason it is in so much trouble.

But if there is not that coalition, then I think those of us who have an interest in specific commodities should have to fend for ourselves. We have had meetings without any result at all. Everyone is interested in one thing, protecting his own commodity. It is all right to cut the other program but do not touch ours.

Mr. President, I move to table the motion to recommit.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. DOLE. It is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No debate is in order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will suggest the absence of a quorum. It seems to me the Senator from Nebraska should be at least in a position to speak for a minute or two. We are going to take longer than that for this quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withhold the quorum and yield 5 minutes.

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

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, if I understand correctly, the majority leader still has the floor, is that correct?

Mr. DOLE. For 5 minutes to speak.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the majority leader if we are anxious to move the farm bill ahead why do we not get right into the farm bill as was reported out by a majority vote of the Agriculture Committee?

I know that the distinguished majority leader is a member of this committee, and he does not like the bill that came out of the committee. I know that the distinguished chairman of the committee does not like that bill.

But is there some reason that we are going through this game playing without going directly to a vote on the bill as it came out of the Agriculture Committee?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I just say we are trying to end the game playing. That is the whole reason for this approach. We have been playing games with the American farmers for 5 or 6 months. We tried to pass a bill in July. We could not do it.

I think either we are going to have a farm bill this year or we are not. I would say to all those who think their commodities are sacred nothing is sacred.

This motion to recommit, I might add, includes a number of the provisions that were available to all of us and a number of provisions to reduce

spending. The distinguished Senator from Montana indicated earlier he had a number and we put in nearly every one of those he suggested.

So it is sort of a bipartisan bill in that respect. It saves about \$7.6 billion. That may not be the last savings we are able to obtain. There is still sugar and there is the peanut program and there is the dairy program. Everyone else is taking a cut. Others do not want to cooperate.

So my view is we go out and do the best we can.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, if I may ask a further question, I ask the majority leader once again, why do we not go to the consideration of the bill that was reported out of the Agriculture Committee? This Senator for one does not agree with the majority leader that there are those of us who are trying to protect only our basic commodities. I think the bill that came out of the Agriculture Committee is a long ways from perfect, but I think it was a generally well-balanced bill, and I think we should face up to the fact that the main reason we are going through this game playing is that there are those on that side of the aisle, particularly, who do not want a 4-year freeze on target prices.

If there is remaining time, I wish to have my colleague from Montana ask a question because I know he is anxious to get involved in this short-term debate.

Mr. DOLE. I would be happy to provide 5 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the majority leader.

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

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, I have looked through the 188-page amendment, and I want to just express my judgment on a couple of points. The 1-year-target price freeze is in this package and that is very vigorously opposed by farmers and farm organizations no matter who they are and is really questioned by their creditors, whether they are banks or PCA's. So that is a negative point for the amendment.

The farmers need to express their judgment on this proposal and we have not had, of course, time to do that.

I am advised, however, by the various commodity groups, by their national organizations, that wheat and those commodity groups involving feed grains vigorously oppose the amendment. The same is true of rice and cotton.

Mr. President, while there has been a lot of charges of delaying tactics, we have waited all yesterday afternoon to see what this proposal will be. I do believe the expressions of these commodity groups should be taken rather seri-

ously right now and that we do have some opportunity to get back to them to see whether this kind of a proposal should ever be adopted. The tabling motion, if it fails—which I hope it does not fail. The majority leader is trying to table his own amendment. That is fine with me. It will be an expression of where the votes are, and so we will know that.

If the proposal is going to be adequately debated, we are going to need that feedback. If these national organizations located here in Washington are correct and that they oppose it, then I would suggest there is some big flaws in it. If they can take an instant reading like that and say, "Oh, no, we couldn't go for that," it must have some pretty big flaws. Those commodity organizations live this stuff day in and day out and, in most instances, they seem to represent the prevailing view of the farmers that produce those types of commodities, whatever it is, rice, cotton or feed grains or wheat.

Finally, the savings are in here, and the savings, as I read them, I have no objection to except one, and it is the \$2 billion that is saved by having the 1-year target price freeze. There are many other areas in the bill to get that type of savings. The package that I have put together was not the end game. There are more that can be found without wrecking the programs of the various commodities. But that added up to \$7.6 billion. The majority leader is correct. He has taken \$5.3 billion of those \$7.6 billion and put it in his own amendment. He gets the other \$2.3 billion by putting in the 1-year target price freeze.

There are possible savings in this bill to add up more than enough to bring it within the budget without doing that. We will have that opportunity to offer those savings under any event. We will have the opportunity on the 4-year target price to offer a corrective amendment on that one feature if it should prevail.

The majority leader has indicated that perhaps there are votes to come on the \$50,000 payment limitation, on the honey program, or on the milk program, or what have you. On all of those, those of us who have worked with this bill will stick with the provisions that are in that bill. And the votes to do that will be here on this side, plus whatever is necessary to make a majority on that side.

I thank the majority leader for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. DOLE, Mr. President, this is not a debate, but I appreciate the comments of both Senators. Let me indicate, first of all, that this is an effort worked out with the chairman, with Senators COCHRAN, LUGAR, and HELMS, myself, and a number of our colleagues on this side to sort of bring this matter to a head.

The chairman advised me he had about 5 months of hearings on this proposal, and it has passed the House. It is November 1. We are going to be tied up on reconciliation, the debt ceiling, and a number of other things the next couple of weeks. If we are going to pass a farm bill this year, we have to make some decisions.

All we are doing is offering an amendment. This is all you do when you bring a bill up, I say to my friend from Nebraska. We are not circumventing anything. We are trying to offer an amendment.

I hope those of us who come from farm States would take a look at it. There are some commodities not in this proposal. Some people objected because we did not put sugar in because they would like to see the sugar program changed in some way. Others are objecting because we even thought about putting it in. Peanuts are not in the program. The peanut people do not know what to do. They like what they have because they got more than anybody else. They even got an increase in the committee when everybody else was taking a decrease. So they are pretty happy. They do not want anybody to know about peanuts. "Don't mention peanuts; somebody will find out there are peanuts in the bill."

We have already discovered the peanuts. And we discovered the sugar. It is very costly.

Mr. BRADLEY. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY. The amendment as proposed contains no provision on sugar whatsoever; no change in the loan rate, no change in the transportation subsidy?

Mr. DOLE. No; it is identical to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Indiana, which contained nothing about sugar. It is a 1-year freeze for certain commodities. It is sort of a TOP program, Target Option Program, for wheat. It is a conservation reserve and it is the savings many of us have talked about, Senator MELCHER has talked about, as well as Members on this side.

Mr. BRADLEY. The Wheat Program is different than the amendment offered by Senator LUGAR?

Mr. DOLE. This amendment saves more money.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 2 minutes of the leader have expired.

The question is on the motion to table.

Mr. BYRD. Will the majority leader get another minute or so, so that I might ask a question?

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

Mr. BYRD. The question I have is: In light of the fact that we sought on our side of the aisle to be able to offer some amendments to this farm bill, the distinguished majority leader, exercising his right of recognition—and I have no problem with that; that is the way it ought to be—lined up a motion to recommit and amendments thereto, thus shutting out all other Senators from offering amendments, why that was all lined up last night and without any debate on the farm bill today and all of a sudden there is the motion to table this motion to recommit and amendments, I cannot understand that. Why are we not having some debate on the majority leader's amendment?

Mr. DOLE. I say to the distinguished minority leader that we have been debating this for 7 months and most of us from farm States understand it and we are afraid that some of the people from urban States may begin to understand part of it. They are already getting on to the sugar program and the peanut program. They are starting to understand some of it.

But we believe it is time we have a vote. Our farmers have already got their wheat in the ground in my State. I would be willing to debate it, if I could get an up-or-down vote later today. But it seemed to me that we ought to have a test vote to find out today whether this was going to fly. If not, maybe somebody else has a better idea.

But I know Senator MOYNIHAN and Senator HAWKINS have dairy amendments. There are at least 60-some additional amendments. We certainly do not want to preclude other amendments.

But it just seemed to me consideration of this amendment would be a good thing to do.

Mr. BYRD. If the distinguished majority leader will indulge me further, it seems to me that we are being asked to table an amendment we have had no debate on. We started for a while last night to read the amendment, then we called off the reading at my suggestion.

What I cannot understand is why we are moving now to table the majority leader's amendment, which has been in the Senate less than 24 hours. I was told that it is a comprehensive compromise or new farm bill.

I am not from a farm State. So I do not understand the content of the measure as well as do most other Senators, I am sure. But the distinguished majority leader calls his amendment up, will not let others call theirs up,

and then overnight decides to table his own amendment.

Mr. DOLE, Mr. President, I want to vote against tabling. If it is not tabled, we will have a lot of time for debate.

Mr. BYRD, Mr. President, is the distinguished majority leader not going to offer other amendments if his pending amendment is tabled?

Mr. DOLE. If this is tabled, I may have another one.

Mr. BYRD. Is this going to be tabled by the distinguished majority leader after a little while?

Mr. DOLE. I hope this is not tabled. There is a lot of work in this. I would like to have it considered. I hope my colleagues on both sides will take a careful look at the amendment. I think it has the makings of a good bipartisan farm bill.

So I hope it is not tabled.

Mr. BYRD. I did not know we were playing games around here until the distinguished majority leader said that that is what we are doing. So I understand that now this is just another play in the game playing.

Mr. DOLE. Well, it is a small one. I have not learned how to play the big ones yet.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas to lay on the table the amendment (No. 940) of the Senator from Kansas. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 276 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Baucus	Glenn	Melcher
Bingaman	Gore	Metzenbaum
Boren	Grassley	Mitchell
Bradley	Harkin	Moynihan
Bumpers	Hart	Nickles
Burdick	Heflin	Nunn
Byrd	Hollings	Pell
Chiles	Inouye	Pryor
Danforth	Kennedy	Riegle
Dixon	Kerry	Rockefeller
Dodd	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Durenberger	Leahy	Sasser
Eagleton	Levin	Simon
Exon	Long	Stennis
Ford	Matsunaga	Zorinsky

NAYS—49

Abdnor	Boschwitz	Cohen
Andrews	Chafee	Cranston
Armstrong	Cochran	D'Amato

Denton	Humphrey	Roth
Dole	Kassebaum	Rudman
Domenici	Kasten	Simpson
East	Laxalt	Specter
Evans	Lugar	Stafford
Garn	Mathias	Stevens
Goldwater	Mattingly	Symms
Gorton	McClure	Thurmond
Gramm	McConnell	Trible
Hatch	Murkowski	Warner
Hawkins	Packwood	Weicker
Hecht	Pressler	Wilson
Helms	Proxmire	
	Quayle	

NOT VOTING—6

Bentsen	DeConcini	Johnston
Biden	Hatfield	Wallop

So the motion to table amendment No. 940 was rejected.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, regular order.

Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BOSCHWITZ. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, what was the vote?

Mr. DOLE. I moved to reconsider the motion to table.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair just stated that the motion to lay on the table was agreed to. Is that correct?

Mr. DOLE. The motion to table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas understand?

Mr. BUMPERS. Yes, Mr. President.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am advised that we have now received a message from the House. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is not correct.

Mr. DOLE. 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. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I understand that the conference report has not yet arrived. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have a message from the House. The conference report has not appeared.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. While we are awaiting the conference report, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend beyond 4:30 p.m., with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each, with the exception of the distinguished

Senator from South Carolina, who would like 10 minutes.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I only do this, I tell the majority leader, to get some feel as to when we return to the farm bill or when we would expect to return to the farm bill.

Mr. DOLE. As I have indicated, we have a reconciliation matter, we have the debt ceiling, which will come ahead of the farm bill. I hope sometime on Monday.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. We have the House message. Does anyone know where the conference report is? Not too long ago, a conference report walked out of the east door over there. I hope that is not the case today.

Mr. DOLE. I have checked around. We cannot find it on this side, anyway. We have not checked the safe yet.

Mr. BYRD. All right.

SENATOR LUGAR—STRONG HELMSMAN

Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Mr. President, in today's Wall Street Journal my colleagues will find an article on DICK LUGAR, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. The article compliments the chairman on his efforts to bring back to the Foreign Relations Committee to a position of prominence. Rightly so. In this past year, the committee has once again become a place not only where the major foreign policy issues of the day are debated, but where substantive legislation is considered and passed upon.

In the beginning of the year, as the article notes, the committee undertook a series of comprehensive hearings on American foreign policy. Immediately thereafter, the committee turned to its major regular pieces of legislation, the foreign assistance bill and the Senate Department authorization bill. Both of these bills gained broad bipartisan support in the committee, and both ultimately passed the Senate by overwhelming margins.

In addition, the committee has reported out the Genocide Convention; resolved, for the time being at least, the legislative situation with regard to South Africa; and has dealt with other controversial issues like the Jordan arms sale in a manner remarkably free of contention and with great skill.

Mr. President, today's Journal article casts considerable light upon the reasons for the chairman's success. It points to his calm, patient, and thoughtful approach to the issues which confront American foreign policy. I commend the article to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR LUGAR IS GAINING NEW PRESTIGE FOR PANEL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

(By Robert S. Greenberger)

WASHINGTON.—During a recent roast of Sen. Richard Lugar, who is known as a competent but colorless legislator, and old friend served up a one-liner that brought down the house.

"Dick has maintained that childhood capacity of walking into an empty room and blending right in," joked William Ruckelshaus, former administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. Mr. Ruckelshaus, who has known the Indiana Republican since kindergarten, says, "I used to go over to his house and push him off his swings."

But since becoming the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last January, Dick Lugar has been doing the pushing. By finding consensus positions on foreign-policy issues and selling them to the White House, he has restored some of the credibility and clout that the once influential panel lost in recent years.

SOUTH AFRICA AND JORDAN

Some examples of his pushing:

As racial violence grew in South Africa, Mr. Lugar saw the political and diplomatic risks in the Reagan administration's policies toward that country and pressed a reluctant White House to imposed economic sanctions.

He saved the White House from an embarrassing defeat by forging a compromise to delay a showdown on a controversial arms sale to Jordan.

He crafted a bipartisan consensus on a \$12.8 billion foreign-aid authorization bill, the first such bill that the committee had been able to clear since 1981.

"Everyone knows he has made the committee more effective," says Sen. Joseph Biden, a liberal Delaware Democrat who is a member of the panel. "He can make judgments and take the committee with him."

As a result, Mr. Lugar and his committee have an unusual opportunity to fill any gaps in the administration's foreign policy. The White House hasn't achieved significant successes in the Middle East following its involvement in Lebanon. It is struggling to find ways to promote orderly change in the Philippines. And its policy in the arms-limitation talks with the Soviet Union has been marked by internal disarray; if an agreement is reached, the committee is expected to play a decisive role in the drive for Senate ratification.

Mr. Lugar is well positioned to strengthen the role of the committee, which has been more liberal than the rest of the Senate for much of the past two decades. A man of the middle and a man of the Senate, he reflects the nation's conservative mood and enjoys the trust of colleagues on the left and the right.

He also has the confidence of the administration. He breakfasts every other week with Secretary of State George Shultz, when their schedules permit, and has long telephone conversations with him nearly every weekend. When the White House decided to impose economic sanctions on South Africa, Mr. Shultz, nattily attired in yellow pants and green golf shirt, sought out Sen. Lugar in his Capitol hideaway office late on a Saturday afternoon to deliver the news.