Sarbanes: Anechoic Chamber, Pax River Ready Reserve Fleet.

Simon: IMET provision, peacekeeping funding, contingency force peace operations, land exchange.

Wellstone: Relevant.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 92 just received from the House. I ask that it be read so that all Members will know what it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:.

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 92) providing for an adjournment of the two Houses.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Friday, August 4, 1995, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, it stand adjourned until noon on Wednesday, September 6, 1995, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day beginning on Saturday, August 5, 1995, through Saturday, August 19, 1995, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Tuesday, September 5, 1995, or until such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be considered and agreed to, and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

So, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 92) was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. I thank my colleague. If that took more than 1 minute, take it out of my leader's time.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Exon amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Can we get the yeas and nays on all the amendments?

Mr. EXON. I will be glad to incorporate that. I ask for the yeas and nays on all of the amendments with reference to the matter that we have been debating.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOLE. So there will be the yeas and nays on four amendments.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield back any time remaining, and I am going to move to table the Exon amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. EXON. I make an inquiry of the Chair. I thought that the yeas and nays on the Exon amendment had been ordered.

Is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. EXON. Then a tabling motion would not be in order at this time, would it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that a tabling motion would be in order.

Is there a sufficient second on the tabling motion?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Exon amendment is set aside. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] is recognized to offer an amendment, on which Senator REID will control 40 minutes and Senator THURMOND will control 20 minutes.

The Senator from Nevada.

AMENDMENT NO. 2113 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2111

(Purpose: To strike the provision designating the location of the new tritium production facility of the Department of Energy)

Mr. REID. I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for himself and Mr. BRYAN, proposes an amendment numbered 2113 to amendment No. 2111:

On page 29 of the amendment, strike lines 18 through 21.

Mr. REID. The record should read as on the amendment that this is offered on behalf of both Senators from Nevada.

Mr. President, I object to the section of this amendment that directs the Department of Energy to site its new tritium production facility at Savannah River.

For Members of the Senate, let me explain briefly what we are talking about. Tritium is an element that is critical to all modern nuclear weapons. However, it is radioactive and decays. Our weapons will cease to work if we do not periodically replace the tritium. We do not now in the United States have the ability, the capability to produce tritium. We must develop a new tritium source.

We are, in this amendment, striking from this Thurmond amendment the specification that this new producer of tritium shall be in Savannah River. This is not an appropriate action and certainly it is not an appropriate issue for legislative action.

Decisions like this belong with the administrative branch of our Government. Decisions like this must be based on a complete analysis of many complex technical and economic decisions. A fair and impartial assessment of alternatives for different techniques and sites is what is called for. To think that we, as a Senate, can step in without hearings, without any procedures at all to indicate what would be the proper site for this production facility would be absolutely wrong.

It is clear the reason that this is in the bill is because of the chairman of the committee being from South Carolina. There is no other reason. The fact is there are a number of sites that the Department of Energy and this administration generally are looking at to determine where would be the best place to put it. One of the sites, of course, is at the Nevada test site.

If there were a vote taken today with the people in the Department of Defense, people in the Department of Energy who are making the decision, Nevada would probably win, but that is not how these decisions are made. It is not by a vote. It is by people who are administrators, who listen to the experts who work under them and for them and with them to determine where would be the best place to site this production facility. It certainly should not be done in a site specific amendment as we are now asked to consider.

Why does South Carolina feel that they must legislate the outcome of this issue? Why should not South Carolina and the Members of this Senate be willing to take their chances that their site is the best site?

The junior Senator from New Mexico earlier today in his remarks on the underlying Thurmond amendment indicated that he would not approve of the site specific section of the bill. He said that he would support the Reid amendment, and I think that is the way it should be.

This is not some small project that you can put any place you want. This is a multibillion-dollar project. This is not a project that costs a few million dollars, a few hundred million dollars. This is a project that costs a few billion, and it is simply wrong to site it as has been done by the committee in this bill. This is a multibillion-dollar

project upon which our nuclear deterrent critically depends.

As we all know, funds for all Federal projects are limited. We should not be taking such a large and significant project and turning it into a local jobs project.

I have already stated that Nevada is one of the places that is being considered for this project, and I say ''considered'' because I do not know what ultimately, when all the merits are added up, where this project would go. Nevada has a shot at it, of course. But we certainly cannot eliminate good science and good administration and in this bill simply say it is going to South Carolina. It is wrong. This is one of the types of things that gives Congress the name it has now. If there were ever an example of congressional pork, this certainly would be a good example. I also realize that Nevada's chances are eliminated if we do not pass this amendment that is now before the body. So, Mr. President, this is not a parochial issue, it is an issue of good Government. We all agree that we have to balance the budget. We have a different method of doing that. We have priorities that seem to be bantered around here which would be the best way to go to balance the budget. We all agree it should be balanced. But one of the things we have to stop doing is legislating as we are doing in this manner. We simply cannot put a multibillion dollar project in a certain State or district because the chairman of the committee is from that State or district. That is wrong.

This is an issue for all of us who care about spending our limited dollars wisely. This is not an appropriate way to spend our money. The amendment that I have offered to preclude the earmarking of the site for this new tritium project is an amendment for good Government and saving the Government money. I ask all Senators to join me in defeating this attempt to bypass the ongoing process to choose a technology and a site for our Nation's future tritium production.

The language from the bill, that is from the Thurmond amendment, says, ''* * * shall locate the new tritium production facility of the Department of Energy at the Savannah River site, South Carolina,'' before we know the technology, before we know the cost, before we know the suitability of the Savannah River site for the project. It is regardless of NEPA reviews; that is, the environmental impact that it would have on that part of the country. It is regardless of the cost of alternatives. What if we find an alternative that will save 10 percent? That is hundreds of millions of dollars. What if we find an alternative that will save us 5 or 3 or 20 percent? Should we not be given the latitude, should our administration not be given the latitude of looking at what would be best environmentally, what would be best from a cost basis? What about the ability of the facility to start producing tritium? What if one site, that is, the one in South Carolina, would take 8 or 9 years to develop this production capability? And let us assume another one would take 2 years. Should the administration not look at which would come on line the quickest? Of course.

But what we are doing, we are citing it in this amendment, regardless of the environmental impact, regardless of the cost, and regardless of when it will be able to come on board, when we will be able to start producing tritium. Does this mean we are forgoing the option of using a commercial reactor for tritium production? It appears that way.

Mr. President, we have no tritium production today. Any production facility will therefore be a new facility. It seems that we have just precluded the commercial reactor option; that is, are we going to use some of the commercial reactors that are now available for tritium, and we would buy it from the commercial producer? That is an alternative. Should we not be able to take a look at that to see if that is most appropriate way to get our tritium for our nuclear weapons? Why are we forcing a decision now?

Mr. President, the question is the answer. We all know why the decision is now being forced. We are needlessly constraining the decision process for what? Again, the question assumes the answer. It is very obvious.

Mr. President, I reserve the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Who yields time?

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I move to table the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the motion to table the amendment, is there a sufficient second?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is a unanimous consent request that has been——

Mr. THURMOND. After we vote on the Exon amendment, not now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion would not be in order until after all the time is expired or yielded back.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I will make it after the time expires.

I rise to oppose the Reid amendment and point out to my colleagues that the Savannah River site has had the tritium production mission for over 40 years. Why change? The U.S. Government has invested heavily in a unique infrastructure at the site for handling that naturally decaying radioactive gas and for recycling tritium throughout the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile.

For this reason, it would not be cost effective for the new tritium source to be placed at any other location regardless of the technology used for production. The taxpayer, who is frequently mentioned here on the floor, would have to duplicate the recycling infrastructure required to handle the radioactive tritium and the gas bottles which contain it in our nuclear weapons. Additionally, transporting this radioactive gas across the land from separated production and recycling sites does not make sense either.

The colocation of tritium recycling facilities and the new tritium production facility is the only solution that makes economic sense for the American taxpayer.

I wish to point out to the Senate that the Savannah River site is located on the border between the States of Georgia and South Carolina. The people of both States have, after the land was condemned for this facility, supported this mission of the site for the past 45 years and cooperated fully with the Government in every way possible in its important mission to sustain the nuclear stockpile.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from South Carolina, if all these arguments are valid, then why should we have this in the bill? If all his arguments are valid, then the people who are making the decision, the Department of Energy and the Department of Defense, I am sure, will take all those facts into consideration. If he is right, South Carolina would wind up getting it.

I will yield whatever time the Senator from Nevada may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. BRYAN. I thank the Chair, and I thank my senior colleague for his leadership in providing this amendment, which I strongly support.

Mr. President, as Senator REID has indicated, he and I clearly have a vested interest in the outcome of this amendment. The Nevada test site is also being considered as the location for a new tritium source. Frankly, our view is it is far superior to any other location that is being considered. But I hope, Mr. President, my colleagues will understand that this is not just a battle between two States that seek to acquire a new major project which Senator REID has indicated is of the magnitude of several billions of dollars.

The Department of Energy's efforts to build a new tritium supply is probably one of the most important current programs to ensure our continued confidence in our nuclear stockpile. The tritium supply program is absolutely essential to our national security program. Senator REID alluded to it, but I would like to embellish on it a little bit. Tritium is a radioactive gas and tritium is used in almost all of our nuclear weapons to achieve a so-called booster effect; that is, to magnify or to amplify the full impact of the nuclear yields. And our national defense planners, strategists, have come to rely

upon those projections. So the premise undergirding our national defense strategic deterrence is predicated upon yields that can be achieved only with the use of tritium.

Tritium, however, has a relatively short half life, a little over 12 years, which means that it decays at a rate of about 5 percent a year and needs to be replenished on a regular basis.

Recent reductions in our nuclear weapons stockpile have allowed us during this interim period of time to recycle tritium from retired weapons and has reduced the pressure to build a new tritium supply somewhat. But the need in terms of a long-range supply is still quite critical.

Even if we take advantage of the tritium made available by retiring weapons, if we do not have a new tritium supply on line by the year 2011—that is just 16 years away—we will need to start to dip into our tritium reserve.

By 2016, even using the reserve, it will not be adequate to meet our needs.

Mr. President, since I think most everybody acknowledges it will take about 15 years or more to get a tritium supply facility up and operational, we need to act now to make sure we will have a viable nuclear deterrent capability after the year 2011.

There are two ways, as I understand it, that you can produce tritium. There is the traditional way that we have produced it in the past with a nuclear reactor, and there is a new way which offers considerable hope and promise. It is a linear accelerator. Scientists tell us that either way is feasible, and the Department of Energy is in the process of evaluating these two options, including an evaluation of numerous options within the nuclear reactor category.

A decision on which technology will provide us the most confidence and will be the most fiscally responsible is to be announced soon by the Department of Energy.

In addition to evaluating the technology options, the Department is going to decide where to site this new tritium facility. Several sites are considered including one in Idaho, Savannah River, Oak Ridge, Pantex, and the Nevada test site. This will be primarily research oriented. I do not consider the naming of the site at this time an urgent matter.

Nevertheless, the Secretary of Energy is committed to the announcing of a preferred site for the tritium supply technology in the near future.

The Department recognizes the seriousness of this decision and has devoted a considerable amount of time and a great many resources to ensuring that the final decision will result in a viable cost-effective tritium supply program.

Mr. President, this is not the time for Congress to meddle in what is essentially a technical and scientific decision process. I realize that some of my colleagues may be frustrated with what they perceive to be delays in moving forward with the tritium supply decision, and given the Department's track record in a number of programs, it is all too easy to place the blame for delays in a program on the Department of Energy.

In this instance, however, I simply do not believe the criticism is justified. Since 1988, when the New Production Reactor Office was established to develop a new supply for tritium, there have been incredible changes in the environment in which the Department is acting: The Soviet Union has imploded. The cold war is over, and President Bush's three announcements during 1991 and 1992 of significant reductions in the nuclear weapons stockpile program has dramatically changed the picture with regard to a new tritium supply.

When the Bush administration, under Secretary of Energy Watkins, decided not to pursue the new production reactor, an entire new plan had to be developed for the production of a tritium resource.

The Secretary of Energy was required under the fiscal year 1994 Defense Authorization Act to issue a programmatic environmental impact statement by March 1, 1995. This draft PEIS for tritium supply and recycling issued by the Department last February complied with the requirement and is the latest product of a 7-year process to develop a rational, cost-effective, scientifically based program to ensure the capability of our nuclear weapons well into the next century.

No preferred site or technology was identified by the February 1995 document, nor is one required under the NEPA process. At that point, the Secretary of Energy committed to executing a record of decision by November of this year.

By Government standards, that is a reasonably quick turnaround. The Secretary also made it clear that a decision on the preferred technology or site may be announced prior to the November record of decision.

That is where we stand today, Mr. President. The PEIS is on the street and the Secretary is committed to a decision by November of this year. The Secretary, clearly feeling she did not have sufficient basis to make a decision on site or technology prior to March 1, is currently evaluating the technical and scientific evidence gathered through the NEPA process. That is as it should be.

To give you some indication of the magnitude of the PEIS, this indicates the voluminous nature of the information that is being compiled, that is currently being reviewed and analyzed by the Department. These are two volumes entitled ''The Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Tritium Supply and Recycling.''

It is my view that the Secretary ought to be permitted to move forward in that evaluating process. It is hard to understand how Congress, on a matter of such importance to our national defense, could even consider substituting its judgment on a parochial basis for the scientific and technical expertise that is being considered by the Department of Energy.

I realize that the language our amendment seeks to strike only specifies the site for the new tritium source. The language presumes to leave the technology choice to the Secretary of Energy and only identifies the site for the new facility.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, it is not quite that simple. In order to obtain the most reliable and cost-effective results, the Department of Energy must maintain the flexibility it needs to determine both the site and the technology for the new tritium resource.

As the draft PEIS makes abundantly clear, each of the sites being considered for the new tritium source has its own advantages and disadvantages.

Should the DOE decide to build a new reactor, whether it is a so-called triple-play reactor, advocated by the senior Senator from South Carolina, or any other type of reactor, Savannah River appears to be the most likely site. The Nevada test site is less suitable and, parenthetically, I would oppose building a reactor anywhere in Nevada. On the other hand, given the freedom to make the most rational decision, the Nevada test site would be the preferred alternate, if the chosen technology turns out to be an accelerator. Others would disagree, and I acknowledge this is a debatable proposition, but at this point, the best course we in Congress can pursue is simply let the NEPA process run its course.

In supporting the Reid-Bryan amendment, that is what the Senate is pursuing: To allow the course which the Congress set in motion in 1994 by directing that a programmatic EIS be developed to make the determination as to site and technology for the new tritium supply. That is what we allow to occur.

By leaving the language in the bill as it currently is, we preempt that process, and in the interest of a parochial decisionmaking process, foreclose the Department from making a determination both, in my view, on technology as well as site.

Mr. President, I yield my time back to the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NUNN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I will make brief remarks on this amendment. I support the Senator from South Carolina and his position. Savannah River has been the tritium production complex since the dawn of the nuclear age. It has the infrastructure, it has the trained work force, it has the experience, it is a logical place for the new tritium facility, whatever technology is being chosen.

We do not have in this bill now, as I understand this amendment—I have not been a part of working on this amendment—but as I understand it, there is nothing in the bill now, after this amendment is adopted, that would tell the Secretary of Energy what kind of reactor to have. She still has that choice—the light-water reactor, the gas reactor, the multipurpose reactor, heavy water or even the accelerator. All of those technologies are available.

The Secretary of Energy said she is going to make this decision sometime in late summer or early fall. That means that this bill is bound to be in conference in September, and if the Secretary of Energy makes any other decision, other than Savannah River, then certainly we will have a time to study that carefully and to react to that in conference.

So I support the Senator from South Carolina on this. I urge the defeat of the second-degree amendment.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I yield the able junior Senator from Georgia such time as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, as my good colleague from Georgia noted, the Savannah River site has been the site for weapons tritium production for nearly half a century—specifically 40 years. Obviously, given the importance of the production of that plant in terms of our nuclear policy, a very large capital investment has already been made by the taxpayers of the United States on the Savannah River site's unique, extensive tritium handling, tritium bottle recycling and production infrastructure—a huge capital investment.

If the new tritium production facility which DOE was planning were to be located at another site other than Savannah River, the large tritium bottle recycling facilities and the tritium production handling facilities would have to be replicated, rebuilt at a new site. This would be very expensive, cost-ineffective, and not wise.

Another alternative, I guess, would be to transport radioactive tritium to the Savannah River site bottle recycling from a distant new production site. This would require expensive, unique transportation, and would be perceived as a potential negative public health risk in the States transversed. On this basis, it is both logical and cost-effective for the Congress to designate this longstanding facility, a facility uniquely prepared to deal with this production as the location for the tritium production facility.

The bottom line here is, if you are talking about a change, you are talking about spending millions and millions of dollars, and you are talking about breaking the continuity chain of preparedness that the Savannah River site represents.

Mr. President, I yield back my time to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, how much time is left on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 13 minutes remaining for the Senator from South Carolina, and the Senator from Nevada has 19½ minutes remaining.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend, the ranking member, the former chairman of the committee, said the only question is what kind of facility. Well, that really is not the only question. But, in fact, if that were the only question, why in the world would you want to site in South Carolina, no matter what kind of facility, a reactor accelerator?

If the Secretary of Energy is going to make this decision late summer/early fall, why would Congress want to meddle with what is already in the process of being decided? If there were ever an example of congressional meddling, this certainly would be it.

Mr. President, this is a big project. I am reading from one newspaper:

> The new tritium production facility would be the Nation's first since the 1960's. Cost estimates range as high as $10 billion, and the project could create more than 2,000 jobs.

In the other body, something like this was tried and, again, I read from the Energy Daily of June 1995, where over there it was referred to as ''radioactive pork.''

Well, thank goodness the House in its wisdom got rid of that radioactive pork, and that was deleted from their legislation.

If the Savannah River site is so good, why do they not let it compete on its merits? If the threat that I heard—namely, if the Department of Energy sites it someplace else, we will take a look at it in conference. This is a threat to the Secretary to site it on the Savannah River, or we will take care of it in conference. That is wrong.

My amendment lets the system of Government work the way it should, not with ''radioactive pork.'' It would be with the orderly process of Government. Let me repeat, Mr. President, the language in the underlying amendment of the Senator from South Carolina that I and Senator BRYAN are attempting to delete States, ''shall locate the new tritium production facility * * * at the Savannah River Site, South Carolina.''

We are subverting, standing on its head, making a mockery of the system of Government that we have, where the Director of the Department of Energy—the Secretary—will make a determination after due consultation with the Department of Defense, with the people that work for and with her, as to where it should go.

But in this Thurmond amendment, we are going to site it in South Carolina before we know the technology that will be used, the cost, or the suitability of the Savannah River site for the project. There may be technology that should only go to Savannah River that the Secretary will decide on. Or she may find that that is technology that they want to use and should not go to Savannah River for many reasons. Maybe the cost of the Savannah River, because of all the pollution from the failed reactor, for over 45 years, makes that site so expensive, so unreliable, that it should go someplace else.

This language sites it in South Carolina, regardless of the environmental concerns, regardless of the need for reviews, regardless of the cost alternatives, and, of course, as I have mentioned before, regardless of the impact on the schedule to produce tritium. What if we need to get tritium produced quickly. Does this mean that we are foregoing the option of using an existing commercial reactor for tritium production? Yes, it does. That may be the decision the Secretary will make, saving the taxpayers of this country billions of dollars.

We have no tritium production today. Any production facility will therefore be a new facility. It seems that we have just precluded the commercial reactor option. That is wrong, and that is not what we should want or what this Congress should be up to. We have certain budget constraints that we have all been working under. This flies in the face of that. Why are we forcing a decision now when we know, as indicated by the senior Senator from Georgia, that the Secretary is going to make this decision in late summer? Late summer is upon us. This decision could come within a matter of weeks.

We are needlessly constraining the decision process. For what? We are doing it for ''radioactive pork,'' and that is wrong.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I want to take a minute or two more. I want to just recall that in 1946, when I was Governor of South Carolina, the project was announced to build this plant in Aiken, SC, on the Savannah River between Georgia and South Carolina. I moved to Aiken to practice law. I guess I represented over 90 percent of the landowners down there. They had the land condemned and taken away, whether they wanted to or not. The Government said, ''We need this land for this plant.'' The Government needed it. They sacrificed a lot. They underwent many hardships. The plant was built.

Why now do we want to take away the opportunity for those people who sacrificed like they did to help the Government to build this plant for the good of our country? We are not asking that they use any particular kind of technology. They can use the accelerator or they can use the reactor, or whatever they want to.

We are merely saying it should not be taken away from these people who

sacrificed so much in their lifetime for this plant and for the Government.

We feel it should not be moved, regardless of what the technology is. It ought to remain at this site. It has been there for 45 years. Why take it away? They have done a good job. They have the infrastructure. They have the workers. They have everything to make a success.

I do hope that this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the proponents of sight infrastructure costs as their main argument, but this facility will produce training for 50 years.

I say, what is the lowest life cycle cost of 50 years? Do we care? We should care, Mr. President.

I yield to my colleague from Nevada whatever time he desires.

Mr. BRYAN. I thank the Chair. I thank my colleague.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that we have heard what essentially are three arguments by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. One is that it has been there for 45 years, and therefore it should continue in perpetuity for 45 years.

Mr. President, I think the answer to that question is self-evident. We are considering prospectively what is the best location for the tritium production facility in the future. That is the entire purpose of the problematic environmental impact statement.

Indeed, they may make and come to the same conclusion that our friend, the senior Senator from South Carolina made. But that is not an analytical or rational argument for a policy that has always been there, always been that way, and therefore we should continue that way forever in the future.

The second argument that my friend made was to suggest that somehow the recycling operation has been at Savannah River and that by colocating the new production facility, somehow we would ease or eliminate the transportation of tritium.

Mr. President, that is simply not true. As my colleagues, I am sure, know, we do not move nuclear bombs around the country, to have the tritium components of them added in second. When we are talking about retrofitting or adding the tritium component, you are talking about doing that at a facility that has the capability of doing that.

That is, first and foremost, the facility at Pantex. No one should have the impression that by having a recycling and production facility in South Carolina that we eliminate the necessity of transporting that new tritium product to either Pantex, or there is a facility at the Nevada test site that could handle the disassembly.

My friend makes the argument of sacrifice. While I am sure he recites the history, nobody quarrels with the senior Senator from South Carolina when he describes the history of the state that he has represented so long and so ably, and which I know he has great personal affection.

If we are talking about sacrifice, he is talking about the few thousand acres at Savannah River. Nevada is the mother of all sacrifices—the mother of all sacrifices. The Nevada test site alone is larger than the entire State of Rhode Island. Just the Nevada test site. If you want to talk about Federal sacrifice, 87 percent of the entire land mass of the State of Nevada is under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, either the Department of Energy, the Department of Defense, the Bureau of Land Management, or the Forest Service.

I must say that I do not think any of those three arguments are compelling.

Finally, I return very briefly to, I think, the argument that my senior colleague makes so ably. That is, we started the process in 1994. We said, ''Let's look, see how we should handle future tritium production. Let's have a problematic EIS.'' Added into that mix is the fact there is a new technology we want to take a look at, the linear accelerator technology.

There are different types of reactor technologies that we want to consider, as well, some four technologies within the rubric of the reactor option, which is the other option other than the accelerator. All of those ought to be considered rationally as part of an evaluation process and ought not to be the subject of micromanagement by the Congress.

Let this process work its course. We in Nevada have a vested interest. We would like to see it in Nevada. I would like to see the linear accelerator, but I am willing to take my chance. I think that is the best policy.

I urge the Congress and this Senate to allow that course to work its way, as well, and let the experts make the decision. I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 2114 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2111

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to make certain technical amendments to the Thurmond-Domenici amendment. These have been agreed to by both sides. I send them to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] proposes an amendment numbered 2114 to amendment No. 2111.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 17 strike out ''$2,341,596,000 and substitute in lieu thereof $2,386,596,000''.

Page 8, line 20 strike out ''$2,121,226,000 and substitute in lieu thereof ''$2,151,266,000''.

Page 9, line 1 strike out ''$220,330,000'' and substitute in lieu thereof ''$235,330,000''.

Page 9, line 25 strike out ''$26,000,000'' and substitute in lieu thereof ''$41,000,000''.

Page 13, line 6 strike out ''$550,510,000'' and substitute in lieu thereof ''$505,510,000''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. REID. I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2114) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2113

Mr. THURMOND. I move to table the Reid amendment and 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. REID. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry.

Could the Presiding Officer indicate what the parliamentary status is now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first vote will occur in relation to the motion to table the Exon amendment.

Mr. THURMOND. I am informed Senator MCCAIN is not going to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote on the motion to table the Exon amendment can occur now.

Mr. REID. Immediately following that will be the Reid-Bryan amendment.

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

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

The question is on the motion to table.

Mr. EXON. Yes. If I understand the agreement right, the Senator from Nebraska has 2 minutes, as does the Senator from South Carolina.

I ask unanimous consent, as previously agreed to, that immediately preceding the vote on the Exon amendment, 2 minutes be allocated to the Senator from Nebraska and 2 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2112

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, there can be no question that we are about to cast a critically important vote. We will send a signal that will resonate around the world and have far-reaching implications on mankind's chances of moving further away from a reliance on nuclear weapons and a possible nuclear holocaust, or we can reverse course, abruptly and shamefully. As the world's leading nuclear superpower, we can send a signal loud and clear that, notwithstanding our protestations about the spread of nuclear devices, notwithstanding our supposed commitment to a nuclear test ban treaty, we are going to reverse course.

The Exon-Hatfield amendment assures a constructive policy of gradual and very deliberate thought processes, and offers the nuclear olive branch, if you will, to potential friend and potential foe alike, that the United States of America offers a hand of nuclear understanding.

If we vote down, if we table the Exon-Hatfield amendment, it is going to be a significant step backward for which we will not forgive ourselves, I suggest, for centuries to come. It is the time we reemphasize our restraint, our vigilance, and agree to the Exon-Hatfield amendment as we have explained in great detail during debate this morning.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I just want to say that every weapons system, indeed every machine in our technological society, requires testing. The hydronuclear testing is the only tool left to assess our confidence in the safety and reliability of the shrinking nuclear stockpile.

Mr. President, we need to do this. We are living in a dangerous world. It is important that we be informed as to the reliability and safety of our weapons. They may have to be used. I do not need to cite the situations that could be dangerous in various parts of the world. We know about North Korea. We do not know what Russia is going to do, what China is going to do. We do not know what certain nations like Iran or Iraq and Libya will do, the terrorist nations. We must be prepared. And to be prepared we have to know what our weapons will do. We have to know they will be safe and reliable, and that is the purpose of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on the motion to table the Exon amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced, yeas 56, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 359 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Abraham	Gorton	Mikulski
Ashcroft	Gramm	Murkowski
Bennett	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Packwood
Breaux	Gregg	Pressler
Brown	Hatch	Reid
Bryan	Heflin	Roth
Burns	Helms	Santorum
Coats	Hollings	Shelby
Cochran	Hutchison	Simpson
Cohen	Inhofe	Smith
Coverdell	Johnston	Snowe
Craig	Kempthorne	Specter
D'Amato	Kyl	Stevens
DeWine	Lott	Thomas
Dole	Lugar	Thompson
Domenici	Mack	Thurmond
Faircloth	McCain	Warner
Frist	McConnell	

NAYS—44

Akaka	Boxer	Campbell
Baucus	Bradley	Chafee
Biden	Bumpers	Conrad
Bingaman	Byrd	Daschle
Dodd	Jeffords	Moynihan
Dorgan	Kassebaum	Murray
Exon	Kennedy	Nunn
Feingold	Kerrey	Pell
Feinstein	Kerry	Pryor
Ford	Kohl	Robb
Glenn	Lautenberg	Rockefeller
Graham	Leahy	Sarbanes
Harkin	Levin	Simon
Hatfield	Lieberman	Wellstone
Inouye	Moseley-Braun	

So, the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 2112) was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2113

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next order of business is amendment No. 2113, and under the previous order there are now 4 minutes of debate equally divided between the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]——

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina and I have agreed to yield back our time.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I agree to yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

All time is yielded back.

The question is now on agreeing to the motion to table the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 360 Leg.]

YEAS—57

Abraham	Frist	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gramm	Mikulski
Bennett	Grams	Murkowski
Biden	Grassley	Nickles
Bond	Gregg	Nunn
Breaux	Hatch	Packwood
Brown	Hatfield	Pressler
Byrd	Heflin	Roth
Campbell	Helms	Santorum
Chafee	Hollings	Shelby
Coats	Hutchison	Simpson
Cochran	Inhofe	Smith
Cohen	Johnston	Snowe
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Specter
D'Amato	Kyl	Stevens
DeWine	Lott	Thomas
Dole	Lugar	Thompson
Domenici	Mack	Thurmond
Faircloth	McCain	Warner

NAYS—43

Akaka	Feinstein	Levin
Baucus	Ford	Lieberman
Bingaman	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Gorton	Moynihan
Bradley	Graham	Murray
Bryan	Harkin	Pell
Bumpers	Inouye	Pryor
Burns	Jeffords	Reid
Conrad	Kempthorne	Robb
Craig	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kerry	Simon
Dorgan	Kohl	Wellstone
Exon	Lautenberg	
Feingold	Leahy	

So the motion to table the amendment (No. 2113) was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next order of business is the vote on amendment No. 2111.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be vitiated on amendment No. 2111.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Do all Senators yield back their time?

Mr. THURMOND. I ask for a voice vote on that amendment.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, is all time yielded back?

Mr. THURMOND. We yield back all time.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2111

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With all time yielded back, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2111.

The amendment (No. 2111) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next order of business is an amendment to be offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], dealing with defense firewalls, with 1 hour of debate equally divided.

Who yields time?

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I hope the time will not start running until we have order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas directs that the time not begin until the Senate is in order. The Senate will be in order, please.

The Senator from Arkansas is recognized to offer his amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2115

(Purpose: To restore a common sense approach to the appropriations process by repealing the defense firewalls established in the FY96 Budget Resolution)

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], for himself, Mr. SIMON, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, proposes an amendment numbered 2115.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. REPEAL OF DEFENSE FIREWALL.

(A) Strike Section 201(a) through 201(b)(1)(B) of H. Con. Res. 67, as passed by

both Houses of Congress and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 201. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(A) DEFINITION.—As used in this section and for the purposes of allocations made pursuant to section 302(a) or 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, for the discretionary category, the term 'discretionary spending limit' means—

(1) with respect to fiscal year 1996, for the discretionary category $485,074,000,000 in new budget authority and $531,768,000,000 in outlays;

(2) with respect to fiscal year 1997, for the discretionary category $482,430,000,000 in new budget authority and $520,295,000,000 in outlays;

(3) with respect to fiscal year 1998, for the discretionary category $490,692,000,000 in new budget authority and $512,632,000,000 in outlays;

(4) with respect to fiscal year 1999, for the discretionary category $482,207,000,000 in new budget authority and $510,482,000,000 in outlays;

(5) with respect to fiscal year 2000, for the discretionary category $489,379,000,000 in new budget authority and $514,234,000,000 in outlays;

(6) with respect to fiscal year 2001, for the discretionary category $496,601,000,000 in new budget authority and $516,403,000,000 in outlays;

(7) with respect to fiscal year 2002, for the discretionary category $498,837,000,000 in new budget authority and $515,075,000,000 in outlays;

as adjusted for changes in concepts and definitions and emergency appropriations.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN PARAGRAPH (2), IT SHALL NOT BE IN ORDER IN THE SENATE TO CONSIDER—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 (or amendment, motion, or conference report on such a resolution) that provides discretionary spending in excess of the discretionary spending limit for such fiscal year; or

(B) Within 30 days of the date of enactment of this Act, the House and Senate Appropriations Committees shall meet to consider the reallocation of the fiscal year 1996 suballocations made pursuant to section 602(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I know this psychologically is a terrible way to open a debate, but I have no delusions about the possibility of winning on this amendment. Given the makeup of the Senate right now, it is going to be several years before an amendment like this will take root, but it will take root when the American people focus not only on their misery but what caused it.

Everybody here is aware of the fact that we treat defense as not only the highest priority but everything else is secondary to it.

Not to be trite, but the truth of the matter is that we, like so many civilizations, from the Israelites on, may very well find that the strength of this Nation is not all in planes, tanks, and guns. How we treat our people, the kind of health care they get, the kind of education they get, the kind of environment they live in, those things determine what a powerful nation is, too. It usually takes me about an hour or two after I read the Washington Post in the morning to get enthused sufficiently enough to come to work. This morning it was especially depressing.

Here were three front page stories: House votes to prohibit States from paying for an abortion in cases of rape or incest. Mr. President, to me, that is a form of barbarism, to say that a child who may be pregnant by her father, or the most innocent housewife who is raped, if she has the money, no problem. If she is poor, she will birth that child. You remember the beatitude, ''Blessed are those who are persecuted.'' If that is not a form of persecution, I do not know what is.

The second story was: Senate votes to abrogate antiballistic missile treaty. That is not entirely true, but figuratively and, down the road, literally it is true. We will decide the interpretation of the treaty; we will decide whether it is abrogated or not, and if the Russians happen to disagree, so be it. The language of the bill itself said the Senate, not the President, will decide whether the ABM Treaty is in our interest or not. We will decide whether we want to live by it or not. And that solemn document that we put our names on in 1972 will be for naught. Who else wants to sign a treaty with us knowing that that is the way we treat our treaties? We simply cannot give up on the cold war. We just love it too much. Dr. Strangelove. Another beatitude is, ''Blessed are the peacemakers.'' Not too many people are blessed in this body.

The third story was: House cuts $9 billion in education, health care, and food for the poor. ''Blessed are the poor,'' unless one of them happens to get pregnant at the age of 17. What do we do in the Senate? We add $7 billion more than the Secretary of Defense and our chiefs of staff want. Can you imagine that? We are adding $7 billion more than our defense authorization asked for.

It was depressing. And as I read those three stories, I pondered on what else. Medicare? No firewalls around Medicare, health care for the elderly; there are no firewalls there. We are going to cut $270 billion over the next 7 years. We are going to give the States block grants on Medicaid and AFDC, not necessarily because we think it is more efficient, but because we are going to cut back on Medicaid. All that is health care for the poorest of the poor.

We are going to cut PBS, which is one of the few things that provide a little enrichment for our children. ''Sesame Street'' and Big Bird, adios. ''All Things Considered,'' which every Member of the Senate listens to going to and from work on NPR, adios. No commercials. We need to privatize this so we can get some commercials on PBS and NPR. I want to see, right in the middle of the Civil War series, a bunch of youngsters running down the beach with a Budweiser in their hands. That is what I call cultural enrichment.

And the arts—how I wish that guy Mapplethorpe had never received a grant. You see, he does not have anything to do with the repertory theater in my State. But we will be lucky to make it in my State with our symphony without some help from the National Endowment.

Food stamps. We did not develop food stamp programs willy-nilly. We did it because we made a conscious decision that we did not want anybody in this country to go hungry. Everybody acts as though it was some sort of a Communist conspiracy that should have never been put in place. We are going to cut that. If you do not happen to have a PAC or a $1,000 check, you are not getting anything out of this crowd.

Eliminate affirmative action. I have heard so many anecdotes on affirmative action that make my blood boil, and some of them are true. It has been an abused program. But do not say that the time has come when we have a level playing field when 14 percent of the black males in this country are unemployed, and 40 percent of the black teenagers are unemployed, compared to about 5 percent white.

You know, if we were to eliminate this famous tax cut I hear so much about—that is what the Medicare cut is, $270 billion; and $250 billion of that—virtually all—is for a tax cut, 70 percent of which goes to people who make over $100,000 a year. When I was a young practicing lawyer, I yearned for the day when I would make $100,000 a year. So now I am going to get a nice healthy tax cut. Every Senator gets $133,000 or $135,000 a year, a big fat pension, a health care plan second to none, and we are going to get a tax cut when 50 percent of the people in this country over 65 cannot sleep at night because they are in abject terror of getting sick and not being able to pay their bills.

If we just cut Medicare by half that amount and eliminate the tax cut and spend the other $135 billion on education and things that make us a great nation, we can still balance the budget in the year 2002 and do what we know we ought to do.

No, we are going to reward those who have already been richly blessed. And we are going to further abuse those at the bottom of the ladder. Indeed, we will step on their hands if they happen to be reaching for the first rung. We have become so cynical and indifferent. So we have to put firewalls around defense to make sure none of it ever gets out of the Pentagon into the hands of some poor soul who might need it for an education.

Senator KOHL is going to offer an amendment later today which would cut the $7 billion which was added on to this bill. Even if he were to prevail, which he will not even come close to doing, you could not take that money and use it for any other purpose.

Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 18 minutes and 50 seconds remaining.

Mr. BUMPERS. Will you kindly notify me when I have used a total of 20 minutes.

Mr. President, here is a chart which shows what is going to happen from 1995 to the year 2002, in defense. We go from $264 billion in 1995 to $280 billion in 2002.

What do we do with everything else—what is known as domestic discretionary spending—education, health care, you name it, medical research, law enforcement? What happens to that? It goes from $241 to $218 billion over 7 years.

Of the spending cuts that are projected to be made over the next 7 years to reduce the deficit and pay for the Republican tax cut for the wealthy, domestic spending, the things that make us great will absorb 43 percent of all the cuts. What in the name of God are we thinking about? We will spend $400 billion more for defense spending than domestic programs over the next 7 years. Mr. President, $400 billion less to take care of the real needs of the people of this country, that we are going to spend on defense.

How much are we spending on defense? Are we looking for two wars, as the Bottom-Up Review said?

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUMPERS. Not until I finish this statement.

This chart demonstrates what we spend for defense in comparison to our eight or nine most likely adversaries, Russia, China, North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Libya, Syria, Cuba—name somebody else. I do not care who you name. Our defense budget is twice as big as all nine of them put together. If you add NATO, twice as much as the rest of the world.

What are the proponents of the bill we are considering today proposing? That we add $7 billion to the defense budget.

We get so hairy chested around here when defense comes up. Everybody favors a strong defense. Nobody wants to ever be vulnerable. This is what you call piling on. You just cannot pile on enough money. Even the Pentagon is trying to shovel it back to us, and we will not take it.

I appreciate the Defense Department. When we have a crisis, I am glad we have aircraft carriers. I am glad we have all the sophisticated weaponry. All I am saying is, there ought to be some kind of balance, because it is not going to make any difference how much we spend on defense if we are not careful about what we are doing back home.

Mr. President, I saw a poll of high school seniors about 5 years ago. Who are your heroes? About the only one I can remember is Tom Cruise. I think Mr. T was on the list. It was a list of rock stars. Michael Jackson was high on the list. That is who the high school seniors revere in this country. Mother Theresa did not make it. The Pope did not make it. Poor old George Bush did not make it. Not even mom and pop.

Senators, can you imagine somebody asking you that question when you were in high school, who were your heroes? I would have popped out my father so fast it would make your head swim. You talk about a hero. I worshipped the ground he walked on. Mom and pop did not make this list. If we keep going the way we have gone this year in the U.S. Congress, Tim McVeigh and David Koresh will be on the list next year.

I am not trying to take the money away from the Pentagon with this amendment. I am simply saying the people of this body ought to be more thoughtful about where the real strengths of the Nation are. We ought to be more thoughtful about people who have not had the luck we have had.

I know a woman who is very wealthy and she is always saying, ''Can't everybody be rich and beautiful like me?'' The truth of the matter is, most people who have made it, and especially if you come from a town during the Depression with a population of 851, have had a lot of help. I did not become a Senator just because I am such a great person. I tell you why I did it. I did it because this same Congress, back when they were a little more sensitive about things like this, gave me a free education.

That is right. My brother went to Harvard. I went to Northwestern. My father was a poor man. He could no more have afforded that than he could fly to the Moon. I was fortunate and received a little Government help after World War II, and had a teacher who taught me to speak and read well, did something for my self-esteem. The main thing I did, and what most people that make it did, is choose my parents well.

Mr. President, I just want to say I am not trying to move money out of the Defense Department into any of these other programs. I am saying as a psychological thing we ought not to be sitting here and saying you cannot touch defense for anything, no matter how critical it may be.

If we continue the way we have started this year, and especially that Contract With America, this country is in for a terrible shock. That is not what the people were voting for, they wanted change, but this is not the change they were voting for, I do not think.

When they begin to feel the pain, they are going to begin to wonder what they voted for. I am telling you, if we keep going the way we are going now, trying to tinker with the Constitution, spending every extra dime we can get our hands on on defense, that age of know-nothingism back in the middle of the 19th century will be known as the age of enlightenment.

As you know I have such a reverence for the freedom of religion in this country, but there is a great quote of Isaiah, admonishing the Israelites when they got sort of cynical about all their people.

He said to them:

> Learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow.

Maybe that is just good for the Senate prayer breakfast or on Sunday morning. It does not seem to be terribly relevant here.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder if the Senator will yield 6 minutes?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time do we have in opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 30 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, first let me suggest to my good friend, Senator BUMPERS, he has given a very great speech about what he thinks we ought to be doing in the United States. But I must tell those who are listening, very little of it has to do with the amendment he is talking about.

The amendment he is talking about is very, very simple. In 1990 I was privileged to have an idea—that I had been thinking about and worrying about—become the law. In that year, 1990, and 3 years thereafter, we decided that once the Congress of the United States voted in an amount of money that they wanted spent on the defense of the United States, that during that year they only had two options regarding defense: First, if they did not want to spend all of the defense money, they applied what was saved on the deficit; and, second, if they want to spend defense money on anything else, they had to get 60 votes to do it.

That is a pretty reasonable approach, when you consider the propensity of legislators to want more and more for programs that they love, or that they need, or that they want for their constituents. And you put it up against a big defense budget and everybody can say, ''Oh, take a little bit away for this. Take a little bit away for that.'' Frankly, if we had not seen that happen in the processes around here, we would not have been concerned about it. But whenever the pressure is tough on nondefense spending, the nest egg of defense is looked to as the savior for every other program you want.

Mr. President, I believe this year we did the right thing. We decided that once we voted on a budget resolution, which was indeed a compromise—between the House that wanted more, and the Senate that wanted less—once you compromised on that, you can only spend defense money if you get 60 votes in the U.S. Senate, a supermajority.

I believe that is very good law for the United States. It is practical. And if there is a real emergency and you want to move money from defense, you can get 60 votes. But otherwise you leave defense for defense.

These arguments about how much do we spend versus the rest of the world—

let me remind Americans right off the bat, we decided on an All-Volunteer Army, and we pay our military well. So the first thing you have to do, to all the other militaries in the world, is adjust what they are spending to what we are spending because we pay our men and women good wages. In fact, we are hopefully moving toward the marketplace. And few other countries do that. So we are proud to pay our people who serve in the military a living wage and give them benefits and other things, because we are depending upon them and their high quality.

My last point will be on Medicare and Medicaid. If it was relevant, I would suggest that a comparison of the next 7 years compared to a 1995 freeze will tell you that defense will go down $13 billion, Medicaid will go up $149 billion, Medicare will go up $349 billion. That is the reality of the current budget.

Having said that, the truth of the matter is if you took the firewall down—which is what this amendment would do—you could not spend any of that money on Medicare or Medicaid in any event. These are entitlements. That money would be controlled by the appropriators and spent on a myriad of domestic programs which feel pinched and which Members of Congress might decide in an appropriations process they want to take from defense to spend.

My last point, and it is quick. First of all, the Senator should know the Bumpers amendment is subject to a point of order, and I will make that when we are finished with our debate. That means it will take 60 votes to agree to that amendment. I think that is fair, too, because it is consistent with the firewall.

But I just did some quick numbers on domestic spending versus military spending, and I will just quickly share them with you all. In 1990, nondefense discretionary was $202 billion. In 1995 it will be $274 billion. That is a 36 percent nominal change upward. Defense was $300 billion. It went to $270 billion, which is minus $30 billion, which is minus 10 percent during the same period of time. In fact, the only part of the discretionary budget that went down is defense. Nondefense went up.

I am willing to admit, as one who is familiar with the budget, that the next 6 years will be tougher on nondefense. But I submit that it is not right for us, during a calendar year when we have said this is what we need for defense, to leave it vulnerable to an appropriations process which will take from it whenever and wherever it is deemed necessary, not because of defense needs but because of other program needs. I submit, in closing, the more pressure there is on domestic spending, nondefense, the more you ought to keep the walls if you are satisfied that what you need is represented within the defense number for defense.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the able Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, this issue has already been raised and voted on just 2 months ago on the budget resolution, as the Senator from New Mexico said. That was the appropriate place to debate this.

These firewalls are part of an overall Senate and House budget agreement. I think just to pick out one part of it and say we are going to pull it apart, either from the defense point of view or overall point of view—contrary to what the Senator from Arkansas may be assuming, these firewalls also protect domestic spending for the next 3 years. There are many Members of this body in the House and the Senate who feel that defense spending should be higher and are willing to take it out of domestic spending. We saw the House vote last night to cut $9 billion out of the domestic budget. Believe me, if we take down the firewalls, within a year or so you may find just the reverse, I say to my friend from Arkansas, than what you assumed. Because what the Senator from Arkansas assumes is if you take down the firewalls, you are going to take money out of defense and put it in domestic. Not necessarily so. That has been the indication in the past. I am not sure that is the case now.

I think, Mr. President, though, the main point I want to make is the firewalls do keep a separate account between defense and domestic. But there is nothing in the firewall provision of the Budget Act that in any way prevents defense from being cut. Anyone who wants to cut defense can come on the floor, propose an amendment to cut defense, either on this bill or the appropriations bill, and defense will be cut if a majority approve that amendment. What the firewalls do, and I think this is very important, they say if you cut defense it goes to deficit reduction, it does not get shifted to another spending account. That is what the firewalls do. I think they are very important. I think they preserve both defense and domestic spending, as the Congress decides on the budget resolution.

It is not as if we do not make decisions here. We make decisions on the budget resolution. We decide what goes within those firewalls. We do it every year. So that is the key place to make these changes.

I urge the Bumpers amendment not be agreed to.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as may be required.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered today by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

I am concerned about defense spending levels. I have argued for years that defense was under funded. Even this year's budget resolution recommends defense budget levels lower than those I have advocated. As the search for precious dollars intensifies, I anticipate more and more attempts to divert defense funds to nondefense programs. We have seen attempt to fund nondefense programs in the last 2 days.

The Department of Defense has done more than its share in the budget reduction efforts. Defense has contributed more to achieving the deficit reductions outlined in the 1990 budget agreement than any other executive branch agency.

Establishing the caps will not prevent reductions in defense spending. It will, however, discourage raids on the defense budget by those seeking to fund domestic programs at the expense of our Nations' security.

With the caps on defense and nondefense spending levels, any reductions in these categories would have to go directly to reduce the deficit. This was the case when the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 was passed. In fiscal year 1994, the cap on separate categories was eliminated allowing funds to be transferred between defense and domestic programs. As a result, we saw transfers out of defense to pay for some domestic programs from the Defense authorization and appropriations bill last year.

Since 1990, the defense budget has been reduced more than any other. We have asked thousands of service men and women to end their careers earlier than they had planned. DOD drastically scaled back procurement as well as research and development. The Joint Chiefs have testified that we are on the brink of return to the hollow force of the 1970's and early 1980's. At the same time, we are increasing the number and type of missions assigned to our forces. The Armed Services Committee worked very hard this year, within the defense levels in the concurrent resolution on the budget, to reverse these trends. In order to maintain these initiatives, I support the efforts of Senator DOMENICI and the Budget Committee to establish firewalls or caps on domestic and defense discretionary spending.

Mr. President, the Bumpers amendment would remove the protections we have worked hard to achieve. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Thank you Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAIG). Who yields time?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas for the reasons that have been previously stated relative to the contribution of defense spending to reducing our deficit over the past decade, the limitations on commitment to defense spending for the next 7 years as opposed to the significant increases in spending that will go to a number of programs but particularly to Medicare and Medicaid, and for the reasons stated by Senator from Georgia, and the Senator from South Carolina. However, what I would like to do is to discuss this proposal to allow further reductions in defense spending in a broader context.

There are some on the left who view every defense dollar as a dollar that is taken from social spending. And in all candor there are some on the right who view every defense dollar as a dollar taken from deficit reduction.

I submit, Mr. President, that neither can understand why we are asking for more money in this legislation than the President requested, albeit a very small amount more, $7 billion. Both I think the left and the right are missing the big picture of history by focusing on the small print of the budget.

There is a great deal at stake in this debate. Defense spending must be placed in a broader context. That context is outlined with exceptional clarity by historian Donald Kagan in his new book ''On the Origins of War''. In case after case, he argues, war has been ''The product of the failure of the victors * * * to construct a solid basis for peace.''

He goes on to say, ''A persistent and repeated error through the ages has been the failure to understand that the preservation of peace requires active effort, planning, the expenditure of resources, and sacrifice, just as war does.''

This historical fact should sober us. Great, victorious powers have a special burden, and are especially prone to misjudgment. They have a tendency, Kagan says, to be either too hard or too soft, or both in succession. They can be motivated by the highest ideals, but still lack the will to secure them. In this way, leaders who desire peace can encourage war. Sustaining the peace is always an act of will and design—based on diplomatic and military strength.

The history of America has become the central feature of the history of the world. We did not seek that position through imperial ambition—but we have been selected, nonetheless, for great responsibilities. This should focus our minds, and focus this debate.

I'm looking at this we are not left without guidance from the past. Every generation imagines itself exempt from the laws of history, and every generation is forced to follow them. Those laws can be respected or resented, but not changed or ignored. It is a useful exercise to clarify and repeat them, as Donald Kagan and others have done.

Listen to his rules.

The first rule is that peace is not a natural condition. The New World Order is destined to disorder. Moments of international calm have never prevented future conflict. Every prediction of perpetual peace has been disappointed. The reason is rooted in human character. British military historian Michael Howard comments, ''We have not improved as people, however much we have improved as technologists.'' That should be obvious from the 50 conflicts that rage in the world at this moment.

The second rule is that war is always a surprise. Strategies that depend on long warning periods or time for preparation, are bound to fail. Deterrence with current power is the only adequate insurance against the unknown. During the cold war, the experts said that the likely warning time of a Warsaw Pact attack on NATO was somewhere between 3 days and 3 months. After German reunification, we discovered that Warsaw Pact readiness would have allowed for an attack in 3 hours.

Paul Wolfowitz of Johns Hopkins draws this lesson from our experience in Korea in 1950. Just 5 years after the height of American power in World War II, he says, ''A third-rate power almost kicked the U.S. off the peninsula.'' It was not until 4 months later that General MacArthur was able to launch the Inchon landing that started a 3-year fight back to Korea's original borders.

In a regional conflict, an enemy does not judge America's potential power, but our actual force. ''The bottom line,'' says Wolfowitz, ''is that people are judging your will, your capability to deliver.''

The third rule is that war is prevented by creating a prohibitive cost for disturbing the status quo, and exacting that cost cannot be done by international institutions. The United Nations is sometimes useful, but it is not an alternative to American power.

In September of 1993, President Clinton declared that ''U.N. peacekeeping holds the promise to resolve many of this era's conflicts.'' Six days later a company of U.S. Rangers under U.N. command was decimated in Mogadishu.

In the last few years, we have had a short but decisive experiment with what Madeleine Albright called ''aggressive multilateralism.'' That experiment has failed miserably and millions of people have been subjected to war and humanitarian failure.

Fourth, Kagan says the ability to take swift, firm, early action against aggressors is the best way to prevent large, protracted, painful action in the future. He argues that tentativeness among great powers is one of the principal causes of war. He analyzed a series of avoidable conflicts and concluded:

> Unwilling to commit themselves clearly and firmly to the price of defending the peace that they so badly wanted to maintain, they had to pay the price of a long, bloody, costly, devastating, and almost fatal war.

The history of this century bears out the truth of that statement. Unable, unwilling to commit ourselves clearly and firmly to the price of defending peace, millions in this world in this century have been subjected to long, bloody, costly, devastating, almost fatal wars.

Defending that peace depends, ironically, on not a defensive but an offensive military capability. A defensive posture, no matter how strong, is not sufficient.

At the beginning of World War II, neither France nor Britain deployed a credible offensive force because the Western leaders and many of their people, again quoting Kagan:

> . . . did not examine their situation objectively and realistically but emotionally and hopefully. They were moved by the horror of war, the fear of its reappearance, and the blind hope that a refusal to contemplate war and prepare for it would somehow keep the peace.

Our concept of cost effectiveness must be deeper and more serious than it often is today. Our choice, our real choice is not between the B–2, for example, and Head Start. Our real decision is between a cutting edge military capable of offensive operations and an unthinkable, immeasurable future cost in American lives and American resources.

Kagan's fifth rule is that democracies are not particularly good at making and keeping these commitments. Kagan comments that they are motivated by ''an ethical system that is commercial, individualistic, and libertarian.'' Their governments are under continual demand to ''satisfy domestic demands at the expense of the requirements of defense.''

That is what we are seeing in the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas and what we have seen year after year in amendment after amendment.

It can lead us to a dangerous situation, because democracies can be handicapped in the maintenance and use of power. They invite challenges, and when those challenges come they are often not fully prepared.

Kagan's final rule is that politicians have always had the tendency to interpret history to fit their budgets, not the other way around. They have a vested interest in the assumption of peace because the assumption of peace matches domestic fiscal need.

These facts of history, of course, are not a strategy by themselves, but they should inform our strategic approach. And I would suggest it is time we had a strategic approach.

Some of the delay in creating a vision for America's role in the world is understandable. We are still emerging

from the conceptual grip of the cold war for four decades that consumed our attention and consumed our creativity, but now the absence of a self-confident American self-image is beginning to create risks. It does not take much imagination to imagine what our threats are. Eighty percent of North Korea's forces are within 100 kilometers of the DMZ. Tensions between India and Pakistan are high. Iran is more assertive. Iraq is unpredictable. Algeria is on the edge of Islamic revolution, threatening Egypt as well. Will there be conflict in Macedonia? Will we face a bad outcome in Russia?

Some of the categories of threats against international stability ought to be evident to all of us: The proliferation of conventional weapons; the disintegration of political order; the proliferation of biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons. All of these threats can be controlled with decisive, aggressive action, but if they are allowed to run their course the consequences would be hard to contain and the costs could be terribly high.

I suggest, Mr. President, that containing the crises that face us in the post-cold-war era depends on two things. First, it depends on American superiority in new weapons, something that is costly to maintain. America, for example, has held the lead in Stealth technology. The price was high—$65 billion over 20 years. No one can now argue that this investment was wasted.

Second, early decisive, decisive American involvement depends on a commitment to act, not just react. We need to aggressively shape the security environments of the gulf area, Asia and Europe, not just respond to crisis after crisis, emergency after emergency. This is the best way to minimize our future commitment.

This presents a challenge. America's lead in military power and technology can easily result, if we are not careful, in complacency. Historically, the United States has made the error of excessive downsizing again and again. Each time has resulted in tragedy, and I fear that we may be starting down that path once more. Never in the history of this country have we successfully downsized after a victorious conflict—never. Each time, we have paid a significant price in terms of the loss of American lives, the commitment of resources that otherwise would not have had to have been committed, the lack of preparedness that had led to the subsequent conflict.

Next year, as has been pointed out, will be the 11th consecutive year of real decline in defense spending. When President Clinton took office, he doubled his projected defense cuts to get deficit reduction without a net increase in domestic spending. We have reduced military personnel by 23 percent. We are headed for a 33 percent cut by 1999. Our military is a third smaller than it was just 10 years ago.

To suggest that the Defense Department has not done its share in addressing the budget deficit or freeing up funds for domestic discretionary spending is factually totally inaccurate. As was pointed out by the Senator from New Mexico earlier, since 1990, defense discretionary spending has decreased 10 percent and all other nondefense discretionary spending has increased 36 percent. In the next 7 years, while defense will decrease $13 billion in real spending, Medicaid will increase $149 billion and Medicare $349 billion. How can we begin to suggest that after 11 years of reductions, after reducing our Air Force and Navy and Marines and Army by a third, defense has not done its share? I ask the Senator from Arkansas to name one program, one Federal program that has cut anything, that has even begun to match what the Department of Defense has done. I doubt that he can.

In October of last year, Anthony Lake from the administration argued, ''The Cassandras attacking our readiness are wrong.'' But just a few weeks later an audit revealed that one-fourth of the Army's active combat divisions were less than combat ready and that one armored brigade and one mechanized brigade, both quick-reaction units, could not carry out their missions on short notice. With projected levels of spending, America could soon be short of the resources to fight on two fronts by 3 army divisions, 6 tactical air wings, 4 carriers, and 40,0005 marines.

Meanwhile, the Pentagon is spending less on new weapons and equipment than at any time in the last 50 years.

Let me repeat that. The Pentagon is spending less on new weapons and equipment than at any time in the last 50 years.

To suggest there is some kind of spending binge going on over at the Pentagon is factually and totally inaccurate. In 1996, the Navy will purchase just three new ships. The Army will not even order one new tank. All four services combined will buy only 20 replacement jet fighters compared to 458 they bought in 1980.

Now, the theory behind this pattern is clear. We are living off the procurement of the Reagan years, weapons that were designed in the 1970's and procured in the 1980's. We are depending on military technology that is already in the pipeline. We are not even spending enough to replace existing equipment before it wears out. We are often preserving force structure by gutting procurement and research and development funds. All this has left us in the early stages of a predictable decline. American forces have more commitments than ever before, but those commitments are not matched by sufficient resources. Our soldiers, sailors, and airmen are asked to patrol more broadly, with decreasing force, while trying to keep acceptable personnel rotations and operations tempo in attempting to prolong the life of older equipment. It is a challenge they meet, but with great sacrifice, and a challenge they cannot meet forever.

The price. The price, as usual, is paid by the men and women who serve their country—a particular concern of mine. Deep cuts have reduced training, put pressure on military pay, forced longer deployments. This has encouraged many able people to leave and has weakened the spirit of those who remain.

In Armed Services hearings before our committee, and in discussions with personnel around this country and the world, I have heard a number of disturbing reports—snapshots of the military on the verge of a serious problem. Last year, in order to stretch its forces, the Navy started gapping its presence in the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf and the Western Pacific. For a third of each year, two of those theaters will have no aircraft carrier.

Since Navy officials were short last year of $300 million in operations funds——

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

Mr. COATS. I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Since Navy officials were short last year of $300 million in operations funds due to increased tempo of operations, they reduced flying hours for squadrons aboard carriers. Marines getting home from a 6-month deployment to Somalia aboard the USS Inchon were sent to Haiti 12 days after they reached home.

One general reports, ''Strategic lift in this country is broken right now.'' He warns that most U.S. military capability would not begin to arrive at a regional conflict for 3 months after it began. Yet the administration pretends the charade that it has a military capability to respond to two major regional crises at nearly the same time.

The Marine Corps is using 50-year-old canvas tents and wearing boots from the Korean war era. These instances are isolated, but they are not uncommon. They represent an emerging trend. The inspector general of the Marine Corps commented to me, ''At some point in the near future, the current funding strategy will ultimately undermine the corps' ability to meet warfighting and peacetime presence requirements.'' It is the same story in every branch.

Mr. President, in conclusion, the reason that we must be concerned is simple. We cannot afford as a nation to repeat the patterns of the past, a pattern of American withdrawal followed by major costly commitments. We need the ability to consistently shape our strategic future, not just to respond when it falls in disorder. And that requires both readiness and continued technological advances.

There is no simple formula for avoiding war, but some things clearly do not

work. Again, Donald Kagan observed, ''Good will, unilateral disarmament, avoidance of alliances, teaching and preaching the evils of war are of no avail.'' Denying our leadership and power will not keep the peace. The peace is kept by ''active effort, planning, the expenditure of resources, and sacrifice.'' It is reinforced by the possession of superior force and the will to use it skillfully.

It was World War I poet Siegfried Sassoon who said 76 years ago, ''Look down, and swear by the slain of war that you'll never forget.'' We best preserve that memory by recalling how war is prevented. It is not a task for the weak. It rests on a large vision of our Nation's role. And it involves the inescapable necessity of American leadership.

We can save money by shirking from this duty. Yes, we can. But we will not in the long run save the peace or save American lives. Kagan concludes in his ''On The Origins of War,'' with a warning:

> The United States and its allies, the states with the greatest interest in peace and the greatest power to preserve it, appear to be faltering in their willingness to pay the price in money and the risk of lives. Nothing could be more natural in a liberal republic, yet nothing could be more threatening to the peace they have recently achieved.

This is worth remembering in this debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COATS. There will be no excuse. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Let me say, the Senator from Indiana has said, name one program that suffered with the cuts that defense has taken. I am sorry I did not prepare for that particular question. But let me tell you why I am up here today. Right here on this chart—and figures do not lie; liars can figure—defense goes from $264 billion this year, goes up every year, to $280 billion in the year 2002.

Where are they suffering in all these big budget cuts?

Mr. COATS. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. BUMPERS. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. COATS. If the Senator had incorporated figures from 1985 to the present, you would see an entirely different picture. By drawing the line at what might happen in the next 5 years, you are ignoring what happened in the last 10 years. There has been a dramatic decrease in real dollars in defense spending for the last 10 straight years. But that is not on the Senator's chart.

Mr. BUMPERS. In the next 7 years, they will more than make up. You said ''Name one program.'' I will name them.

Mr. COATS. Taking cuts in defense.

Mr. BUMPERS. Nondefense discretionary spending. Of all the spending cuts over the next 7 years, poor little old nondefense, domestic discretionary spending—education, health care, law enforcement, you name it—takes 43 percent, 43 percent of the total spending cuts over the next 7 years.

The Senator said this is not about B–2 versus Head Start. That is precisely what it is about. I supported the B–2 much longer than I should have. For years I voted faithfully for it. I voted for the Trident submarine, the F–15's, the F–16's, the F–18's, the F–111's, the F-B–111's, the F–117's, you name it. I voted for all of them. And I tried to cut a few, too.

I have stood at this desk for 20 years saying, for example, that we ought not to bring 40 rust-bucket battleships out of mothballs. Boy, the herd of instincts flew through here. The ''evil empire'' was about to come up the Potomac and get us. We even bring battleships out of mothballs, the ones the Japanese surrendered 50 years ago on, and we spent almost $2 billion on them. What do you think happened? They floated the high seas for 2 years and we put them back in mothballs. But our $2 billion is gone. You could not say anything here without being considered a dove.

Senator DOMENICI told you a moment ago what all would go up. He did not tell you what would go down. What will go down is $250 billion a year in taxes—$250 billion over the next 7-year period for people who make over $100,000 a year. They get 75 percent of it. Is that where this country's values are? We are going to cut Medicare for the elderly $270 billion and cut taxes by $250 billion.

He told you about nondefense discretionary spending. I just got through telling you that will take—that nondefense discretionary spending is going to absorb 43 percent of all the cuts. And in the year 2002, nondefense domestic discretionary spending will fall to 2.4 percent of our economy, the lowest since 1954.

The Senator from Georgia said this same amendment was brought up on the budget resolution. And it was. But it was one of those amendments that could not be debated. You just had to throw it out and let people vote on it. And on that same budget resolution, incidentally, that came out of the Senate and went to conference, you know what happened to it in conference? It came back with $33 billion tacked onto it from the time it left the U.S. Senate.

We gave in to the House on everything and added $33 billion to the budget resolution after it left the Senate.

Year after year, as I stood here and said, ''Don't bring those old battleships out of mothballs,'' and a host of other things, I always got run over like a Mack truck. And here I am again. I always come back hoping that somebody across America might be paying attention, might even be listening.

But the argument always was, ''The Secretary of Defense wants this,'' ''The President wants it,'' ''The Joint Chiefs want it.'' And this year I say the Secretary does not want it, the President does not want it, and the Joint Chiefs do not want it. And the argument on the other side is, ''Well, what do they know?'' It does not make any difference what you do, whether you want it or do not want it, you get it.

Mr. President, this ought to be compelling. It ought to be absolutely compelling. The figures are stark. They are staggering. I told the Senator from Georgia awhile ago, I do not have anything to lose. I know how many votes we are going to get on this and how we are going to come out on it. It is going to be years before this U.S. Senate is going to listen to this kind of argument. I only pray that it will not be too late.

So, Mr. President, let me just close—and I am prepared to yield back my time and let the Senator make his point of order.

Mr. DOMENICI. Might I ask Senator BUMPERS a question?

Mr. BUMPERS. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time does the Senator have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. We are out of time. I wonder if the Senator will object to my taking 30 seconds at this point, and then I will make the point of order.

Mr. BUMPERS. I yield the Senator 30 seconds of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields to the Senator from New Mexico 30 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I think with reference to the years 1995 to 2002, the Senate should know that in 1995, we will spend $270 billion on defense, and in 2002, we will spend $271 billion—$1 billion higher 7 years later, almost 8 years later.

The numbers the Senator is using have to do with ups and downs in between. The truth of the matter is, we entered this budget period at $270 billion; we leave it at $271 billion.

I thank the Senator for the 30 seconds.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, my chief cosponsor on this amendment is Senator SIMON, who happily has laryngitis, so I get to do all the talking. My cosponsors are Senators WELLSTONE, MOSELEY-BRAUN, KOHL, and FEINGOLD. I am prepared to yield back such time as I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields back his time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the pending amendment contains matters within the jurisdiction of the Senate Budget Committee. Pursuant to section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act, I raise a point of order against the pending amendment.

MOTION TO WAIVE THE BUDGET ACT

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I move to waive the Budget Act for purposes of the Senate's consideration of this amendment, and 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 question is on agreeing to the motion to waive section 306 of the Budget Act. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

(Disturbance in the galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will restore order in the gallery. The clerk will resume calling the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 63, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 361 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Akaka	Feingold	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Harkin	Moynihan
Biden	Hatfield	Murray
Bingaman	Hollings	Pell
Boxer	Jeffords	Pryor
Bradley	Johnston	Reid
Breaux	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Bumpers	Kerry	Sarbanes
Byrd	Kohl	Simon
Conrad	Lautenberg	Specter
Daschle	Leahy	Wellstone
Dodd	Levin	
Dorgan	Mikulski	

NAYS—63

Abraham	Ford	Lugar
Ashcroft	Frist	Mack
Bennett	Glenn	McCain
Bond	Gorton	McConnell
Brown	Graham	Murkowski
Bryan	Gramm	Nickles
Burns	Grams	Nunn
Campbell	Grassley	Packwood
Chafee	Gregg	Pressler
Coats	Hatch	Robb
Cochran	Heflin	Roth
Cohen	Helms	Santorum
Coverdell	Hutchison	Shelby
Craig	Inhofe	Simpson
D'Amato	Inouye	Smith
DeWine	Kassebaum	Snowe
Dole	Kempthorne	Stevens
Domenici	Kerrey	Thomas
Exon	Kyl	Thompson
Faircloth	Lieberman	Thurmond
Feinstein	Lott	Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 37 and the nays are 63. Three-fifths of the Senators present and voting having voted in the negative, the motion to waive the Budget Act is rejected.

The pending amendment No. 2115 contains matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget, and therefore violates section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act. The point of order is sustained. The amendment falls.

Mr. THURMOND. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. As I understand, the Senator from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN, is prepared to accept the 20 minutes equally divided time agreement; so I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCCAIN be recognized to offer his amendment regarding the Olympics, and there be 20 minutes equally divided prior to a motion to table, and that no second-degree amendments be in order prior to the vote on the motion to table.

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

Mr. DOLE. After that, as I understand it, the Senator from Vermont is prepared; if not, the Senator from Wisconsin is prepared to proceed.

Mr. LEAHY. I am prepared to proceed under a time agreement. I believe it is similar to the one—I must admit, I was distracted on the one you gave about the Senator from Arizona, but it sounds about the same.

Mr. DOLE. We will do the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin first, then.

Following disposition of the McCain amendment, Senator KOHL be recognized to offer his amendment; that he have 1 hour and 15 minutes, and 15 minutes on this side.

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. DOLE. No second-degree amendments will be in order.

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, I will not object. I just had a question for the majority leader.

I have an amendment that has been cleared on both sides. I only need 5 minutes on my side to describe it. If we could work that in sometime soon, I would be very grateful to the Senator.

Mr. DOLE. Will there be a rollcall vote?

Mrs. BOXER. I would like a rollcall, but it could be stacked at any time that managers feel is a good time to stack.

Mr. NUNN. We need to take a look at that amendment. I believe it is probably cleared on both sides. We can get to them quicker if there is not a rollcall vote.

Does the Senator from California have to have a rollcall vote?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes; I have been working on it for a year and a half.

Mr. NUNN. We will look at it.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, but if I may have the attention of the majority leader.

The question was asked earlier by the majority leader, and I am willing to go forward on my amendment, following the Senator from Arizona, under the same time agreement. I just had a chance to read the agreement made with the Senator from Arizona. I advise the distinguished majority leader that I am happy to follow him with a similar agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request on the Kohl amendment by the majority leader?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I believe the amendment of the Senator from California has been cleared on both sides. I believe she wants 5 minutes of discussion. I do not think we will need over 1 minute, so we could get a unanimous-consent to have that in order, with about 6 minutes on it, and have a rollcall vote. We could do that, and perhaps even have a 10-minute rollcall vote after, following either the Kohl rollcall or the McCain rollcall.

Mr. DOLE. We will work that out if we can.

What is your time agreement?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the request for 20 minutes evenly divided in the usual order. I would accept that, to follow after the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from California.

Mr. DOLE. There may be a second-degree amendment to yours. Is that a problem?

Mr. LEAHY. My understanding is that there be no second-degree in order prior to a motion to table. Obviously, if the motion to table is lost, they reserve their rights.

Mr. DOLE. Can I get back to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. LEAHY. I am just trying to be helpful.

Mr. DOLE. So, following the debate on the Kohl amendment, but prior to the vote, we will take up the amendment of the Senator from California, Senator BOXER; 10 minutes equally divided. Then we will have back-to-back rollcall votes.

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

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, as someone who has been engaged in attempting to move this bill forward, I would hope Members will accept reasonable time agreements. We have been working long days and long nights for a lot of weeks now. Most of us have not been home with our families for meals for weeks, and the Senate is going to be in session tomorrow. We take up the welfare debate next week, which will be a long week.

If there is a way we can avoid the time it takes to have rollcall votes on amendments that are already accepted, or if there is a way that Members can reduce the amount of time they speak on issues that have been debated over and over and over, time after time after time, and everybody knows how they are going to vote, I think everybody would appreciate that.

My experience is that no matter how articulate and eloquent my speeches might be—and they are not all that articulate and eloquent—it does not change any votes. So to the extent any of us can summarize our arguments, realizing that no matter how passionate or eloquent they might be, it is probably not going to do anything except make us more tired and irritable and probably produce more votes against us than when we started speaking. I hope everybody, in the interests of those of us who have families at home and would like to see them once in a while, could take those situations into their consideration.

To the extent we can move along with these bills and people can summarize their statements in the interests of providing some comity for their colleagues, I would certainly appreciate that and I am sure others would also.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. For the information of all Senators, I think it would be helpful if the President might give us the sequence, now, as was just agreed to in the unanimous consent. Is it my understanding the McCain amendment will be followed by the Boxer amendment to be followed by the Kohl amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. McCain, Kohl, Boxer.

Mr. DASCHLE. And the McCain amendment has 20 minutes with a rollcall and then the Kohl amendment is an hour with a rollcall and then the Boxer amendment is 6 minutes with a rollcall after that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Kohl amendment has a total of an hour and a half for debate.

Mr. DASCHLE. So there will be a rollcall in 20 minutes, is that correct?

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, if I could say to the leader, I believe the order provided the McCain amendment would be disposed of, then the Kohl amendment would be taken up and debated. Before the Kohl vote, the Boxer amendment would be taken up and debated, and then we would vote on Kohl and Boxer after that.

So as I understand it, we will dispose of the McCain amendment first. Then we will have debate on the Kohl amendment and then we will have the debate on the Boxer amendment and we will vote on those two amendments after that. That is my understanding.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if I might make a suggestion, if we could take Boxer after McCain, we could have a vote here on those two amendments in about 1 hour and then have another vote in an hour and a half, after the others? I only say that because I know there are a substantial number of us who are going to be leaving here very soon.

Mr. NUNN. I have no objection to that. The majority leader entered into the agreement. I think it probably needs to be cleared with him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. I suggest we could save more time if we went ahead with the unanimous-consent agreement, which I believe is my amendment. Keeping in mind the admonition of my dearest friend, Senator COATS of Indiana, I will try to be very brief, because it is a very simple issue. Since we have just 10 minutes on each side, I will be very brief.

AMENDMENT NO. 2116

(Purpose: To mandate the money made available to the Department of Defense and used for civilian sporting events be reimbursed to the Department of Defense)

Mr. McCAIN. I have an amendment at the desk. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McCAIN], proposes an amendment numbered 2116.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the Act, add the following new section:

SEC. . CIVILIAN SPORTING EVENTS.

(a) No funds made available to the Department of Defense may be expended either directly or indirectly to support civilian sporting events, including but not limited to the World Cup Soccer Games, the Goodwill Games, and the Olympics, until the Secretary of Defense enters into an agreement with the appropriate entity or affiliated entity or entities and certifies that such funds will be reimbursed to the extent available to the Department under terms and conditions established by the Secretary of Defense, and that such terms shall—

(1) not mandate any reimbursement until after the event is complete and all event-related contractual obligations have been met by the entity; and

(2) such reimbursement shall not exceed surplus funds available.

(b) For the purposes of this Section, paragraph (a) shall be null and void and of no effect if the entity or entities with which the agreement was made have no surplus funds after all other contractual obligations have been met.

(c) SURPLUS FUNDS DEFINED.—For the purpose of this section, the term ''surplus funds'', with respect to an organization sponsoring a sporting event, means the amount equal to the excess of—

(1) the total amount of the funds received by the organization for the event other than revenues derived for any tax, over

(2) the total amount expended by the organization for payment of all of the costs under the organization's contractual obligations (other than an agreement entered into with the Secretary of Defense under this section) that relate to the event.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, this amendment is extremely simple. We have been through it before. It is something that I find very difficult to understand, why that would not make sense to most Members of this body. It is simply that any money—not just on the Olympics in Atlanta—any money that is spent by the Department of Defense for a civilian sporting event be reimbursed to the Department if the event makes a profit.

I want to emphasize that about five times, if I might. The reimbursement to the Department of Defense for money that is spent out of the Department of Defense would only be reimbursed if the event made a profit.

I do not understand the argument that the Olympics are a wonderful thing, because they are; and that they need security, because they do. One thing I still have been unable to figure out is that I am told by the opponents of this legislation, primarily, and understandably the two Senators from the State of Georgia, they do not know, they are not going to be able to tell whether they make a profit or not.

If they cannot figure out whether they make a profit or not, they sure as heck should not have gotten the Olympic games. I have done a little research. Every other Olympic games have, at the end of it, been able to figure out whether they had a profit or loss. And why Atlanta seems incapable of doing so staggers the imagination.

The Los Angeles Olympics made $222 million; ABC has agreed to pay $225 million in serving as host broadcasters. They did at the Los Angeles Olympics. There is a U.S. Mint coin program that has made $147 million.

I have a great quote from ''Making It Happen,'' the story of the Los Angeles Olympics.

> There was always concern that someone could stand up in Congress and demand that the committee reimburse the Federal Government its security and other expenditures on the games. This ran at least $30 million for security alone and could have been estimated as high as $68 million overall. I believed then as I do now that there are many important programs much more deserving of Government support than a sports event.

''Made in America,'' by Peter Ueberroth.

Mr. President, what this is all about simply is that this Olympics, if it does not make a profit, will not be required to reimburse the taxpayers of America. This does not have anything to do with any reluctance to provide the security that is necessary for these Olympics. We do not have to hear again about the tragedy of Munich. We are all aware of that. And I believe that the taxpayers of America deserve to be reimbursed if the games make a profit. If not, I certainly will not seek that.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. President, I ask that notwithstanding the previous consent, the Boxer amendment be in order following the McCain debate and the votes then occur back-to-back—courtesy of the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. COHEN. Reserving the right to object, I inquire whether or not, between the votes, after the vote on the McCain amendment, I be allowed to offer an amendment that has been agreed to?

Mr. McCAIN. Does the Senator from California seek a rollcall vote on her amendment?

Mrs. BOXER. The Senator from California does, in fact, seek a rollcall vote.

Mr. McCAIN. I repeat my unanimous consent request, Mr. President. I ask, notwithstanding the previous consent agreement, the Boxer amendment be in order following the McCain debate, debate on the McCain amendment, and the votes then occur back to back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). The Senator from Virginia has control of the time.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Arizona will control the time on this.

Mr. McCAIN. I only have 10 minutes. I spoke for about 5. Now I believe it is the other side's turn to speak.

Mr. WARNER. For purposes of control in favor of the amendment, you control the time.

Mr. McCAIN. I am speaking for the amendment.

Mr. WARNER. I understand that.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Georgia control the time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment. As my good colleague from Arizona noted when he began his remarks, we dealt with this before and, therefore, he would be brief. He is correct. We dealt with this last year, and his amendment was defeated 77 to 21. It was defeated for several reasons.

One, there is an understanding that there are facilities and capacity that the Department of Defense must provide for the security of the U.S. Centennial Olympics, which will occur in Atlanta, GA, in less than a year. It was defeated because it was interloping on 4 years of contract and arrangement. And it was thought at that time, which was 2 years before the Olympics, that it was too late to intervene and contravene and disrupt the very intricate process of DOD security as provided to our guests—12,000 athletes, 196 countries, with venues occurring in five separate States and 31 villages. It was defeated for that reason.

Here we are a year later, less than 1 year before the flame is lit in Atlanta, GA, and we have the same amendment back. It was not acceptable a year ago; it certainly is not acceptable today.

The amendment deals with more than reimbursement. The first section of the amendment says no funds may be expended to the various events, including the Olympics, until the Secretary of Defense has entered into an agreement with the various entities involved. That means that no funds could be expended, no security and preparation of this international event of this magnitude until the Department of Defense has entered into an agreement with 43 separate jurisdictions—States, counties, municipalities, et cetera.

If this amendment is adopted, it would bring the security apparatus envisioned—and which all of us know needs to be in place—to a standstill. We all know the process that would be underway in terms of trying to deal with this and the agreements that would have to be sought and concluded and the morass that would surround it.

Mr. President, in addition, the amendment removes the accounting procedure. Vast expenditures would be called upon by the Olympics—employee wages, upkeep of the facilities, maintenance, electric bills, which would fall outside what would be in the accounting process.

The point is, in sum and short, the Department of Defense is the only facility and capacity that can provide the very special security requirements. This will disrupt that process and it should be an effort that is entirely proactive. It would bring the security process to its knees.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to my distinguished colleague from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. I thank my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. President, I would just say very briefly, and reserve the remainder of my time, that there are three problems with this amendment. It does look like a simple amendment. I know the Senator from Arizona is sincere in his efforts to try to save money for the Federal Government.

One of the problems with this amendment—and there are three main problems. First of all, it will not work. It is an accounting nightmare. We would have to basically call off the security for a period of weeks or perhaps months while a team of lawyers and accountants went down and negotiated not only with the Olympic committee but with many different jurisdictions, as my colleague from Georgia pointed out.

So the first problem is it is not workable with an entity like the Olympics that is operating in five States in many different local jurisdictions, that is not intending to make a profit, that is putting up a huge number of buildings and structures that would have to have an amortization table set up because they are going to be turned over to local entities afterwards. How can you determine a property in those circumstances?

The second problem is it is not going to save the Government any money. They do not intend to make a profit. If they see they are going to have a surplus toward the end of the games, they are going to try to put it back into the games. I have been told that over and over and over.

The third problem with it is it will probably cost the Government money. How would it cost the Government money if we adopt this and it became law? It would cost the Government money because this amendment says very clearly that no reimbursement would take place until the event is complete. Right now the agreement that has been worked out with DOD is that anything that is not related to the security is reimbursed immediately.

So DOD does some things that are not security related that get reimbursed. They have already reimbursed the Government something like $55,000. It will probably be something in the neighborhood of $1¼ million to $1 million before it is over. So this amendment, intending to save money, will end up, in my view, costing money because there will be no excess.

The other problems—the big problem is what State and local governments do. Our States are putting at least $35 million or $40 million in. There will be events in Tennessee. Tennessee is going to be spending money. Once we adopt this, each State is going to say, ''We want to get reimbursed for our costs before the Federal Government.'' I do not know how that will play in this amendment. Perhaps someone could explain it.

So this amendment is simply not workable. It will not save the Federal Government any money. It would reverse the precedent we have had over and over again.

Mr. President, this is what is at stake here. We have 195 countries, 100 heads of state, 15,000 athletes and officials, 15,000 media representatives, 25,000 Olympic family and VIP's, 12 million tickets, 350,000 visitors per day, 3,000 hours of TV coverage, 3 billion viewers around the world. That is what is at stake.

How much would Germany have paid for the security to prevent the slaughter that took place by terrorists at Munich in 1972? Do we want to nickel and dime security and have the ACOG committee, knowing they may be called on for some kind of cost accounting nightmare reimbursement and then negotiate with our military to see what we need in terms of chemical warfare specialists, what we need in terms of people who know about biological warfare, what we need it terms of communications?

Mr. President, we do not want that for the Olympics. We do not want a black eye for the Olympics. We do not want to cut security to the bone and then end up with some tragedy or some great embarrassment.

So I urge the rejection of the amendment and reserve the remainder of the time.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, how much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 5 minutes 42 seconds, and the Senator from Georgia has 2 minutes 22 seconds.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. President, I had hoped that 1972 would not come up again in this debate. No one, no one, no one believes that 1972 should ever come up again. And to relate the tragedy of 1972 and what happened in Munich when the terrorist attack took place on a request which I think is reasonable—and reasonable people can disagree; if the Olympics make a profit, they reimburse, of course—it is just hard for me to understand.

The senior Senator from Georgia said it would be an accounting nightmare. I believe that the people of America who invest sizable amounts of money—not just in defense—they have the right to know whether this Olympics makes a profit or a loss.

As I said, I have done research of every single Olympic game that has been held in the United States. They come out with a profit or a loss as any other enterprise would. I am shocked to hear that it is impossible for the Olympic games to figure out whether or not they make a profit or a loss. I am shocked.

With the appropriate legislation, if there are Federal funds involved with the Olympics, I am going to propose some kind of amendment that the American people have an accounting. I do not think that is unreasonable.

I would like to congratulate the two Senators from Georgia. They are for the Olympic games for the first time for which there is no accounting.

The second thing is they do not intend to make a profit. If they do not intend to make a profit, then we should adopt this amendment by unanimous consent agreement by voice vote because then they do not have a problem. If the senior Senator from Georgia is convinced that they are not going to make a profit, then he does not have to worry about this amendment.

Why is he debating against it? In his words, they do not intend to make a profit. That is their option. But the American people deserve an accounting.

As far as the cost to the Government to be reimbursed immediately, all I can say is that if we are talking about as much as $20 million to be spent, $10 million last year and $10 million this year, I think the American people deserve to be reimbursed if this enterprise makes a profit.

Obviously, it has nothing to do with the 1972 tragedy in Munich, and I do not believe that cost considerations would drive any organization to reduce the security required to make sure, to make every effort possible so that the Olympic games would be made safe and secure.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. COVERDELL. I yield 1 minute to the distinguish Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Chair.

In concept, I have no problem at all with the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona. Having been in business, however, I have discovered that there are profits and there are profits. I remember in the Los Angeles Olympics, I was living in Los Angeles at the time. There were divergences of as much as $100 million as to the amount of profit made by that Olympic games, depending on who was doing the accounting.

His amendment does not specify how that is going to work or where we are going to determine the profit or what is going to be charged or what is not. All of that is going to have to be worked out.

Second, the same issue applies to the question of costs, the costs to the Department of Defense. Again, having been a businessman, I know there are differences between costs and costs. I am told by the Defense Department that they look forward to this opportunity because it gives them a training opportunity for troops that will train in a real-life situation.

Where would the money be spent if it was not spent while they were at the Olympics? I was interested in an amendment that says incremental costs only that spells out the kind of problems. The amendment of the Senator from Arizona, in my opinion, is flawed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to help out the Senator from Utah. The exact amount of money in profit from the Los Angeles games, according to all, including the head of the Olympic games, Mr. Ubeberroth, was $22,716,000. No one questions that.

As far as the training opportunity, putting up fences is not exactly the training opportunity that we want for most of our men and women in the military. Regularly, when costs are incurred by the Department of Defense, they send bills to entities and organizations.

And finally, I would like to congratulate the Senator from Utah for the selection of the city of Salt Lake for the Olympics.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, how much time remains for the opponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute of time for the Senator from Georgia and 2 minutes and 16 seconds for the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. COVERDELL. I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. President, we are not talking about building fences. We are talking about physical security for athletic villages, an entire communications grid that only DOD can put in place, a command coordination, providing site surveys, aerial visitations. It goes on and on.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat, we are less than 1 year from the lighting of the flame. There are 43 separate jurisdictions. This amendment shuts it all down with less than 1 year to go while we would enter into 43 separate negotiations on contracts. If this amendment were to prevail, it will literally shut down the planning for security for one of the world's greatest events, for which there will be an assembly like none has ever occurred and it will be in the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 2 minutes 15 seconds.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I believe that the Atlanta Olympic Committee has made agreements with a lot of different organizations for services that are provided for the Atlanta Olympics. For example, I am sure they have made an agreement with the post office for mail delivery. I am sure they have made an agreement with many other commercial organizations. I am convinced that they could do the same thing with the Department of Defense; that after there is a final accounting, upon the completion of the Olympics, the American people deserve to know what the profit and loss was, that we could then consider reimbursing the Department of Defense.

If the two Senators from Georgia are convinced there is not going to be a profit, then they should not have a problem at all with this amendment. If they think they might make a profit, I can assure them that only after there would be a final accounting would a profit be divided up. I would even be willing to have a certain percentage of the profits go back to reimburse the Department of Defense, if not all.

The reason why I do this, Mr. President, finally, is because time after time after time we find ways to spend taxpayers' dollars that are earmarked for defense on issues and areas and programs that have nothing to do with defense. This is just one of hundreds of examples. This really does not have anything to do with national defense. It has to do with providing security for the Olympic games, which are fine. But it has nothing to do with defending this Nation's vital national security interests. That is why, as I say, only if there were a profit should we reimburse the taxpayers of America.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I move to lay the McCain amendment on the table.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote will be taken after debate on the Boxer amendment. The amendment is temporarily laid aside.

The Senator from California is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2117

(Purpose: To provide a substitute for section 526, which amends a provision of the Uniform Code of Military Justice relating to forfeiture of pay and allowances and reduction in grade)

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

This will be a very brief debate because I think there is very broad agreement on this issue. However, I thought it was important to take just a few moments. I think the Senate will be very proud to vote for this amendment because we are going to put an end to a most outrageous policy that has gone on really without the knowledge of many of us. It is one of those issues that has gotten buried over the years.

Late last year, I learned from a series of articles in the Dayton Daily News that military personnel convicted of heinous crimes continue to be paid while they appeal their convictions through the military court system, a process that often can take many years.

According to data, the Department of Defense spends about $1 million each and every month, $1 million a month, on the salaries of more than 600 convicts. In 1 month, the Pentagon payroll included 58 incarcerated rapists, 164 child molesters, and 7 murderers.

The individual stories of military criminals continuing to receive full pay are shocking. In California, a marine lance corporal who beat his 13-month-old daughter to death almost 2 years ago receives $1,105 every month—more than $25,000 since his conviction. He spends his days in the brig at Camp Pendleton and refuses to pay a dime of child support.

I spoke with the murdered child's grandmother who now has custody of the surviving 4-year old grandson. She is a resident of northern California and was justifiably outraged to learn that the murderer of her grandchild still receives full pay, and that is what this amendment is going to end.

Mr. President, I can stand here for hours, and you know that I will not do so but, rather, in the next couple of minutes will share a couple other cases.

The lieutenant colonel who raped young girls in a church basement has been paid more than $150,000 since his conviction. I can tell you about the Air Force sergeant who tried to kill his wife with a kitchen knife and is still paid $1,100 a month. From inside his prison cell, he reads the Wall Street Journal and watches his taxpayer-funded nest egg grow. He told the Dayton Daily News, ''I follow the stock market, and I buy EE bonds.''

When I first learned that hundreds of violent criminals remained on the Pentagon payroll, I immediately wrote to Secretary Perry to demand an end to this outrageous practice. The Secretary quickly notified me of the support for changing the policy. He established a working group to propose the necessary legal changes.

I introduced legislation to prohibit pay for military convicts on March 16, and my bill quickly attracted 19 bipartisan cosponsors. I am very grateful for their support. The ranking member of the committee, Senator NUNN, offered a number of helpful suggestions to improve my proposal, as did the chairman of the Personnel Subcommittee, Senator COATS.

I wish to thank each of them for their good work and constructive advice on this issue. I would say that the Armed Services Committee on both sides of the aisle was very supportive. They held a hearing. We all rolled up our sleeves, and we got to work. The bill addresses this issue. The only difference with the Boxer amendment is we end the pay in a quicker timeframe.

This amendment has been cleared on both sides. Again, I want to say to my friends on both sides of the aisle, thank you very much. I think we will be proud today that we end this unconscionable practice.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COATS. Will the Senator from California yield?

Mrs. BOXER. I will be happy to yield whatever time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from California send the amendment to the desk?

Mrs. BOXER. I believe the Senator's amendment is at the desk already.

Mr. President, I will ask for the yeas and nays. Then I will be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for herself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. BRADLEY, proposes an amendment numbered 2117.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 189, strike out line 5 and all that follows through page 191, line 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 526. FORFEITURE OF PAY AND ALLOWANCES AND REDUCTION IN GRADE.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE OF PUNISHMENTS.—Section 857(a) (article 57(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(a)(1) Any forfeiture of pay, forfeiture of allowances, or recuction in grade included in a sentence of a court-martial takes effect on the earlier of—

''(A) the date that is 14 days after the date on which the sentence is adjudged; or

''(B) the date on which the sentence is approved by the convening authority.

''(2) On application by an accused, the convening authority may defer any forfeiture of pay, forfeiture of allowances, or reduction in grade that would otherwise become effective under paragraph (1)(A) until the date on which the sentence is approved by the convening authority. The deferment may be rescinded at any time by the convening authority.

''(3) A forfeiture of pay or allowances shall be collected from pay accruing on and after the date on which the sentence takes effect under paragraph (1). Periods during which a sentence to forfeiture of pay or forfeiture of allowances is suspended or deferred shall be excluded in computing the duration of the forfeiture.

''(4) In this subsection, the term 'convening authority', with respect to a sentence of a court-martial, means any person authorized to act on the sentence under section 860 of this title (article 60).''.

(b) EFFECT OF PUNITIVE SEPARATION OR CONFINEMENT FOR ONE YEAR OR MORE.—(1) Subchapter VIII is amended by inserting after section 858a (article 58a) the following new section (article):

''§ 858b. Art. 58b. Sentences: forfeiture of pay and allowances.

''(a) A sentence adjudged by a court-martial that includes confinement for one year or more, death, dishonorable discharge, bad-conduct discharge, or dismissal shall result in the forfeiture of all pay and allowances due that member during any period of confinement or parole. The forfeiture required by this section shall take effect on the date determined under section 857(a) of this title (article 57(a)) and may be deferred in accordance with that section.

''(b) In a case involving an accused who has dependents, the convening authority or other person acting under section 860 of this title (article 60) may waive any or all of the forfeitures of pay and allowances required by subsection (a) for a period not to exceed six months. Any amount of pay or allowances that, except for a waiver under this subsection, would be forfeited shall be paid, as the convening authority or other person taking action directs, to the dependents of the accused.''.

''(c) If the sentence of a member who forfeits pay and allowances under subsection (a) is set aside or disapproved or, as finally approved, does not provide for a punishment referred to in subsection (a), the member shall be paid the pay and allowances which the member would have been paid, except for the forfeiture, for the period during which the forfeiture was in effect.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter VIII of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''858b. 58b. Sentences: forfeiture of pay and allowances.''.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to a case in which a sentence is adjudged by a court-martial on or after the first day of the first month that begins at least 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator request the yeas and nays?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 1 minute 10 seconds.

Mrs. BOXER. I will be pleased to yield to my friend, Senator COATS.

Mr. COATS. I thank the Senator. I will just take 30 seconds.

Senator BOXER worked carefully with the committee on this proposal. While the committee language was slightly different from what the Senator's amendment proposes here today, it simply accelerates the time in which the Department has to effect the change. It is acceptable to the committee. We appreciate the Senator working with us on this, and we support this amendment.

I thank the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NUNN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment by the Senator from California. I congratulate her on her leadership in bringing this to the attention of the Department of Defense Armed Services Committee. This reaffirms a provision that the bill now has in it precluding pay for military prisoners who are sentenced to extended confinement. I believe that term is defined as ''over 1 year.'' I also believe it changes the appeal time before the actual compensation is cut off. The bill has 21 days. This has 14 days after conviction.

This is an abuse that has gone on too long. It was not brought to the attention of our committee or the Department of Defense.

I congratulate the Senator for his leadership.

I urge its approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mrs. BOXER. I yield my time back, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield back his time?

Mr. NUNN. Has the Senator from Indiana used all the time he needs?

Mr. COATS. Yes. We yield back our time.

Mr. NUNN. I yield back the time.

VOTE ON MOTION TO TABLE AMENDMENT NO. 2116

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the motion to table the McCAIN amendment No. 2116.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 362 Leg.]

YEAS—80

Akaka	Exon	McConnell
Baucus	Faircloth	Mikulski
Bennett	Feinstein	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Ford	Moynihan
Bingaman	Frist	Murkowski
Bond	Gorton	Murray
Boxer	Graham	Nunn
Bradley	Gramm	Packwood
Breaux	Grassley	Pell
Bryan	Harkin	Pressler
Bumpers	Hatch	Pryor
Burns	Heflin	Reid
Byrd	Helms	Robb
Campbell	Hollings	Rockefeller
Chafee	Hutchison	Roth
Cochran	Inouye	Santorum
Cohen	Johnston	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kassebaum	Shelby
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Simon
Craig	Kennedy	Simpson
D'Amato	Kerrey	Snowe
Daschle	Kerry	Stevens
DeWine	Leahy	Thompson
Dodd	Levin	Thurmond
Dole	Lieberman	Warner
Domenici	Lott	Wellstone
Dorgan	Mack	

NAYS—20

Abraham	Gregg	Lugar
Ashcroft	Hatfield	McCain
Brown	Inhofe	Nickles
Coats	Jeffords	Smith
Feingold	Kohl	Specter
Glenn	Kyl	Thomas
Grams	Lautenberg	

So, the motion to table the amendment (No. 2116) was agreed to.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, this last vote is ample testimony that we will never stop spending the taxpayers' dollars that are earmarked for defense on anything but pork and wasteful spending.

The very concept that if an organization makes a profit that uses defense dollars, we cannot pay that back, then, Mr. President, I have no confidence whatsoever that we will ever be able to do what the taxpayers asked us to do—that is, to use the tax dollars earmarked for defense for purposes of national security.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2117

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on amendment No. 2117 offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, is this a 15-minute vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a 15-minute rollcall vote.

Mr. NUNN. I will suggest a 10-minute rollcall vote, unless there is objection.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2117 of the Senator from California.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 363 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Abraham	Dorgan	Lautenberg
Akaka	Exon	Leahy
Ashcroft	Feingold	Levin
Baucus	Feinstein	Lieberman
Bennett	Ford	Lott
Biden	Frist	Lugar
Bingaman	Glenn	Mack
Bond	Gorton	McCain
Boxer	Graham	McConnell
Bradley	Gramm	Mikulski
Breaux	Grams	Moseley-Braun
Brown	Grassley	Moynihan
Bryan	Gregg	Murkowski
Bumpers	Harkin	Murray
Burns	Hatfield	Nickles
Byrd	Heflin	Nunn
Campbell	Helms	Packwood
Chafee	Hollings	Pell
Coats	Hutchison	Pressler
Cochran	Inhofe	Pryor
Cohen	Inouye	Reid
Conrad	Jeffords	Robb
Coverdell	Johnston	Rockefeller
Craig	Kassebaum	Roth
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Santorum
Daschle	Kennedy	Sarbanes
DeWine	Kerrey	Shelby
Dodd	Kerry	Simon
Dole	Kohl	Simpson
Domenici	Kyl	Smith
Snowe	Thomas	Wellstone
Specter	Thurmond	
Stevens	Warner	

NAYS—3

Faircloth	Hatch	Thompson

So the amendment (No. 2117) was agreed to.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KOHL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. COHEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KOHL. I yield to the Senator from Maine, Senator COHEN.

AMENDMENT NO. 2118

(Purpose: To reform the management and procurement of information technology for the Government)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I have an amendment I am sending to the desk, cosponsored by Senators LEVIN, ROTH, GLENN, and BINGAMAN. It has been cleared on both sides. It deals with the acquisition of computer technology.

I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN], for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ROTH, Mr. GLENN, and Mr. BINGAMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 2118.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.'')

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, the amendment I am offering today lays the foundation for real information management reform not only at the Department of Defense but at all Government agencies.

The amendment is based on S. 946, the Federal Information Management Reform Act of 1995, which Senator LEVIN and I introduced earlier this year.

Before discussing the details of the amendment, I want to both commend and express my appreciation to Senator ROTH, chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee, and Senator GLENN, the ranking member. Both have been leaders on issues relating to information technology, and their contribution to crafting this amendment has been invaluable.

I would also like to thank my friend and colleague Senator LEVIN who I have worked closely with for over 15 years on the Oversight Subcommittee. I very much appreciate his counsel, cooperation, and support on this issue.

Finally, I want to also mention the members of these Senators' staff whose valuable assistance is appreciated. Specifically, Peter Levine, Mark Forman, David Plocher, and Debbie Cohen.

The amendment which would reform the Federal Government's approach to using and buying information technology, is cosponsored by Senators LEVIN, ROTH, GLENN, and BINGAMAN. Together, we have been able to fashion an amendment that will address many critical issues of information technology management within Federal agencies.

The amendment would accomplish meaningful reform, in part, by emphasizing upfront planning and the establishment of clear performance goals designed to improve agency operations. Once the upfront planning is complete and the performance goals are established, other reforms would make it simpler and faster for agencies to purchase information technology.

The need to reform how the Federal Government approaches and purchases information technology is well documented. The amendment reflects recommendations contained in literally hundreds of General Accounting Office and inspector general reports. The Defense Science Board's and numerous other formal Government studies have also outlined a number of problems in the current system and have made many recommendations for improvement. Now is the time to act on these recommendations, many of which are included in this amendment.

The current situation is abysmal. Last October, I issued a report entitled ''Computer Chaos,'' which stressed two key problems affecting the $27 billion we spend each year on information technology.

First, much of this money is wasted buying new systems that agencies have not adequately planned or managed. Consequently new systems, especially high dollars systems, rarely work as intended and do little to improve agency performance.

Second, a large portion of the $200 billion spent on information technology over the last decade has been thrown away maintaining old technology that no longer performs as needed. In other words, we are throwing billions of dollars away every year on technological bandaids, and we cannot, by virtue of the existing procurement and management system, effectively buy replacement systems.

Nowhere is this situation more evident than with our Nation's air traffic control system. In recent months, air traffic control system failures have become all too common. Passing this amendment will help to ensure that follow-on systems can be adequately planned and implemented to replace our Nation's aging air traffic control system before we have a tragedy.

The Government's failure to purchase effective computer systems has had significant implications for the Defense Department. The lack of effective information systems at the Pentagon has contributed to the mismanagement of billions of defense dollars. The payment of phantom employees, excessive inventories, and payments that weren't matched to invoices are the result of the Pentagon's inability to adequately and appropriately plan for and buy needed information systems.

In addition, defense agencies have spent billions of dollars each year to keep old, inefficient computer systems running, and they continue to buy new computer systems that are poorly planned and, once operational, do not meet the needs of the defense agencies which use them.

For example, 3 years ago I held hearings on the Defense Commissary Agency's failure to make timely and accurate payments to vendors. The Agency's computerized bill payment system was inadequate. Consequently, the vendors that delivered goods to commissaries, ranging from Kraft to Quahog Lobster Co. in my State of Maine, were not getting paid on time, if they were getting paid at all, while other vendors were getting paid repeatedly for the same invoices.

We do not know how much money the Defense Commissary Agency wasted through erroneous payments and added administrative expenses in an often futile attempt to sort out who was owed what. Although it has taken the Agency and some of its vendors years to recover from this experience, the whole episode could have been avoided had the Defense Commissary Agency invested in adequate technology.

Effective modernization at the Department of Defense has the potential to save taxpayers billions of dollars through increased efficiencies. In April, the Oversight Subcommittee held a hearing examining how the Pentagon manages its system from processing employee travel vouchers. We discovered that 30 percent of the Pentagon's travel budget—some $1 billion—was being spent just to process the $3 billion in annual DOD travel.

Private sector organizations spend on average about 10 percent of their travel budgets on processing vouchers and the best private sector organizations spend 6 percent. By adopting travel processing systems that are similar to private sector models and automating these processes, we determined that the Pentagon could save as much as $4 billion over the next 5 years.

As you can see, it is critical that we encourage not only the Pentagon but all Federal agencies to look at the way they do business, make changes to these business processes, and automate. I believe we can achieve a 5-percent annual reduction in Government overhead by adopting this strategy and, as a result, save the American taxpayer as much as $175 billion over the next 5 years. In this time of austere budgets, we cannot afford not to adopt the reforms contained in this amendment.

The bottom line is that the Government's current approach to buying computers is outdated and takes little account of the competitive and fast changing nature of the global computer industry. Markets and prices change daily, yet Government often gets locked into paying today's prices for yesterday's technology.

When the Brooks Act which governs how the Government buys computers was written in 1965, the Federal Government was the dominant computer buyer in the world and purchased over 60 percent of the industry's entire output. Today, the Federal market comprises only 3 percent of industry sales. While Government is still the largest single buyer, it no longer moves the market.

Over the last three decades, the Brooks Act has produced a process that has become too bureaucratic and cumbersome. It has spawned hundreds of pages of regulations and caused agencies to be primarily concerned with conformity to a paperwork process. What the process fails to address are the results—more efficient and less expensive Government—and fairness to the taxpayers.

In addition, an adversarial culture has developed between Government and business. Many companies believe they won't get a fair shake. Federal employees are suspicious of companies because of a fear of being second guessed and having the procurement protested.

In short, it is a culture of little trust, less communication, and no incentives to use information technology to improve the way Government does business and achieve the savings that we so desperately need.

It is time to move the Government's use of information technology into the 21st century. That is why I am introducing this amendment today so that we can significantly alter how the Government approaches and acquires information technology.

The legislation would repeal the Brooks Act and establish a framework that will respond more efficiently to the information technology needs of the Federal Government now and in the foreseeable future. The amendment would also eliminate the delegation of procurement authority at GSA, establish guidance and specific budgetary review authority at OMB, and establish Chief Information Officers at the major Federal agencies. Through the guidance and review process, OMB and the agencies will be required to emphasize up-front planning, monitor risk management, and work with contractors to achieve workable solutions to the Government's information needs.

The amendment will also discourage the so-called megasystem buys. Following the private sector model, agencies will be encouraged to take an incremental approach to buying information technology that is more manageable and less risky.

By replacing the current system with one that is less bureaucratic and process driven, the bill is designed to enable agencies to buy technology faster and for less money. More importantly, the bill is designed to make sure that before investing a dollar in information technology, Government agencies

will have carefully planned and justified their expenditures.

Similar to managing an investment portfolio, decisions on whether to invest in information technology will be made based on potential return. Decisions to terminate or make additional investments will be based on performance. Much like an investment broker, agency management and contractor performance will be measured and rewarded based on managing risk and achieving results.

I should note that the amendment is different from S. 946 in a number of significant ways. For example, S. 946 called for the establishment of a National Chief Information Officer at the Office of Management and Budget. Concerns were raised by the administration and Senators ROTH, GLENN, and LEVIN, that this has the potential to become a bureaucratic hurdle. Similar concerns were also raised at a hearing I conducted on this legislation in July. Consequently, the provision requiring a national CIO has been dropped.

In addition, a number of changes have been made to the procurement provisions. Specifically, a number of procurement reforms in the original legislation have been deleted from the amendment. These reform issues are currently under discussion by a Governmental Affairs/Armed Services/Small Business Committee working group and will be dealt with on a Governmentwide basis in procurement legislation later this year.

The amendment will fundamentally shift the Government's focus on information technology from a technical issue to a management issue. Information technology procurements under the current system have focused on features like the speed of the computer or the type of processor. Rarely, if ever, have they focused on whether the system was going to enhance the agency's mission by, for example, reducing benefit processing time or realize savings by reducing overhead expenditures.

Failure to recognize information technology as a management issue has cost taxpayers billions of dollars in inefficiency and waste. By passing this amendment, we can help transform the way the Government does business. If Government is going to regain the confidence of taxpayers, it must successfully modernize. And, as we all know, we cannot successfully modernize unless we can buy the tools which will enable us to automate.

Mr. President, my amendment is needed not only by the Department of Defense but throughout Government. Passing this amendment will go a long way toward bringing our Government into the 21st century. Reform is clearly the key to creating a Federal Government that, as the Vice President has put it, ''works better and costs less.'' I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, as an original cosponsor of S. 946, the Cohen-Levin information technology bill, I find myself in an unusual position with regard to this amendment. I had expected to work closely with Senator COHEN and other members of the Governmental Affairs Committee and our subcommittee to revise and perfect this bill. Instead, I find myself addressing this issue on the Senate floor before hearings on the bill have been completed and before the bill could be marked up and amended through the committee process.

There are serious problems with our Federal Government systems for purchasing and managing information technology. I believe that problems as far-reaching as these deserve serious consideration at the committee level. The changes proposed in the Cohen-Levin bill deserve a full airing in public hearings and an opportunity for input from the executive branch, the public, and all members of the committee of jurisdiction. For this reason, I initially intended to oppose this amendment.

I shall not do so, however. While I continue to have major concerns about the process through which this amendment has been considered, Senator COHEN and his staff have made major modifications to the bill to address concerns raised by the administration and by other members of the committee. They have also agreed to delete a number of provisions addressing issues that we expect to address on a more comprehensive basis in the context of a later procurement bill. As a result, the amendment before us would take a number of significant steps to address problems with the procurement and management of computer systems without raising the concerns that the earlier bill did.

Mr. President, I continue to believe, as I did when I joined Senator COHEN in introducing S. 946, that it is very much time for us to reexamine our systems for the acquisition of computer equipment from the ground up. I continue to believe that is appropriate for us to ask why procurement and bid protest procedures and standards that have met our needs for products ranging from toasters to fighter aircraft cannot also meet our needs in the area of computer procurement. I continue to believe that it is appropriate for us to ask why we still need the centralized approach of the Brooks Act, under which the General Services Administration is responsible for approving computer purchases by other Federal agencies.

The amendment that Senator COHEN and I are offering today would dramatically revise Federal procedures for the procurement and management of information technology products and services by:

Repealing the Brooks Act of 1965;

Eliminating the requirement for a delegation of procurement authority by General Services Administration;

Ending the unique role of the General Services Board of Contract Appeals in information technology bid protests;

Clarifying the role of the Office of Management and Budget and the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs in coordinating and improving Federal procurement and management of information technology;

Creating a new position in Federal agencies, known as the chief information officer or CIO, dedicated to the management of information technology resources;

Establishing a governmentwide CIO council to provide guidance to agencies on information technology management issues;

Establishing a preference for incremental purchases of information technology over a period of years, instead of unworkable megapurchases of huge amounts of products and services through a single contract; and

Establishing a pilot program to test the innovative Canadian system for procuring complex computer systems.

The Cohen amendment also contains the provisions of S. 675, my bill to reduce paperwork in the acquisition of off-the-shelf products by providing governmentwide, on-line access to GSA's multiple award schedules. The implementation of these provisions should bring effective competition to the multiple award schedules and make it possible to reduce or even eliminate the need for lengthy negotiations and burdensome paperwork requirements placed on vendors to ensure fair pricing. Accordingly, we would also establish a pilot program, under which direct competition at the user level would substitute for lengthy and paper-intensive price negotiations with vendors. I am pleased that these important provisions will be included in the Cohen amendment.

This amendment would not contain a number of provisions that I and others found problematic in the original Cohen bill. Unlike the original Cohen bill, this amendment would not create a new chief information officer or [CIO] in the Office of Management and Budget; it would not establish a new congressional committee; it would not overturn the prohibition on organizational conflicts of interest in acquisitions of information technology; and it would not provide for automatic termination of contracts and solicitations, or automatic pay adjustments for Federal employees, based on artificial formulas.

Because Senator COHEN and his staff have worked hard in the last few days to address substantive concerns with the earlier bill and because they have agreed to include the important streamlining provisions from my bill in his amendment, I ask to be included as an original cosponsor of the amendment. While I continue to be troubled that we are moving an amendment of this significance without the benefits of committee deliberation, I support the amendment.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I am glad to be a cosponsor of the Cohen amendment and urge my colleagues to support it, as well. This amendment contains two sets of provisions regarding information technology [IT] management and procurement reform. Both are important, and both deserve support.

While I am cosponsoring the amendment because of its substantive merit, I must add that as a matter of process, I believe the amendment should have been considered more fully by the Committee on Governmental Affairs. The amendment differs significantly from the original legislation, S. 946. The one subcommittee hearing held to consider that bill does not suffice for a thorough review of the issues presented in either that bill or the revised language before us today. In my view, I would have preferred for a bill as significant and important as this one to go through the committee process so that we would have a report to turn to in the years ahead to know why we did what we are about to do. But, given my work on these issues, I am now comfortable with the amendment.

This amendment is needed because of the state of Federal Government information activities. Recent press stories about repeated failures of FAA air traffic computers alone should convince people of the need to substantially improve the way the Government buys, uses, and manages information technology.

This year Congress already took a major step toward addressing this issue when it passed the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. This law not only tackles the problem of public paperwork burdens, but also sets in place new requirements for broader improvements in information resources management [IRM].

The first set of provisions in the amendment before us today establishes detailed guidelines for implementation of the information technology management provisions of the 1995 Paperwork Reduction Act. The administration has been moving vigorously to implement the new act and has found that additional requirements would be useful to press agencies to improve their information technology investment planning and control processes and to provide greater accountability for information technology acquisition and management decisions. The administration supports these elements of the Cohen amendment and I commend those in the administration who are showing their commitment to making significant improvements in the management of Government information resources.

The second set of provisions in the amendment, also supported by the administration, provides related reforms in the area of procurement of information technology. These provisions are key to our buying of IT. They include such provisions as modular acquisitions and pilot projects which will give us the flexibility we need to procure information technology at a pace that is consistent with its rapid development. After all, that's what this amendment is all about.

I would also add that the bill as originally written contained many more procurement provisions than those included in this amendment. I am pleased that Senator COHEN deferred on these provisions—which are just as significant to IT as they are to other procurements—so that they will be considered by the acquisition reform working group. This bipartisan group will produce another piece of governmentwide acquisition reform legislation in the next couple of months to follow up on last year's success of the passage of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act.

Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor Senator COHEN's amendment and appreciate his work on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I want to thank my distinguished colleagues, Senator COHEN and Mr. LEVIN, the authors of this amendment, Senator GLENN, and others, for their assistance in including my language in their amendment. Although this compromise language is not all that I had hoped, I believe that it takes an important step toward ensuring that the public who fund the creation of government information will be able to access it.

The amendment by my distinguished colleagues is a version of legislation currently before the Committee on Governmental Affairs, S. 946. I have serious concerns about that legislation and the impact it has on issues within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, on which I serve as the ranking member.

The Rules Committee has worked hard over the last several years to ensure that Government information that is disseminated electronically, rather than through printed documents, is readily found and obtained by the public who pays to produce it. As technology allows us to move from the printed page to electronic databases, the Rules Committee has the same historic interest in ensuring that the public has access to that information in the least costly, most efficient form. At some point, most information that is available electronically is reduced to a printed form, and it is imperative that the protection of title 44 with regard to ensuring public access to such information be preserved no matter how much technology changes.

Currently, we achieve that through a combination of the depository library system and provisions of title 44 which created the Government Printing Office electronic access system, enacted 2 years ago. This system maintains a directory of Federal electronic information which can be readily located and accessed by the general public through the depository library system.

The depository library system, including over 1,400 libraries located in every congressional district across this country, provides an essential link for individual and communities to their government. The depository library system ensures that all government printed information, and now electronic information through the GPO access system also, is available to anyone, regardless of whether they have a computer in his or her home or office.

It is a system that is working and working well. It simply makes no sense in these times of fiscal restraint to reinvent the wheel when it comes to a system by which the public will locate and access government information. That is not to say that this should be the sole method of disseminating public information. But it should be the plain, vanilla method by which anyone, no matter how geographically isolated or computer illiterate, goes about obtaining government information.

The language I sought to have added to this measure provides that if an agency determines that its information technology system will be used to disseminate information to the public, then that information must be provided to the Government Printing Office, pursuant to section 4101 of title 44, United States Code. The GPO directory is currently being used by depository libraries across this country to provide the public with a usable reference system for government information.

Under this provision, an executive agency will continue to determine when it will make information available to the public. But once that decision is made, regardless of whether the information is reduced to printed form or posted on an electronic database, the public will be able to find it through the GPO access system. The public is entitled to that information and should not have to own a computer with a link to the specific agency, or any other database, to find it. My language ensures that they will not. A simple trip to their library to access the GPO system is all that is required.

This provision is necessary to ensure that the taxpayers of America who fund the creation of information technology systems which will be used to disseminate information will be able to access that information. This is an important link between government and the public and will increase the accountability of government to the public it serves.

I appreciate the considerable assistance of my distinguished colleagues, and their staff, in developing this compromise. I look forward to continuing efforts to ensure that no matter how much technology changes, the American public still gets their dollars worth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2118) was agreed to.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COHEN. I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for yielding.

AMENDMENT NO. 2119

(Purpose: To limit to $257,700,000,000 the total amount authorized to be appropriated)

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself and Senator GRASSLEY and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. HARKIN, and Mrs. BOXER, proposes an amendment numbered 2119.

On page 16, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 4. GENERAL LIMITATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1996 under the provisions of this Act is $257,700,000,000.

Mr. KOHL. addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, my amendment is very simple. It limits the spending in the bill before us to the level in the Senate's version of the budget resolution: $257.7 billion. On May 23, 1995, in a strong bipartisan vote, the Senate defeated an amendment to the budget resolution which would have increased defense spending above the level requested by the administration. Sixty Senators voted against that amendment to increase defense spending. Unless they have changed their minds, the same 60 Senators should support this amendment. It offers another chance for the Senate to support the defense spending level laid out in the Senate's budget resolution and to save $7 billion in defense spending.

I also want to remind my colleagues that the defense spending number supported by opponents of this amendment represents an increase in defense spending over last year's spending level.

We are spending far too much on defense. We are not at war. We are coming off the defense buildup of the 1980's. The United States defense budget is larger than the combined military expenditures in the next nine largest military budgets, and our defense budget is 3.5 times larger than that of the next biggest spender, Russia. How can we possibly justify these exorbitant spending levels to the American people? How do we explain to them this hemorrhaging of taxpayer dollars? At a time when we are cutting programs for the poor, for students, for seniors—how can we justify giving the military money it has not asked for. This is not a question of national security; there is no major power threatening America. This is not a question of readiness, because most of the increase in spending is not to train troops, it is to pay defense contractors for more military hardware. The question is, do we need an extra $7 billion in this bill that the Defense Department says it does not want or does not need?

The President increased the defense budget by $6.9 billion before he sent up his fiscal year 1996 budget request to respond to some perceived shortfalls in readiness, and, perhaps, to head off defense spending increases ahead. Yet, in a move unprecedented in the last 14 years, the fiscal year 1996 defense authorization bill increases defense spending even more, $7 billion above the administration's request. And, I should note, none of the $7 billion went to pay for ongoing military operations in and around Iraq, Cuba, and Bosnia even though Secretary Perry had made an urgent request for funds to cover these contingency operations. The decision not to fund these operations puts even more pressure on the operations and maintenance accounts and raises the question of how serious the Armed Services Committee is in addressing the readiness issue.

Again, I want to emphasize: A majority of this body—60 Senators—has already gone on record supporting $257.7 billion for Defense. And that is what this amendment would do. Let me lay out some of the reasons why we should support this amendment.

First, this defense bill, with its huge spending levels, is reminiscent of the cold war. Our defense infrastructure looks remarkably similar to what was created to stand up to the Soviet Union and its Eastern Bloc allies. Even though we all agree that they no longer pose the same threat to our national security, we have not found a way to reduce the tremendous burden defense spending places on our country. While the Soviet Union constituted the main security threat to the United States throughout the cold war, present-day Russia is a shadow of its former military might. Look at the Russian military's recent performance in Chechnya. The breakup of the Soviet Union has deprived the Russians of military forces and defense production capacity. Even if an authoritarian regime took over, readiness has eroded so much as a result of deep budget cuts that it would take decades to recreate that threat.

The greatest threats we face today are less likely to be resolved with military force, and more likely to be resolved through political or diplomatic intervention. To be sure, we need a strong defense. We need to develop a strategy, and maintain a force structure, to protect and advance our interests in the new global environment. The difficulty is recognizing that our present infrastructure may not be relevant to the challenges ahead. If we could start over again, and create a new force structure from scratch, I am confident that we would have a leaner, more mobile and more efficient force at far less cost. Even working with our present defense budget, CBO and others have identified options to cut defense spending which could bring spending down as low as $150 billion by the year 2000. But this amendment is not about making deep cuts in defense spending. This amendment would make a very modest cut of $7 billion from the $264.7 billion authorization bill before us, and bring us back to the spending level that 60 Senators supported just 3 months ago.

Mr. President, there are many weapons systems in this bill that are obsolete. Although much lip service has been paid to the need for a new approach to national defense, little has changed in the last decade. Many of the weapons systems in the pipeline today were conceived during the defense build up of the 1980's, and will do little to address the threats of the post-cold-war world. There are countless big-ticket programs, with dubious rationales for their continued existence, that refuse to die. It is time for the Senate to recognize that we must stop buying weapons systems we no longer need and can no longer afford.

I believe that when it comes to defense, we are not making the tough decisions to reduce the budget deficit. If we truly intend to reduce the deficit, no area of the budget should be held harmless. The defense budget is no exception. We have not made exceptions for other areas of the budget that contribute as much to the long term security and well being of this Nation as does defense. In this era of deep and painful budget cuts, hitting many Americans hard, the bill before us today increases defense spending above what the Pentagon has indicated it needs and above last year's spending levels. Let me repeat, we are increasing defense spending this year at a time when everything else is being cut: education, health care, environmental protection, Medicare, Medicaid, low-income energy assistance, job training, childcare and child nutrition, highway funding, cancer research, elderly housing assistance, farm programs—everything else, but not defense.

Now there are those who will argue that there are defense budget cuts planned for later years. However, I do not believe we will make those cuts because many of the proposed increases we have before us today are devoted to new procurement, and new research and development projects, which lay the groundwork for increased spending down the road.

If we do not stop this spending now, we will have unleashed even more projects that will refuse to die.

The Armed Services Committee report acknowledges this: let me read from page 3:

The committee remains concerned about the adequacy of funding levels for national defense programs in the coming years. Despite the recommended fiscal year 1996 funding increase of $7.0 billion above the adminstration request, budget levels proposed for future years do not adequately

fund even the level of forces required for the Bottom-Up Review Force. These levels cannot meet modernization needs and do not cover inflation. This shortfall will seriously impair the ability of the Department of Defense to field the ready, modern forces essential to our national security. The limited progress reflected in this bill cannot be maintained unless future funding is increased.

Mr. President, there it is in black and white; the Armed Services Committee wants to spend more for defense. We cannot sustain the spending levels and the increased procurement in this budget unless we spend more for defense down the road. Experts on all ends of the spectrum agree on this point. Thus, a vote for increased spending this year is also a vote to increase spending next year, and the year after, and so on.

Mr. President, let me be clear, our amendment is not about any specific weapon system or any particular defense program. I know that there are colleagues who would like an amendment to target specific programs. But that is not the point of this amendment. Our amendment is about how much we should be spending on defense overall. This Senate agreed to spend $257.7 billion on defense just 3 months ago. In affirming that number today, this amendment is not an attack on defense spending. This amendment is about the amount of defense spending the Senate agreed was an acceptable level, which the present defense authorization bill increases by $7 billion.

And so I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, and for a more responsible level of defense spending.

Mr. BRADLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and the distinguished Senator from Iowa. I am pleased to be a cosponsor because I think this is a true ''walk the walk'' amendment.

We have spent countless hours in the 104th Congress ''talking the talk'' about fiscal responsibility. Now with this amendment we have a chance to back up our words by ''walking the walk.''

Mr. President, I considered offering a series of amendments to this bill to cut unnecessary spending. But I finally decided that doing so would not be the best way to make what is my basic point. That basic point is that we spend too much on defense because we spend it the wrong way.

Our defense budgets are still structured to fight the cold war. Although it is easy to come to the Senate floor and talk about the so-called post-cold-war world, it is a little more difficult to analyze exactly what that means for America's security needs. We have already had two reviews that were supposed to do that, one by the Bush administration, the so-called Base Force Study, and one by the Clinton administration, the Bottom-Up Review. And both of those studies really only tinkered at the margin of clearly looking at what we need in a post-cold-war world to defend the interests of this country.

Rather than rethinking the threats to America's security—which I think includes runaway deficits and the erosion of civil society as well as North Korea's nuclear program—these reviews have in fact been elaborate exercises in fighting the last war. Instead of taking a realistic look at the world as it is out there today, these reviews have trimmed a little here and trimmed a little there. But the result was to conform to what I call a cold war lite approach to the world. That is what this budget is, a cold war lite. It does not make any fundamental decisions about direction or what we need to do to defend this country in the so-called post-cold-war world. It simply does a little less here, a little less there. It is cold war lite.

Mr. President, $257.7 billion would be left in this budget after this amendment passed, if it did pass—$257 billion. That is a lot of money, more than enough to fund our defense needs, but only if we eliminate programs that we no longer need and spend the money on what we need.

Mr. President, I must say that looking at the debate and the budget, I see supporters of expensive but unnecessary weapons programs have seized upon the business-as-usual approach to defense budgeting, have seized upon the failure of both the Bush and the Clinton administrations to analyze what we need in a post-cold-war world to simply keep this program alive.

The Comanche, for example—I mean this thing just will not die. Having been pruned back to $199 million and two prototypes—that is how far we got this thing down at one point—it has crept back up to $373 million and eight aircraft. It is simply not needed. The Bush administration tried for 4 years to kill the Osprey, for 4 years, and yet here it is—$762 million strong right there in the budget. It cannot be justified on defense needs.

Mr. President, too big a part of this $265 million defense budget is nothing more than a jobs program. Take this bill, $7 billion over the budget resolution featuring $4.7 billion of unrequested add-ons; $7 billion above the defense resolution; $4.7 billion that was not even requested by the Defense Department or by the Clinton administration.

Last night the Senate voted to keep $1.5 billion in this bill to sustain a submarine industrial base by building a *Seawolf* submarine, a submarine we do not need to secure our national defense.

My constituents in the State of New Jersey will thus continue by the taxes they pay to come to Washington, that then go to the defense contractors to produce weapons systems that we do not need to defend our country. And my constituents in New Jersey are fed up with this kind of approach to our national defense.

Given the magnitude of the problem, it makes no sense to nickel and dime this bill, this little amendment here, this little amendment there. I know it is being done. It probably will be done.

But it is much better to take the approach of this amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Wisconsin and cut a big piece of pork with one slice. This is the way the Senate can send a signal to the administration and frankly to the Congress that the old way of thinking no longer works.

Mr. President, this, then, will be, when we vote on this amendment, a vote to shatter the old way of thinking, and start the difficult and overdue process of rethinking our defense needs and priorities in this world. Cut $7 billion now, and pave the way for a better defense in the years to come.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KOHL. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. McCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator THURMOND for yielding this time. I realize we have 15 minutes as opposed to 75 minutes on the other side.

Mr. President, no decade in this century began more auspiciously than the 1990's. That gross impediment to human liberty—the Berlin Wall—was breached by the stronger forces of human yearning. The central security problem of our time—the possible clash of East and West on the plains of Germany—was resolved by the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, the reunification of Germany, and the collapse of the Soviet Union.

The euphoria that accompanied these events anticipated the imminent arrival of a new world order of independent democracies engaged only in peaceful commercial competition with one another.

But the resurrection of ancient conflicts and hideous barbarism in the Balkans; the reappearance of other incidents of irrational nationalism that had been sublimated by the cold war; the haunting familiarity of Zhirinovksy's odious appeal to a perverse patriotism; the accelerating proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; and the waging of over 50 conflicts around the world have dimmed our hopes for a more just and tranquil world, and reminded us that we have interests and values that are still at risk in this promising, but uncertain world.

The world is still a very dangerous place. American vigilance and struggle are required now more than ever. There

are numerous potential threats to our national security in the world today. North Korea, one of the world's remaining communist dictatorships, seeks to acquire nuclear weapons, and this administration has failed to exercise the decisive leadership necessary to halt once and for all the threat of nuclear warfare on the Korean Peninsula.

In Asia, China has laid claim to the entire South China Sea and has enhanced its claim with a massive buildup of its armed forces, including the acquisition of new submarines, marine forces and aircraft carriers.

In the Middle East, Iran poses a serious threat to the security of the region with their own efforts to acquire nuclear weapons, their longstanding support of terrorist movements, and their aggressive military buildup in the Straits of Hormuz. Iraq remains a potential trouble spot, and Saddam Hussein maintains a stranglehold on political and economic power in that state. Russia's involvement in its near abroad, the ongoing horrible conflict in Chechnya and its advocacy of change in stable arms agreements causes serious concerns. Ethnic conflicts continue to range from Sri Lanka to Rwanda, and in Bosnia, United States military personnel may soon be sent in harm's way to assist in extracting international forces from the failed U.N. peacekeeping effort in that state.

These and other examples of instability in the world today make it imperative that we support an adequate national defense posture in this Nation.

I share the frustration and anger of many Americans as we spend millions and sometimes billions on weapons systems that are unnecessary and pork barrel projects that frankly have no relevance to the post-cold-war era. But I would remind you, Mr. President, the defense budget declined 35 percent in real terms between 1985 and 1994. President Clinton promised in his State of the Union Address in January 1994, ''We must not cut defense further.'' Yet, his fiscal year 1996 defense budget submission would cut defense for 4 more years totaling another 10 percent decline by 1999.

This rapid shrinking of resources available for national defense first damaged the readiness of our forces, damage which has now nearly been repaired as a result of warnings from our Joint Chiefs and Congress over the past few years. Operations, training and maintenance funding has been restored to needed levels in most instances.

Unfortunately, however, the continuing deficit in defense accounts will in the future impair the ability of our military forces to be ready to perform on the battlefield in the future. The fact is that with the Clinton defense budget levels we would be unable to maintain near-term readiness and also fund future force modernization.

Testimony from our highest ranking military officers, the four service chiefs, before the Readiness Subcommittee on April 27 of this year, illustrated the Hobson's choice in the Pentagon today. The chiefs testified that they have halted virtually all major modernization programs because of the need to devote their scarce resources to restoring and maintaining near-term readiness. They also testified that at a consistent level of defense spending much higher than the Clinton administration's defense budget, about $272 billion per year, they would barely be able to fund their modernization efforts. And they stated unequivocally that if additional funding were available for defense, their highest priority would be modernization, by the way, not military construction. Procurement of new weapons systems has nearly stopped.

Four of our highest ranking retired military officers prepared a report entitled, ''A Report on Military Capabilities and Readiness.'' In this report, they illustrated the sharp decline in procurement of fighter and attack aircraft, tanks and combat vehicles, missiles and ships. In all of these categories, procurement of new weapons systems is lower than at any time in the past 20 years.

This year's budget request funds only three new combat ships, 16 fixed-wing combat aircraft, and 60 new helicopters. It contains no funding for new tanks and inadequate funding for improving existing tanks. Average age of equipment will continue to rise as will the cost of maintaining aging forces. Safety margins will narrow.

Under the Clinton administration budget, the technological edge of our military forces, which was responsible in large part for the victory in the Persian Gulf war, will disappear. Without force modernization, military forces in the year 2001, at the end of the current future years' defense program, will not have the technological superiority necessary to fight and win on the modern battlefield. This legislation restores some of the funding required to continue with the development and procurement of modern high technological weapons systems which will provide the battlefield edge in the future.

The level of defense spending in this bill is necessary to ensure our Nation's position in the world and the future security of our people. That will provide the defense funding that is absolutely necessary to accomplish these goals.

The bill is consistent with the budget resolution and funds high-priority defense spending in order to maintain a viable American military force into the next century.

Mr. President, the bill's level of defense spending is minimally adequate to ensure near-term readiness as well as force modernization in the future. National security remains our highest budgetary priority. I urge my colleagues to support our national security and vote against this amendment.

Mr. President, I yield back to Senator THURMOND the remainder of my time.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, how much time does this side have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has 57 minutes 24 seconds.

Mr. KOHL. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE].

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, first of all, I ask unanimous consent to be an original cosponsor of this amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Iowa.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, what this amendment does is simple and straightforward, as the Senator from Wisconsin has so stated, and it deals with one of the craziest things that I have seen happen since I have served in the Senate. What we have here is a defense spending bill that asks for $7 billion more than requested by the President and requested by the Secretary of Defense and requested by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This is just crazy. In a time when we have enormous debt, in a time when we keep talking about the need to reduce budget deficits, now we have a spending bill that asks for $7 billion more than the Pentagon says it wants. It is nothing short of an effort by the Congress to jam down the throats of the Pentagon more spending than the Pentagon says it needs for our national defense.

This is almost unprecedented. I think it is crazy for two other reasons: first, overall global context, and then, second, the here and now of what is happening in this Congress at this moment in our country.

Overall global context. All of our potential enemies—broad definition—potential enemies, total expenditure $121 billion. Looking at our outlays, $271 billion. We spend more money in our budget than all of our potential enemies combined for defense. If you were to add NATO and other allies, then altogether the United States and its allies spend $522 billion compared to our total potential enemies of $121 billion. And now we have an effort to add $7 billion more on to this spending bill than the Pentagon says it needs, in a time when we are supposed to be saving money, in a time in which we are supposed to be fiscally responsible.

Then finally, Mr. President, let me juxtapose this amendment—critical amendment by the Senators from Wisconsin and Iowa—with the front page story in The Washington Post. ''House Votes Major Cuts in Domestic Programs.'' Mr. President, $9 billion. They eliminated the low-income energy assistance program. That is a key issue in a cold weather State like Minnesota for the most vulnerable citizens, and job training programs and education programs.

This represents distorted priorities. On the one hand we have a budget before us—we have a spending bill before us that asks for $7 billion more than

the Pentagon needs. It fits conveniently with a lot of Members that sit on the Appropriations Committee or Armed Services Committee—a lot of add-on projects. On the other hand, we cut into programs that are so key to opportunity and the future of our own country.

Mr. President, I will conclude this way. I said it the other day on the floor. I think I am just going to start shouting it from the mountaintop on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I am for a strong defense. But there comes a point in time when we need to understand that part of the real definition of our real national security is the security of our local communities where there are jobs, where there is health care, where people feel safe in their homes, where people feel safe in their neighborhoods, and when there is a commitment to education second to none. So that every boy—and for that matter every girl—can grow up dreaming to be President of the United States. If we do not start understanding that that is a part of our national security, and we do not get our priorities straight, Mr. President, I fear for the future of our country.

So I support this amendment on the grounds of some rigor, and some good fiscal conservatism and cutting where we ought to cut and not being spendthrifts when we should not be. And I also support this amendment on the basis of what I think are the sound priorities it reflects.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KOHL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I would like to ask my coauthor and colleague of this amendment, Senator GRASSLEY from Iowa, how many minutes he would like to take initially, 8 or 10?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Ten minutes.

Mr. KOHL. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY].

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, first of all, I do not think Senator BROWN was listed as a cosponsor. I ask unanimous consent that he be listed as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, in some ways I wish we were having the debate after Labor Day. I have been in Congress a lot of times in the month of August when we take our traditional recess where after that recess there is a whole different environment than there is before we go on that recess. It seems that we observe, because we are close to the grassroots during that summer break, that there is some change of opinion in Congress that takes place during that period of time.

I believe that when we are home this August and we hear the refrain about cutting too much from Medicare, and too big of a tax cut, and particularly as the Democrats might lambaste us Republicans for giving a tax cut to wealthy, then people start realizing everything is going to be cut, cut, cut, but not the defense budget, that it is going to be increased $33 billion above even what the President suggested for the next few years, we may come back here and decide—think again, do we really need to increase the defense budget by $33 billion?

But the debate is today before the August recess. So we are going to have the benefit of that and a reflection on that. But maybe sometime when there is an impasse between the White House and the Congress on arriving at reconciliation, there may be an opportunity to rethink whether or not defense ought to get a big increase when everything else is being cut.

So we may get another look at this, I say to my friend from Wisconsin. And I hope we do. And maybe we are setting a record for us to do that. Because I do not think the side that wants to spend more money has really made a justification for it because it seems like all the add-ons above what the President wants spent are generally decisions made by Congress to spend more money here or there. That is pretty piecemeal. It is not how you make a studied, responsible decision for our national security.

Now, I would feel much better in a debate talking about more money for defense if I could ever hear the other side say how much is enough. When is enough, enough? I never hear that. I never heard that it was enough when the President of the United States on his own volition said, ''We need to spend $23 billion more than we're spending this year.'' But when the Commander in Chief said that, I did not argue with it. Nobody on the other side that is supporting the Kohl amendment argued with it. We accepted the Commander in Chief's judgment. But the Commander in Chief has not said he needs another $33 billion. But here we are tossing in $33 billion of which the $7 billion in the Kohl amendment is the first installment of that $33 billion. So, how much is enough? I never hear that. I do not think ever enough is enough.

Well, we rejected on May 23, 1995, a proposal to pump up the defense budget. And of course that was on the 1996 budget resolution, 60 to 40. And 17 of those 60 were Republican votes. If they stick with us, we will win again. Sixty Senators said, ''Enough is enough.'' What the Commander in Chief said. Sixty Senators voted to hold the defense spending at that requested by the President. This Senator from Iowa voted for those lower defense numbers.

Well, when the budget resolution went to conference in the House, the extra money for the Pentagon that we are trying to subtract today was approved. The extra money is in the bill before us. I opposed it on May 23. I opposed it in conference. And I oppose it now.

One of the Republican leaders in the other body said to me privately during those conferences, ''CHUCK, you know, I have got a request from our friends in the House for another $6 billion. We just have got to have more money to satisfy the people on our side of the aisle.''

Is that not a nice way of deciding how much we ought to spend on defense, because a mass of humanity from the floor of the other body goes to one of the leaders and says, ''We have got to have $6 billion more''?

That is why I am supporting my colleague from Wisconsin to subtract the $7 billion. Our amendment will bring the defense budget back down to the amount approved by the Senate on May 23.

My amendment would eliminate waste at the Pentagon. Continuing waste at the Pentagon undermines the credibility of the higher defense numbers in this bill. Waste at the Pentagon has been a concern of mine from the beginning of my Senate career. More than anything else, those spare parts horror stories of the early 1980's, the $750 pair of pliers, the $7,000 coffee pots, caught my attention, crystallized my thinking on defense. Those spare part horror stories were a turning point, I think not for me, but for so many people. Uncontrolled waste offends American people. It offends me. The spare parts horror stories convinced me that President Reagan's plan during the 1980's to pump up the defense budget was a colossal taxpayers' ripoff. The spare parts horror stories undermine the credibility of the Reagan defense buildup.

They turned me into a reformer and drove me to watchdogging the defense, digging into fraud, waste, and abuse. I do not happen to sit on the Armed Services Committee. I am not on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. I have to admit, I never served in the military. So as a conservative Republican, it is not easy for me to tangle with the Pentagon. But common sense tells me this waste is not right, so I speak out, and you must keep digging.

That is what brings me to the floor today. For unexplained and unknown reasons, my Republican colleagues and some Democrats seem bound and determined to pump up the defense budget once again without ever telling us when enough is enough.

Their plan is to pump up the defense budget, and it does not seem to make sense. It defies understanding and defies reason. They want to start back up the slippery slope we did in the eighties. It is a prescription for more Pentagon waste and mismanagement. It is like a scheme to extort money from the taxpayers.

The principal threat to our national security, as we knew it, is gone. The Soviet military threat has evaporated. My good friend from Arizona just spoke about the worries around the world that we have to consider, yes, but he mentioned the former Soviet Union. Russia could not even win in Chechnya. If that does not prove the cold war is over, what does?

Once again, I want to remind my colleagues what happened 10 years ago.

Back on May 2, 1985, the Senate rejected President Reagan's plan to rapidly escalate defense spending, which justification was the cold war.

President Reagan and his Secretary of Defense, Cap Weinberger, wanted to push the defense budget numbers from $255 billion in 1985 to $300 billion in 1986, to $400 billion in 1987 to $500 billion in 1990. Remember, that was at the height of the cold war, the height of the Soviet military power. But regardless, a Republican Senate in 1985 and a Republican President put the brakes on. The Senate threw cold water on that plan to go up to double the defense budget in the 5-year plan. The Soviet threat was a main drive then behind those big budget numbers. It is gone now. So the defense numbers should be coming down, not going up.

True, in real terms, the numbers have dropped slightly from the cold war average. Maybe by 10 percent. But that is just a drop in the bucket compared to the dramatic decrease in the threat. So why are my Republican colleagues trying to force the numbers to move in the wrong direction? As we learned back in the eighties, higher defense budgets in peacetime brings higher costs, brings more overhead and more waste, not more defense.

So long as the defense leadership remains asleep at the switch, more money for more defense when there is no real threat, no real need is waste by definition. The Senate is in the process of blessing waste, the mindless and careless expenditure of money.

The Senate is about to give the Pentagon bureaucrats huge sums of extra money to spend for no known purpose, for no known return and no known reason. The bureaucrats at the Pentagon are licking their chops at the prospects. The extra money will be used to buy weapons we do not need, like the *Seawolf* submarine, the F–22 fighter, the B–2 bombers and Comanche helicopters, all designed to defeat a threat that no longer exists.

To make matters worse, these cold war relics are all underpriced and underfunded. They are underpriced and underfunded because their outrageous price tags cannot be justified in the absence of Soviet military threat. So what we are really doing is shoveling money at the contractors to pay for the hidden costs. All this extra money will not buy more weapons and equipment; it is going to buy more costs. It is that simple. History teaches us that the cost of the future years' defense program almost always exceeds the money in the budget. That is called, over program.

DOD budget managers like to underestimate costs and overestimate the amount of money Congress appropriates. Their appetite is always much bigger than their budgets. This kind of mismanagement causes the plan's reality mismatch. The General Accounting Office's ongoing historical review of the 5-year defense procurement program shows that DOD consistently pays more but gets less. On an average, 130 percent is paid by the defense for 80 percent of the program, and that is what the data shows.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa who has always been one of the strongest watchdogs on defense spending. I appreciate his work with me on this amendment.

At this time, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN].

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to support the Kohl-Grassley amendment to cut $7 billion from this bill and bring it back to the level that was requested by the President. I opposed this bill when it was before the Armed Services Committee, in part because I did not support this additional funding. I did not feel that the committee had used the additional funds wisely, even if we decided to go ahead and add the funds.

Taxpayers are demanding, as Senator GRASSLEY just said, and others have said over many months in the Senate, that Congress reduce the Federal deficit. This has been the first priority in Washington since this Congress convened.

Mr. President, the current bonanza of weapons system add-ons that is reflected in this bill cannot be sustained in future year budgets. The committee report admits that. Senator KOHL quoted the committee report in its entirety on this issue in his statement. Let me just repeat one sentence from that report. It says:

> The limited progress reflected in this bill cannot be maintained unless future funding is increased.

Sixty Senators earlier this year voted not to increase defense spending above the President's budget during the next 7 years. A majority of the Armed Services Committee voted for the increase, and the committee is now straightforwardly telling the Senate that they have constructed a bill inconsistent with the budget resolution's funding levels in future years. They will be back for more funding in order to sustain the add-ons for various weapons systems and procurement initiatives in this bill.

Mr. President, when they come back for that additional money, I strongly doubt that the Congress is going to add funding in future years for defense. Instead, we are going to face a choice between force structure and new weapons systems. We cannot have both within the budget resolution's outyear defense totals. The committee agrees that we cannot have both.

Adequately paying and housing and training 1.45 million active duty service members in future years will require greater expenditures for personnel, military construction and operations and maintenance and will further squeeze the amount we have to pay for these weapons systems that we are starting to buy in this bill.

Defense experts from both parties have pointed to the train wreck in defense budgets that we are going to face before the end of this decade. Let me just point out we had a very good hearing in the committee where we talked about this excess force structure. Two experts there, Dan Goure of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, and Andrew Krepinevich of the Defense Budget Project, both made the point that we had to reduce the force structure by somewhere between 200,000 and 400,000 personnel.

Richard Perle, who many people in this body know as a fairly strong supporter of our defense effort, has recently stated:

> We are spending too much on a force structure that is far larger than we need.

Mr. President, I am tempted to offer an amendment directing the Secretary of Defense to prepare for an additional drawdown in the size of our force structure in light of the priority that is being accorded to weapons systems modernization in this bill, and also the fact that it is very unlikely that future defense budgets will have enough in it for both.

I am not sure how I would vote on such an amendment, but I would be very interested in seeing how those who put this bill together would come down on that fundamental choice.

George Wilson, who has long studied the defense issues in this country, wrote a very good article in Navy Times on August 7. Let me read a little bit from that article.

In talking about the present activities in the defense budget, he says:

> It is going to end badly. The budget balancers in Congress and the executive branch, sooner or later, will conclude that the hawks on the House National Security and Senate Arms Services Committees and elsewhere in Congress have made themselves irrelevant.
>
> No later than 1997, the budget balancers will slash military programs right and left because, if for no other reason, this will be the easiest place to cut, barring a big war.
>
> Before the chaos from that budget train wreck sets in, there is the even more worrisome prospect that congressional hawks will succeed in their current efforts to put the country into a U-turn back toward the Cold War.

Mr. President, yesterday, we dealt with the ''U-turn back toward the cold war'' and, by two votes, decided to make that U-turn back toward the cold war. Today, Senator KOHL and Senator GRASSLEY are giving us a chance to ensure that the 1997 train wreck is not made worse by our spending binge this year.

I hope the Senate will support the position it took back in May that additional funding is not needed. I hope we will not see headlines in tomorrow's Washington Post like we saw today: ''House Votes Major Cuts in Domestic Programs'' and ''Senate Backs Missile Defense Network.''

When we are slashing Medicare, slashing Head Start and education programs, slashing Medicaid for the poor

and disabled, slashing environmental protection programs, I, for one, cannot justify the extra $7 billion in this bill for defense.

I urge the Senate to support the Grassley-Kohl amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his thoughtful and balanced comments. It is not unusual because that has been the hallmark of his service in the Senate for several years.

How much time is left on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has 33 minutes, 12 seconds.

Mr. KOHL. I yield 13 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Senator BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. KOHL. He has offered a challenging amendment. It is one which I fully support. It is a post-cold-war wake-up call, a reality check amendment.

This amendment, cosponsored by Mr. KOHL and Mr. GRASSLEY, challenges the Senate to make a choice between significant and substantial deficit reduction, or supporting, on the other hand, a bow wave of unsustainable and unnecessary bloated defense spending—unnecessary, bloated defense spending. This amendment would cut the $7 billion added to the President's request for the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1996.

How much is $7 billion? I was talking to JOHN GLENN this morning. I said, ''You went around the world on February 20, 1963, in 89 minutes.'' He said, ''Another way of saying that is, we were traveling at the rate of 5 miles per second.'' That makes it pretty clear. How much is $7 billion? How long would it take to count $7 billion at the rate of $1 every minute? It would take 14,000 years. Seven billion dollars is a lot of money!

The Senate has voted resoundingly for the President's level of spending already in this session. By a 60–40 vote, this Senate endorsed this level of spending when we took up the Senate-reported budget resolution.

I believe that the overall level of expenditures contained within the bill, although within the limit established by the conference report on the budget resolution—which I did not vote for—is higher than needed for an adequate defense posture. Additionally, the spending priorities established by the committee and numerous provisions of the bill put the country on a militaristic path reminiscent of the Reagan era, despite the greatly reduced threat now faced by the United States.

I was here during the Reagan era. I voted for the increased military spending that was recommended by Mr. Reagan. I voted for all of his exotic weapons. So I come with, I think, pretty good credentials, having been a supporter of the military.

This spending level, though, looks in the wrong direction. It looks to the past, not to the present and to the future.

This bill doubles the funding for national missile defense systems, the core of the Reagan ''Star Wars'' program. It adds funds to anti-satellite programs. The Congress rejected programs for new, expensive ASAT (anti-satellite) systems during the cold war. It turns logic and spending on its head to support such questionable programs now that the Russian threat has collapsed. This just indulges in waste!

This bill also adds funds to increase or expand the purchases of aircraft and ships that were not requested by the Department of Defense. These are in excess of what is necessary to support current military posture and strategy.

One of the great unsaid truths of the recent defense budgets that are written by Congress is that they are, in large measure, jobs programs in disguise. Funds are provided to buy ships, to buy aircraft and missiles that support hundreds of thousands of jobs throughout the United States. These ships and planes and missiles may not be necessary to support a rational and reasonable defense strategy, but they keep production lines open and paychecks going home.

These programs are supported by Republicans and Democrats alike. Like caged mice on an exercise wheel, we go around and around and around, buying weapons we do not need so that hard-working people are not laid off their jobs. No one would argue that these jobs are not important or not necessary to a strong economy. Yet, this Nation cannot seem to find a way off this wheel, so we go around and around and around. We continue to support big defense budgets and questionable weapons procurement plans. And in the process, we allow waste and abuse of the taxpayer's dollar. We also risk crafting a defense budget that neglects our real defense needs. We focused instead on keeping jobs in various States, not on creating the kind of defense strategy that the Nation really needs.

This bill contains funds for ships that are not needed now, according to the Department of Defense. We could do much better to spend that money on becoming the strong, prosperous, and well-educated Nation that other nations seek to emulate and trade with, but not to go to war with.

Yet, funds that would provide a transition—a way to move off the wheel of large defense budgets—were cut in this bill. Technology reinvestment program funds that were intended to move defense technologies into the civilian economy, where they could be maintained without big defense spending, have been cut. Programs to transition military personnel into education and law enforcement are under fire. Small programs that encourage military personnel to help their local communities and to help troubled youth have been cut. Funds to support arms control verification, to help both make the United States and its former enemies feel more confidence about peace, security, and stability in the future, have been cut, cut, cut.

These beginning efforts were the first steps in moving the United States away from the role of the world's only remaining military superpower and into a nobler role as a world economic and education superpower. I am sorry to see us slip back, to move from away from Athens and towards Sparta, away from the education of the mind, to the molding and shaping of weapons.

This amendment shares the deficit reduction pain that is already being felt in the shrinking accounts for energy, agriculture, education, and law enforcement programs—in all of the programs funded in the domestic discretionary accounts that directly and daily benefit every American citizen. Boy and girl, man and woman, black and white, all over this country.

This disparity between defense and nondefense spending over the next 7 years is eye opening. Now, the people out there beyond the beltway hear about it, they hear about these cuts that are being made in domestic programs. They read about the cuts that are being made in domestic programs. On television they see reports of the cuts that are being made. But they have not yet felt the cuts. Wait until they feel the pain. It is coming. It is coming.

Mr. President, I think of Croesus, the King of Lydia, who was defeated by Cyrus at the battle of Thymbra, in the year 546 B.C. This was Cyrus II, Cyrus the Great. In 559 B.C., he became king of Ashan. He ruled all of Persia from 550 to 529 B.C.

Cyrus desired to add the kingdoms that were ruled by the Sythians, in southern Russia, to his vast territory. So he launched a great invasion against the Massagatae, whose ruler was a queen named Tomyris. Before crossing into the territory of the Sythians, he called his generals and advisors about him and asked their advice. He had kept Croesus on at his court as an advisor, this great king who had been one of the richest kings in history. Cyrus asked Croesus for his advise, and Croesus said this: ''There is a wheel on which the affairs of men revolve, and its movement forbids the same man to be always fortunate.''

Mr. President, that same wheel turns for us. That wheel is going to turn in this country, and when the people begin to feel these cuts and see the nation's infrastructure falling apart, the bridges falling down, the railroads deteriorating, and the highways filling with potholes, when the people begin to feel the cuts in health and education, the worm is going to turn. Mark my word, the wheel will turn!

The Department of Defense should not be growing fat on $70 billion in the unneeded calories of defense pork—beginning with $7 billion this year—while education, law enforcement, transportation, and all other domestic

discretionary accounts are starved by $183 billion. I hope that my colleagues will stand up to the challenge posed by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, and vote to cut the fat from this bill in favor of cutting the deficit.

Piling another $7 billion on top of the defense budget, for an array of non-essential, nice-to-have new weapons makes a mockery of our rhetoric to balance the budget.

While raising defense spending, we are cutting nondefense discretionary to the bone—to the bone. I know. I meet in the appropriations subcommittee hearings, and in the subcommittees as they mark up the bills, and I sit in the full Committee on Appropriations with Senator HATFIELD, and you should hear the groans there among the Members. As Senator HATFIELD said today in markup, ''Just wait. If you think it is bad now, wait until 1997.''

So just wait, Senators. You are going to hear from the people back home. The worm is going to turn. And it is going to bite you! When it bites, you will feel the pain.

If Senators really mean it on deficit reduction, the most compelling evidence of how serious they are will be an aye vote on the Kohl amendment. Start here. Start now.

We hear that advertisement on TV, ''Do it here; do it now.'' Well, Senators, now is the time. Do it here; do it now!

I take a back seat to no one when it comes to adequately preparing for our national defense. That is our first priority in this country. It ought to be.

As I have said, I voted for all the weapons during the Reagan era. You name them, I voted for them. That time has passed. It has come and gone.

What we are seeing here is the coming of a shadow—a shadow—of the nondefense discretionary budget, in order to pay for more military weaponry that we do not need, and in order to pay for a $250 billion tax cut that is utter folly! Folly!

Yes, the worm will turn. I respect Senators who do not agree with me; I respect their viewpoint. But the American people are going to wake up one morning and find that it ain't just like they have said it would be. It is going to be different. When that worm turns, Senators are going to see a turning of the viewpoint in this Senate.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and the distinguished Senator from Iowa for their leadership. I hope that the Senate will support their amendment. I intend to vote for it, and I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing budget cuts over the 7 years of the budget resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

BUDGET RESOLUTION VERSUS 1995 FREEZE

[Budget authority; dollars in billions]

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	7-year total
Budget resolution:								
050–Military	$265	$268	$270	$272	$275	$278	$281	$1,909
Nondefense discretionary	224	219	227	216	221	219	218	1,544
Total	489	487	496	489	496	497	499	3,453
Assume 1995 BA freeze:								
050–Military	263	263	263	263	263	263	263	1,839
Nondefense discretionary	247	247	247	247	247	247	247	1,726
Total	509	509	509	509	509	509	509	3,566
Difference (resolution less 1995 BA freeze):								
050–Military	3	5	7	10	12	15	18	70
Nondefense discretionary	−23	−27	−20	−30	−26	−28	−29	−183
Total	−20	−22	−13	−21	−14	−13	−11	−113

Mr. KOHL. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his powerful statement, which lends tremendous credibility and impetus to this amendment. I appreciate his coming to the floor and appreciate his speaking in its behalf.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota, Senator DORGAN.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me compliment the Senators from Wisconsin and Iowa and others who have spoken so eloquently in support of this amendment.

If we were to skip ahead 100 years from today, we would not be able to tell very much about what we were about except historians could look back at this group of Americans and evaluate what we felt was important and our values, by what we decided to spend our resources on. They could, in fact, look at the Federal budget and decide what we thought was important for the future of this country.

It is sad to say that the priorities these days are priorities not to invest in the human potential of the American people that will produce big rewards and big dividends in the years ahead. I refer to priorities like educating our children, like helping people up and out of poverty, like providing the kind of health care that senior citizens need, and other things. Instead, as we find all too often, it is building things we do not need with money we do not have. Never is that more evident than in this bill.

I support a strong defense. I think it is important to our country's security. But I am disturbed when I see legislation brought to this floor in which $7 billion is added on and $4.7 billion just written in for new procurement—most of it, I am sure, with inadequate hearings or virtually no discussion. Instead, somebody just writes it in and says, ''We know you are not asking us to buy this, Mr. or Mrs. Pentagon, but we insist we do.''

Take page 125 of the report, $60 million is written in here, $60 million for blimps—blimps. It does not say blimps. It talks about lighter-than-air air ships. These folks are talking about writing in $60 million for the Hindenburg to defend against cruise missiles, I guess. Blimps.

I just got stuck on the subway, a little subway that runs 2 blocks between the Capitol and the Senate office building. I sat in that subway because the subway would not go anymore, the doors would not open. That is high tech. It is a brand new subway, as a matter of fact.

The weapons program acquisition in this bill, includes $4.7 billion of add-ons. I could go down the whole list of high-tech weapons. We have a subway that does not work. All these things, I guess, are going to work even without full hearings. We are going to write them in and say, ''We are going to build them, just have confidence.'' Among the weapons is a blimp.

I do not know, maybe if we hear Saddam Hussein has started a cavalry, then perhaps we would go out and start buying horses. I just do not understand what people are thinking about. I do not have the foggiest notion what they are thinking about. They say we should add $7 billion extra for defense which the Secretary of Defense says is unneeded?

And then every single day in every way they come to this floor and say, ''We cannot afford to give a poor kid an entitlement to a hot lunch in the middle of the day at school. We just do not have the money. We can afford blimps. We cannot afford medical care for the elderly. We are sorry. Tighten your belt, Grandma and Grandpa. We apologize. We do not have the money.'' But we can buy blimps, I guess.

We say to the middle-income families, ''We are sorry we are going to make it more expensive to send your kids to school because we just cannot afford it.'' But we can go resurrect Star Wars. Star Schools are not important. Star Wars is important.

I do not have the foggiest notion what is going through the heads of people who think that this represents America's priorities. Kids are our future. Investment in human potential is our future.

Yes, defend our country. But how on earth can you say to the Secretary of Defense, when he says, ''Here is what is necessary to defend our country,'' you do not know? And therefore you say instead, ''By the way, take this $7 billion. We do not care whether you want it or not. It is jobs in our States. It represents weapons programs we insist you build. It is ships and submarines, it is fighter planes that you say you do not need, you do not want, but we insist you build them.''

What on earth are people thinking of? Someone once said that 100 years from now it will not matter much how big your house was or how much income you made. But the world might be a different place because you were important in the life of a child.

I would like to hope that one of these days we get our priorities sufficiently straightened out so we can be important in the lives of children in this country. I hope we can stop saying to children and others, ''We cannot afford the things you need,'' but then come to the floor with a bill full of blimps, Star Wars and other nonsense, and shove down the throat of the Pentagon $7 billion they did not ask for to build things we do not need. This in a country where we are up to our neck in debt.

This sort of thing has to stop. This is the place to stop it. Right here, right now, today, with this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KOHL. I thank Senator DORGAN. It was an eloquent statement he made. As usual, he is right on target.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of how those Senators voted in May when we fixed defense spending at $257 billion.

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

Sixty senators who voted to maintain defense spending at $257.7 billion on May 23, 1995.

NAYS (60)

Democrats (43 or 93%):

Akaka, Baucus, Biden, Bingaman, Boxer, Bradley, Breaux, Bryan, Bumpers, Byrd, Conrad, Daschle, Dodd, Dorgan, Exon, Feingold, Feinstein, Ford, Glenn, Graham, Harkin, Hollings, Inouye, Johnston, Kennedy, Kerrey, Kerry, Kohl, Lautenberg, Leahy, Levin, Mikulski, Moseley-Braun, Moynihan, Murray, Pell, Pryor, Reid, Robb, Rockefeller, Sarbanes, Simon, and Wellstone.

Republicans (17 or 31%):

Bond, Brown, D'Amato, DeWine, Domenici, Gorton, Grassley, Gregg, Hatfield, Jeffords, Kassebaum, Lugar, Packwood, Pressler, Roth, Simpson, and Specter.

Mr. KOHL. I will yield some time to the other side if they wish to speak. How much time do we have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has 9 minutes remaining. The Senator from South Carolina has 7 minutes and 56 seconds.

Mr. KOHL. Would the Senator like to use a few minutes on his side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the able Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I was not intending to come down and speak on this, but after listening to the last couple of speeches, I decided I had to speak up and comment.

I heard the Senator from North Dakota, back in my office, say that what we are doing here is neglecting to invest in human potential. If there is anything we are doing here with the defense bill—and by protecting our country—we are, in fact, doing just that. Look at all of the wars we fought and the people who have died and suffered and the country that has suffered so much through our wars. What human potential has been lost on the battlefield? You talk about human potential, look at the young men and women who have died. Look at that potential. That is gone. Educated, hard-working, bright people, trained, who gave up their lives because, in many cases, we were not ready. We did not invest in our armed services to do the fundamental mission that this Government was created for, to protect and defend this country.

Do not talk to me about wasting human potential. This prevents the waste of human potential more than any single thing we can do. To suggest otherwise, that through some feel-good Government program, if we push out more money to people to invest in their potential it is going to change the world, somehow refresh America—you know, that some new Government social welfare program is going to save money, which is what the other side would have you believe we should invest in, is not the answer.

The answer is, by creating peace and prosperity you will loose the human spirit and potential of every American and give them the opportunity, in a peaceful world, to reach their dreams. If you want human potential invested in, then you give a peaceful environment where people do not have to worry about going to war but worry about going to work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KOHL. I would like to make a comment or observe that when Senator BYRD talked about $7 billion, he talked about what an enormous sum of money that is. I do not know if he said it or not, but it is true that here in Washington we spend $7 billion as if, sometimes, it were $7,000 or $700. That is because we are used to dealing with such large sums of money, so it is not acceptable but it is understandable. But it is not acceptable.

Mr. President, $7 billion—I come from the city of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, but I live in the city of Milwaukee. Milwaukee is a middle-size city in our country which has a host of problems which are characteristic of the problems in our country today: crime problems, drug problems, problems with our educational systems, problems with our infrastructure, problems with our inability to train people for jobs that are availables. All the problems that exist in our society—to the degree we are not satisfied with the conditions of life in America—exist in Milwaukee.

Mr. President, for $1 billion—not $7 billion—for $1 billion, which is an imaginative sum for the city I come from, but for $1 billion we could change the face of Milwaukee for 50 years in all the areas I just discussed: The areas of crime, drugs, welfare, job training, education, infrastructure, with just $1 billion out of the $7 billion that we are going to be spending on defense unnecessarily in this next year if we do not defeat that proposal. And $264 billion is on the table. For $1 billion we could change the face of Milwaukee for the next 50 years.

So we are talking about a lot of money that could be used to improve the quality of life throughout our country without in any way taking away from the level of necessary defense which all of us support.

Mr. DORGAN. If the Senator will yield for a minute, Mr. President, I noted the Senator from Pennsylvania referred to my discussion.

I would observe for the benefit of the Senator from Pennsylvania that the list of $4.7 billion in unrequested add-ons for weapons procurement in this bill includes the following: $650 million for 2 destroyers, $564 million for Navy fighters, $216 million for Navy EA–6 aircraft, $125 million for helicopters, and for the Senator's home State, a $33.9 million procurement add-on for Army improved recovery vehicles.

It occurs to me that, at least with procurement, especially of weapons programs, it hardly protects this country's security to buy something that the Secretary of Defense has indicated he does not need. With respect to feel-good programs, I suspect that the add-ons in this defense bill might make some feel good. But, frankly, when we are purchasing what the Secretary of Defense is not asking for, it does not in my judgment make the taxpayers feel good.

We can have a longer debate about what improves or what does not improve this country's social programs or defense programs. I, too, believe we ought to have a strong defense. The point I was simply making is that purchasing what the Defense Department indicates it does not need for America's military hardly improves this country's security. But it certainly does add to the Federal budget deficit. We

are up to our neck in debt, and we have a budget deficit problem. And it seems to me that all of us ought to be concerned about that when we talk about what we purchase from whom and where and when.

Mr. KOHL. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

I would like to yield 4 minutes to the fine Senator from Colorado, Senator BROWN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I rise in support of this amendment for one very simple straightforward reason.

Mr. THURMOND. I yield him 1 minute to express himself.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, as I read the numbers from our budget, rather than reduce the deficit for next year, we are in danger of increasing it. Hopefully that is not the case. Hopefully my estimate is wrong. But it is quite clear that rather than showing significant deficit reduction next year that the overall budget stands perilously close to showing an increase. I think that is a more important factor that Members ought to weigh because part of the dropping interest rates in the international market and part of the confidence that is so important in retaining the value of the dollar and part of the momentum of our moving forward is based on the belief that Congress is addressing this situation and it is addressing the problem.

I have great praise for the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished ranking member who have worked hard to bring this bill to the floor, and to make sure the money is spent wisely.

Do we all agree with everything that has been done? Of course not. But the overall important thing is I think for us to ask this question: Will the deficit drop next year? Will the American people be convinced we are doing our part to bring it into line? And do we have at last credibility?

Mr. President, I am convinced that our credibility and our ability to control the deficit depends on us passing this amendment.

Mr. President, I know time is tight. There are other Members who wish to speak.

I yield whatever time remains.

Mr. KOHL. I thank the Senator from Colorado for coming down to speak in behalf of this amendment. His words are appreciated.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I was under the impression the distinguished Senator from Colorado was on our side. I ask unanimous consent that what he said be charged to the other side.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I congratulate my colleague from Wisconsin, and thank him for offering this amendment today. He has been a consistent vote for deficit reduction, and I compliment him for his leadership on this issue today.

If any one amendment can highlight the absolute absurdity of the defense budget represented in this bill, this is it.

Just 3 months ago, during consideration of the budget resolution in this Chamber, 60 of our colleagues—Democrats and Republicans together—voted against an amendment to increase spending above the President's request for $257 billion. The vote spoke to the overwhelming sentiment in this body that defense spending should not be increased at precisely the time several arms control treaties are coming into force, and we are drastically cutting valued and needed domestic programs.

Nevertheless, the conference committee on the budget increased the allocation for defense spending by $7 billion. Does that mean that we are bound to spend the full $264.7 billion? Absolutely not. In fact, if we are to be consistent with what we voted in May, and if we are going to be consistent with all the rhetoric about deficit reduction, we should be authorizing, at most, the $257 billion we accepted just 3 months ago.

This amendment forces us to be faithful to the principles we voted for earlier in the name of fiscal restraint. It would indeed be hypocritical to have supported that ceiling before, but now oppose the Kohl amendment.

This $7 billion increase in this bill is especially distressing given where this money seems to be going. In December 1994, the President announced that he would propose an additional $25 billion for the defense budget over the next 5 years to cover the so-called readiness gap.

Indeed, the committee report expresses deep concern for the shortfall readiness inherent in the administration's request, but then itself doesn't fund it. In effect, it continues the same irresponsible budgeting pattern it criticizes the administration for. So, we see that the excess budget isn't helping what some were crying wolf about last year.

Instead, it seems to be going largely to homestate projects. This bill authorizes over $5 billion in unrequested weapons programs. According to an analysis by Council for A Livable World, a staggering 81 percent—or $4.1 billion—of that $5 billion plus goes to States whose Members serve on either the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations or the Armed Services Committee.

For instance, the Pentagon's request for F–18 jets was fully doubled by the committee, as was the request for *Aegis* destroyers. In one case, the committee authorized a $1.3 billion ship for no strategic reason other than that it serves the hometown needs of its local representatives.

These add-ons, in most cases, amount to robbery of the Federal Treasury. While I hardly endorse a philosophy that Congress should simply rubber-stamp the Pentagon's budget request, I find it hard to fathom that the Pentagon underestimated its requirements by a whopping $5 billion. In my opinion, it didn't. Instead, the committee plussed up the budget in order to please Senators who wanted to deliver money—any money—to their hometowns.

If we are going to balance the Federal budget, Mr. President, we are all going to have to sacrifice. That is what we all committed ourselves to during the balanced budget amendment debate. But when it comes to actually resisting the excesses, I see little self-restraint.

That is how we get a defense bill that is $7 billion above the level we approved 3 months ago. With the Kohl amendment we have the opportunity to correct that problem, and recommit ourselves to deficit reduction.

I urge my colleagues to support the Kohl amendment.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Our time is tight here. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, one of the myths that we are dealing with here in the debate on this defense bill is the fact that we are asking for more than what the Pentagon requested. That is technically true. The $7 billion is over and above the budget request. But member after member of the Joint Chiefs and others who testified before our committee indicated that they are complying with the number that was given to them by the administration.

The Defense Department and the spokesmen for the Defense Department have said time after time after time that there is more they need to meet the requirements for defense and to meet the strategy but they are constrained by budget numbers. Therefore, they are good soldiers, salute, and provide us with a budget that comes within the top line of the administration's budget level. But there has been testimony from everyone from the Joint Chiefs of Staff on down that we are on the razor's edge of readiness, that we are in need of research and development into new technologies, that our modernization program is in deep jeopardy, that we will not have the equipment necessary to meet the threats of the next century.

General Shalikashvili has been quoted as saying so, the head of the Marine Corps has been quoted as saying so, and the Secretary of Defense has intimated as such, and on and on it goes.

So this mantra that we are hearing from the other side that this is some kind of a wasted expenditure that the Department of Defense has not requested this, and does not need this, simply belies the truth, belies the facts

of what is necessary to provide an adequate defense for this country and what the Department of Defense really needs. They are just simply taking orders from the boss upstairs.

Mr. President, I gave a long dissertation on this very subject earlier. I will just simply say ditto to what I said earlier in the interest of time, and yield back the time.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as may be required.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered today by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Early today you heard my statement relating to defense spending levels. I have continually stated the need to ensure our national security and that defense was underfunded. The budget resolution recommends defense levels lower than I believe are necessary to maintain the readiness of our forces. The Department of Defense has done more than its share in the budget reduction efforts.

The proposed amendment reduces defense spending below the levels necessary to maintain our forces. Defense spending as a percentage of GDP is at 1940 levels. Procurement accounts have been reduced 71 percent since 1985. Continually, the Joint Chiefs have testified that we are on the brink of returning to the readiness levels of the 1970's and early 1980's.

Mr. President, our forces continue to have to deal with higher operating levels, while force structure continues to be reduced.

The Armed Services Committee worked very hard this year, within the defense levels of the budget resolution, to reverse these negative trends.

Mr. President, I just want to say that I was here when President Reagan was President. President Carter had let our defenses go down. He was a good man, but that is what happened. When President Reagan came in, he asked the Congress to increase defense. He said we needed it to protect this country. Congress responded favorably and increased defense.

Then the Soviets felt they had to increase theirs to compete with us, and in doing so, though, they could not increase their defense and also take care of the local economy, and that is the reason the Soviet Union went down the drain. It was President Reagan's action to increase our defense which the Soviets could not meet, and the Soviet Union went down the drain.

We must keep a strong defense. We are living in a dangerous age. We should not think about cutting this $7 billion. We need it. Our soldiers need this. They need better quarters. They need more training. We need more ships and more planes, and we need more tanks. How are we going to get those? How are we going to defend the American people?

After all, the primary purpose of Government is to protect its citizens. How can we better protect our citizens and keep a strong defense? Under our Constitution, our people have more freedom, more justice, more opportunity and more hope than any people in all of history. How are we going to keep that if we go cutting defense down below what it ought to be?

I say to the people who do not favor, who do not understand defense, you better study. You better study history. Why did we lose people in World War I, World War II, the Korean war, the Vietnam war? Simply because we were not prepared. If we had been prepared, we would not have lost so many thousands of people. We must keep this country prepared.

I say to those in the Senate here today, the most important thing we can do is to keep this country prepared.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

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

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. KOHL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey, [Mr. LAUTENBERG].

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, just very briefly, because we are out of time, but the time that remains is the time during which we ought to think very carefully about what we are doing.

When most people talk about budget cuts, they talk about the cuts contained in programs, frankly, that are going to hurt middle- and lower-income Americans, cuts in taxes which will benefit the richest among us. But while most areas of spending have been cut, one has been increased, and that is, of course, the defense bill, the defense bill designed to be $7 billion over that which was originally requested, $25 billion more over the period of time, $25 billion that could go to fix Medicare or fund education or protect the environment or build needed housing—$25 billion, a lot of money.

But apparently it was not enough. The House version of the budget resolution boosted defense spending by another $7 billion in fiscal 1996, and this was such an overreaching case that even the Republicans in the Senate repudiated it when we considered our budget resolution. The Senate rejected an amendment that raised defense spending to the House level, and yet during the conference the House number survived—no compromise by splitting the difference, just a total victory for the House position.

The amendment by Senators KOHL and GRASSLEY would take us back to a sensible level.

Mr. President, I hope that we will do that and reduce this bill by $7 billion. The one thing that we do know is that if we are going to build strength, strength that survives, strength that endures, you have to build it internally. No matter how much you build externally, you will never be a safe, strong country unless you invest in the society domestically.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. KOHL. I thank Senator LAUTENBERG for his outstanding comments. We appreciate them very much.

I would like to yield 1 minute to a senior member of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Nebraska, [Mr. EXON].

Mr. EXON. I thank my colleague from Wisconsin. I will be supporting the amendment that he has offered.

This is the same debate as with the amendment that was offered by myself and my colleague, Senator GRASSLEY, last year on a very similar matter. There has been a lot of heated rhetoric today. As a hawk, I stand here and tell you that this Defense authorization bill is a fat turkey. But we have not really talked about the real fat. The $7 billion is a drop in the bucket. If you will look at what is inaugurated in this bill, it is billions if not trillions in the future. I am fearful that unless the people who are supporting this agree to raise taxes, of all things, you are going do see a decline in the quality of people who serve in the Armed Forces.

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

Mr. EXON. It is going to defense contractors and not where it belongs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. KOHL. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. We appreciate very deeply his comments.

Before I speak, does the Senator from Iowa wish to wrap up for a minute?

Mr. GRASSLEY. We have heard, Mr. President, about the needs being so great and that people in the Pentagon, regardless of what the President says is our level of expenditure, regardless of what the Commander in Chief says should be our level of expenditure, say we can always use more. It reminds me of the days in the State legislature; the president of the university would come in and say the needs are so great——

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRASSLEY. And from that day I never heard anybody say when enough is enough.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRASSLEY. And I never heard anybody say in this debate when enough is enough. We have reached the point where we have to start putting priorities first.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRASSLEY. And our priorities ought to be where we get to a balanced budget, meet the basic defense needs of our country and balance the budget.

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

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Has the Senator from Wisconsin asked unanimous consent for an additional minute above the time that was allocated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. COATS. And is it not correct the Senator has already had 1 hour 15 minutes and this side has had 15 minutes? Is that the correct allocation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. THURMOND. I certainly want to accommodate anybody I can, but we gave the opposition 1½ hours. We only took 15 minutes. I object to any further extension of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The question is now on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. THURMOND. I move to table the amendment and 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 question is on agreeing to the motion to table the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 364 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Abraham	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Bennett	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Burns	Hatch	Nunn
Campbell	Heflin	Packwood
Chafee	Helms	Pressler
Coats	Hutchison	Robb
Cochran	Inhofe	Santorum
Cohen	Inouye	Shelby
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Smith
Craig	Kempthorne	Snowe
D'Amato	Kyl	Specter
DeWine	Lieberman	Thomas
Dole	Lott	Thompson
Domenici	Lugar	Thurmond
Faircloth	Mack	Warner

NAYS—46

Akaka	Exon	Kerrey
Baucus	Feingold	Kerry
Biden	Feinstein	Kohl
Bingaman	Ford	Lautenberg
Boxer	Glenn	Leahy
Bradley	Graham	Levin
Breaux	Grassley	Mikulski
Brown	Gregg	Moseley-Braun
Bryan	Harkin	Moynihan
Byrd	Hatfield	Murray
Conrad	Hollings	Pell
Daschle	Jeffords	Reid
Dodd	Johnston	
Dorgan	Kennedy	
Rockefeller	Sarbanes	Simpson
Roth	Simon	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—3

Bumpers	Pryor	Stevens

So the motion to table the amendment (No. 2119) was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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 order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, we are going to get time agreements on three amendments here so that some of our colleagues who have obligations off the Hill for the next hour and a half can do that and come back and have the votes stacked at that time.

First, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, [Mr. HARKIN], concerning burden sharing be considered under the following time limits: 35 minutes; 25 minutes to Senator HARKIN and 10 minutes to Senator THURMOND; and further, that no second-degree amendments be in order prior to a motion to table.

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

Mr. DOLE. The Levin amendment on the Guard-Reserve package I ask unanimous consent be considered under the following time limitation: 30 minutes; 20 minutes to the Senator from Michigan, Senator LEVIN, and 10 minutes to Senator THURMOND; and that no second-degree amendment be in order prior to a motion to table.

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

Mr. DOLE. And Senator GLENN from Ohio wanted an hour, so I ask unanimous consent the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, Senator GLENN, concerning service academies be considered under the following time limitation: 40 minutes, divided between Senator GLENN, who has 30 minutes, and then Senator THURMOND has 10 minutes; and no second-degree amendments be in order prior to a motion to table.

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

Mr. DOLE. That would mean 1 hour 45 minutes, if all time is used. Most of it is apparently used around here. Members can plan their return if they are leaving.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I just want to say that we plan to finish this bill tonight. We have a lot of amendments yet, and as short a time as we can take on each, we will get through quickly. We do plan to finish this bill tonight.

AMENDMENT NO. 2121

(Purpose: To provide for reduction of U.S. military forces in Europe in relationship to any deficiency in allied defense burdensharing)

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Ms. SNOWE, proposes an amendment numbered 2121.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 371, after line 21, insert the following:

SEC. 1062. REDUCTION OF UNITED STATES MILITARY FORCES IN EUROPE.

(a) END STRENGTH REDUCTIONS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL IN EUROPE.—Notwithstanding section 1002(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (22 U.S.C. 1928 note), but subject to subsection (d), for each of fiscal years 1997 and 1998, the Secretary of Defense shall reduce the end strength level of members of the Armed Forces of the United States assigned to permanent duty ashore in European member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in accordance with subsection (b).

(b) REDUCTION FORMULA.—

(1) APPLICATION OF FORMULA.—For each percentage point by which, as of the end of a fiscal year, the allied contribution level determined under paragraph (2) is less than the allied contribution goal specified in subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense shall reduce the end strength level of members of the Armed Forces of the United States assigned to permanent duty ashore in European member nations of NATO by 1,000 for the next fiscal year. The reduction shall be made from the end strength level in effect, pursuant to section 1002(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (22 U.S.C. 1928 note), and subsection (a) of this section (if applicable), for the fiscal year in which the allied contribution level is less than the goal specified in subsection (c).

(2) DETERMINATION OF ALLIED CONTRIBUTION LEVEL.—To determine the allied contribution level with respect to a fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall calculate the aggregate amount of the incremental costs to the United States of permanently stationing United States forces ashore in European member nations of NATO, and the foreign labor compensation costs of United States military installations in European member nations of NATO, that are assumed during that fiscal year by such nations, except that the Secretary may consider only those cash and in-kind contributions by such nations that replace expenditures that would otherwise be made by the Secretary using funds appropriated or otherwise made available in defense appropriations Acts.

(c) ANNUAL ALLIED CONTRIBUTION GOALS.—

(1) GOALS.—In continuing efforts to enter into revised host-nation agreements as described in the provisions of law specified in paragraph (2), the President is urged to seek to have European member nations of NATO assume an increased share of the incremental costs to the United States of permanently stationing United States forces

ashore in European member nations of NATO and the foreign labor compensation costs of United States military installations in those nations in accordance with the following timetable:

(A) By September 30, 1996, 37.5 percent of such costs should be assumed by those nations.

(B) By September 30, 1997, 75.0 percent of such costs should be assumed by those nations.

(2) SPECIFIED LAWS.—The provisions of law referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) section 1301(e) of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484; 106 Stat. 2545);

(B) section 1401(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160; 107 Stat. 1824); and

(C) section 1304 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 2890),

(d) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) MINIMUM END STRENGTH AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding reductions required pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense may maintain an end strength of at least 25,000 members of the Armed Forces of the United States assigned to permanent duty ashore in European member nations of NATO.

(2) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The President may waive operation of this section if the President declares an emergency. The President shall immediately inform Congress of any such waiver and the reasons for the waiver.

(e) ALLOCATION OF FORCE REDUCTIONS.—To the extent that there is a reduction in end strength level for any of the Armed Forces in European member nations of NATO in a fiscal year pursuant to subsection (a), the reduction shall be used to make a corresponding increase in the end strength levels of members of each of the Armed Forces of the United States assigned to permanent duty ashore in the United States or in other nations (other than European member nations of NATO). The Secretary of Defense shall allocate the increases in end strength levels under this section.

(f) INCREMENTAL COSTS DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ''incremental costs'', with respect to permanent stationing ashore of United States forces in foreign nations, has the meaning given such term in section 1313(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 2895).

Mr. HARKIN. Might I inquire as to the time? I understand we have 25 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, this bipartisan amendment is about burdensharing, but more importantly, it is about fairness. It calls on our allies in Europe to share more of the financial burden of their own defense.

This year, American taxpayers are being asked to pay $6.1 billion for nonpersonnel costs associated with keeping our troops in Europe. At a time when we face large budget deficits, when we are considering large reductions in investments in our own people's education, health, housing, transportation, everything else, we clearly can no longer afford to bear such a large part of the costs of our well-to-do allies' defense.

Therefore, our amendment would require that our NATO allies pay for 75 percent of the incremental costs. That is, the extra cost of our basing our forces in Europe, and 75 percent of the cost of foreign employees of U.S. forces based in Europe.

Mr. President, this is a very moderate amendment, a bipartisan compromise. We are not demanding that they pay 100 percent of the costs. We are not even asking them to bear 75 percent of all of the costs as the other body did by a wide margin last month.

As I said, we are not demanding they pay 100 percent of the cost, or even 75 percent of all of the cost. That is what the other body did last month. In an honest bipartisan effort to begin to make the distribution of costs fairer, our amendment requires a two step increase to 75 percent in payments by our allies of the added cost to U.S. taxpayers of keeping our troops overseas and paying foreign nationals who work on our bases overseas.

Under this amendment, our allies' share of these costs would rise to 37.5 percent in 1997, 75 percent in 1998 and thereafter. Today, they pay much less.

If our allies then do not cover the incremental costs, we would withdraw 1,000 of our troops for every percentage point less than their required share, but leaving a minimum of 25,000 troops in Europe.

Mr. President, payments by European nations would come to about $6 billion over the 4-year period from 1997 to the year 2000. If they met none of their increased requirements and we had to bring our forces home under this amendment, the American taxpayers would still save $1.45 billion over the same 4 years because it costs less to base them in the United States.

This is truly a modest amendment. As I said before, the House DOD authorization bill includes a much broader provision. That passed by 117 votes in the House, 273–156.

Now, the House version requires they pay 75 percent of the entire nonsalary costs of our troops. The House version also called for a reduction of U.S. forces equal to half of those soldiers who might return to the United States because of a failure of the Europeans to pay a fair share of the costs.

Mr. President, if this was a pure business deal and the United States was a police agency providing security for a client, then we would be clearly justified in charging our allies for all of the security operation and not just 75 percent of the incremental cost.

Mr. President, we are all justifiably proud of the role we played in Europe, both during World War II and after World War II. The Marshall plan stands as a monument to American generosity and the concern for our fellow citizens around the world.

Now our European allies are doing much better—their standard of living is equal to ours, in many cases better than ours. But we have continued to ask the American taxpayer to bear a disproportionately large part of the cost of Europe's defense. Europeans, frankly, and simply, are not paying their fair share.

We Senators have different priorities but we agree on two things. We agree we must move toward a balanced budget, and we know it is going to be a painful process with many programs being cut.

I know we will hear arguments about our need to maintain our forces in Europe. Those same arguments were made when we put strong requirements on Japan. Japan is now paying close to a fair share because we took a strong position. Japan can afford it. So can the Europeans.

Right now, in cash payments for United States forces, Germany paid a mere $61 million in 1995. Mr. President, $44 million of that was to pay for the labor costs of their own nationals working on our bases.

They are really not paying much. The United Kingdom, Italy—the United Kingdom paid $40 million, Italy only paid $6 million respectively, and again most of that went for the employment of their own people on our bases.

Let us compare that to what we did with Japan. After it became clear that our troops might be withdrawn from Japan, Japan came across. Right now, they are paying $918 million a year cash for the cost of their people employed on our bases, and paying over $3 billion a year in other costs.

If we did not make them do it they would not do it, of course not.

Those ongoing payments is money the Armed Services Committee does not have to authorize. It is money the Defense Subcommittee, on which I serve, does not have to appropriate. And, most important, it is money the American taxpayers do not have to come up with.

As we move to reduce our expenditures and balance our budget, as we ask college students to take cuts, our elderly, our children, is it not time we ask our European friends to pay a little bit more for the burden of their own defense?

It is a very modest amendment, a very modest one. It will make it a little bit fairer.

Again, I summarize, Mr. President. Here is what this amendment does. If it costs $1 to station a troop in the United States and it cost $1.20 to station that same troop in Europe, then our European allies would only have to pay 75 percent of the 20 cents. They would only have to pay 15 cents of that incremental cost. Plus they would have to pay 75 percent of the costs that we incur to employ their own people working on our bases.

There are two parts of this. They would have to pay 75 percent of the incremental costs and they would have to pay 75 percent of what it costs to employ their own people on our bases.

If they do not meet this requirement by October 1, 1996, they have to pick up 37.5 percent; by October 1, 1997 they would have to pick up 75 percent. If they do not meet those two goals, then we would bring back 1,000 troops for every percentage point under that—either under the 37.5 percent, beginning

next year, or the 75 percent beginning in 1997.

But we would leave a bottom line level of 25,000 troops in Europe.

If that happens, if Europe pays under this very modest provision, if Europe pays, our taxpayers will receive $6 billion over those 4 years.

Mr. President, again I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from a Mr. Stephen Daggett, Specialist in National Defense, from the Congressional Research Service.

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

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE
THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
Washington, DC August 3, 1995.

To: Hon. Tom Harkin, Attention: Richard Bender

From: Stephen Daggett, Specialist in National Defense, Foreign Affairs and National Defense Division.

Subject: Potential savings from increased allied host nation support contributions.

This is in response to your request for an estimate of potential savings to the United States if European allies agree to provide increased host nation support contributions. Specifically you asked how much would be expected if the allies were to pay increasing shares of (1) incremental costs of U.S. forces deployed in Europe and (2) costs of foreign national labor at U.S. facilities in Europe. Allied shares would be 37.5% in FY 1997 and 75% each year thereafter.

It is possible to provide only a very rough estimate of incremental costs of U.S. forces deployed in Europe. According to testimony in the past by senior U.S. military officials, the U.S. European Command has estimated that it is 10 to 20 percent more expensive to deploy U.S. troops in Europe than in the continental United States. The most recent Defense Department report on funding of U.S. forces overseas projects direct costs of troops in Europe of $9.8 billion in FY1997, including costs of military personnel, operation and maintenance, family housing, and military construction. (For a discussion of incremental costs and sources of data, see ''Defense Budget: Alternative Measures of Costs of Military Commitments Abroad,'' CRS Report 95–726 F, which is attached.) These costs should remain stable in the future, since the U.S. troop level in Europe will, under current plans, stabilize at 100,000 from FY1997 on. If incremental costs are assumed to be 15% of the total, then they would amount to roughly $1.5 billion per year. Annual host nation support contributions, therefore would be as follows:

[Dollars in millions]

	Percent	Cost
Fiscal year:		
1997	37.5	$563
1998	75.0	1,125
1999	75.0	1,125
2000	75.0	1,125

Potential increased host nation payments for the costs of foreign national labor compensation can be estimated more precisely. The attached table shows estimated year by year figures for Germany, Italy, and Spain, the only European allies for which DOD has provided data on foreign national labor costs.

POTENTIAL AMOUNTS OF INCREASED HOST NATION CONTRIBUTIONS FOR FOREIGN NATIONAL LABOR COMPENSATION

[Current year dollars in millions]

Fiscal year	Total foreign national labor compensation	Increased host nation percentage share	Host nation foreign national labor compensation if allies increase share
Germany:			
1996	653	0.00	0
1997	642	37.50	241
1998 [1]	661	75.00	496
1999 [1]	681	75.00	511
2000 [1]	702	75.00	526
Italy:			
1996	30	0.00	0
1997	30	37.50	11
1998 [1]	31	75.00	23
1999 [1]	32	75.00	24
2000 [1]	33	75.00	25
Spain:			
1996	30	0.00	0
1997	30	37.50	11
1998 [1]	31	75.00	23
1999 [1]	32	75.00	24
2000 [1]	33	75.00	25
Three country total:			
1996	713	0.00	0
1997	702	37.50	263
1998 [1]	723	75.00	542
1999 [1]	745	75.00	559
2000 [1]	767	75.00	575
Five-year total:			1,940

Source.—CRS calculations based on data from Department of Defense, ''Host Nation Support: FY 1996/97 Budget Estimates,'' May 1995.

[1] FY 1998–2000 figures assume 3 percent per cost growth starting from the FY 1997 level.

Mr. HARKIN. I yield the floor and I yield whatever time the Senator from Maine would require.

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join in cosponsorship with Senator HARKIN and Senator ABRAHAM, from Michigan, on this very important amendment. I think Senator HARKIN certainly explained the framework of this amendment and the reason for having such an important amendment to this defense authorization.

It is a very simple, straightforward amendment. The question is why can our allies not pay more for their own defense?

In response it has been argued in the past and rightfully so that the threat against NATO was compelling and that our allies were spending their fair share by what they invested in their own forces. Moreover, we recognized the ominous threat the allies were facing from the Warsaw Pact nations as well as the threat from the Soviet Union. So, obviously it was not an appropriate time to discuss that we will fairly apportion the cost of our troops in Europe. Certainly it was in our mutual security interests. It certainly was not a time that we should say we are going to withdraw our forces from Europe unless they pay more for the support. That certainly could have, potentially, split the alliance at the time when unity was needed to face down the Soviets.

NATO has been a very successful alliance, the most successful military alliance in the history of the Western World. It was designed with a single purpose, to confront and deter the Soviet military threat to Western Europe. We all recognize now that level of threat has been dramatically diminished with the collapse of the Soviet empire and the collapse of the Berlin wall. We now have to decide, and NATO is deciding, its future mission. But in the meantime we have a right to expect more from our allies, in terms of providing for the support of our troops in Europe.

What we are talking about in this amendment is the aggregate of the incremental costs in the foreign labor costs associated with having American troops in Europe. The total cost is estimated, in 1997 to be $9.8 billion. If, as has been estimated, the incremental costs are to be anywhere from 10 to 20 percent we are talking about $1.5 billion.

We are asking our allies by the year 1998 to pay 75 percent of those incremental costs. So that is about $1.1 billion for each year thereafter.

Then of course the foreign labor costs. There are tremendous disparities in terms of how much Japan pays for the costs of our troops to be stationed in that country, compared to our European allies. In 1990, we reached an agreement with Japan that they now pay 77 percent of the costs of our troops there. They have stepped up their contributions dramatically. They are assuming the burden. We had the same arguments then that we are going to, I am sure, have now with respect to opposition to this amendment. But Japan currently pays 77 percent, approximately $4.2 billion of the United States military nonpersonnel costs incurred by the stationing of our troops in Japan.

In contrast our European allies collectively contribute 24 percent of the military costs. To put it another way, Japan pays the Department of Defense in direct contributions, $3.466 billion for 45,938 American personnel stationed in Japan, or an average of $75,450 per American soldier.

On the other hand, Europe pays the Department of Defense only $60 million direct contributions for the 116,190 American military personnel stationed in European NATO nations, an average of just $516 per soldier.

So now we are asking the allies to assume a greater share of the cost, 37.5 percent by fiscal year 1997 and 75 percent for every year thereafter.

I think it is an important issue in a year in which we passed a budget resolution that establishes a framework for a balanced budget by the year 2002. It becomes all the more important to achieve those savings, and in a year in which we are going to be considering a Base Closing Commission's report in which many communities will be seriously impacted by the closure of bases all across this country, in which these savings could help to ease that economic impact, in a year in which we are bringing down the cost of our own defense, we think it is important to be able to even provide some of these savings towards the operation and maintenance accounts of our Armed Forces.

There are many uses that we could provide with the savings that would be

offered by this requirement if our allies were to have more of our fair share. Frankly, I think this amendment would give strength to the negotiations between the United States and our allies with respect to increasing their contribution to the support of our troops abroad.

I think this is only in the interest of the American taxpayer. The end of the cold war certainly should really result in savings for us as we have drawn down and will continue. But it does provide for a threshold of troops abroad. It also provides a waiver authority for the President in the event of an emergency.

But the fact of the matter is, I think we are talking about responsibility. This amendment is not about isolationism. It is not about withdrawing our troops from Europe. What it is about is shared responsibility. And, frankly, I think our European allies have been avoiding that responsibility.

So at a time when we are supposed to be tightening our belt because of the cuts we will have to make, in a time when community and local and State governments are going to face reduced contributions from the Federal Government, I think is only fair and reasonable to ask our European allies to do the same.

So, Mr. President, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleague from Iowa in offering this amendment linking U.S. force levels in Europe to the effort our European allies make in sharing the costs of NATO defense. For too long we have applied a cold war rationale for the United States to carry the European burden, when the underlying, U.S. national security interests no longer apply.

It costs us 10 to 20 percent more to station a soldier, sailor, marine, or airman in Europe than it does to keep him in the United States. Furthermore, we hire thousands of civilian foreign nationals to work for the U.S. military forces in Europe, civilians who pay taxes to the host government, spend their money in the host country, and never will spend a cent in the United States. This amendment addresses this inequity by requiring our European allies to pay for a portion of the defense we provide them.

I know the House recently passed a measure similar to this, but included all nonpersonnel costs incurred by U.S. forces in European NATO countries as the basis for their burdensharing calculations. My fellow sponsors and I do not believe this is fair, as it requires the Europeans to incur obligations for costs we would incur if these same troops were stationed in the United States. We have therefore changed that language accordingly to incremental costs. But even then, significant revenues can be derived.

The Congressional Research Service has calculated U.S. incremental cost in Europe as roughly $1.5 billion per year. This would provide approximately $1.125 billion in host-nation support contributions per year under this amendment's formula. Furthermore, having the Europeans contribute 75 percent to the foreign national labor compensation costs incurred by the United States would yield an additional $575 million per year by the year 2000, for a total of host nation support contribution of $1.7 billion per year.

This is not an unreasonable demand. We, for too long, have sought negotiated settlement and passed sense-of-the-Congress resolutions that the Europeans should pay more for the costs we incur in defending their lands. Last year's Defense Authorization Act called for the Europeans to ''assume an increased share of the nonpersonnel costs so that by September 30, 1996, those nations have assumed 37.5 percent of such costs.''

This goal is far onerous than that provided by this amendment. It is not fair to expect our European allies to absorb a portion of all our troop costs, but it is fair to expect them to absorb a portion of those costs unique to operating in their countries, that is, incremental costs. This amendment does just that, but also introduces another critical source of host nation support.

In fiscal year 1995, Germany provides only 6 percent of the foreign national labor compensation costs incurred by the United States in Germany, while the United Kingdom provides 9 percent and Italy provides 16 percent. Japan, on the other hand, contributes 94 percent of the United States foreign national labor compensation costs.

When the United States agrees to keep 100,000 troops in Europe to provide the Europeans with that added sense of security, it is preposterous to expect the United States to pick up over $725 million in wages. This is not another U.S. jobs program, and the Europeans should not expect the United States to pick up this tab.

Now I know the administration is opposed to this measure because the Europeans are supposedly suffering from particularly acute economic problems, that they contribute to other programs such as the NATO Infrastructure Program, and that previous host nation support requirement proposals would fall disproportionately on Germany and the United Kingdom.

I disagree strongly with this rationale. I challenge any of my colleagues to stand up and claim the United States should bear the brunt of a modern industrial economic state's economic well-being given today's strategic environment. Can anyone honestly state that it is our responsibility to cover European defense costs because they suffer from high unemployment? That, Mr. President, is simply international welfare.

But even if we accept that responsibility, we already are bearing disproportionate costs of European defense. While the United States spends over 20 percent of its Federal budget on national defense, the Europeans pay only 6.2 percent. Furthermore, while the United States expends 4.4 percent of our gross domestic product on national defense, the Europeans spend only 2.5 percent on national defense. This translates to the United States spending over 250 percent more per capita on defense than the Europeans. I could understand the objections to this proposal if the Europeans were closer to matching us on defense spending. But the fact of the matter is, they aren't even close, and that is just not fair.

What makes this amendment unique to previous requests for greater European host nation support is its enforcement mechanism. This is not a proposal aimed at further reducing our presence in Europe. Rather, it recognizes the value the Europeans place upon the presence of U.S. troops, and utilizes them to compel European burdensharing. There is no reason the Europeans cannot share in those costs unique to our troops living and operating in their countries. This presence directly and materially contributes to the national security of our European allies outside of any NATO context. Considering the markedly lower level the Europeans pay for their national defense, it would appear they need our troops to provide a measure of their security. Therefore, European cost sharing can most efficiently be compelled by the threat of troop pullouts.

We have passed sense-of-the-Senate resolutions over the last 15 years requesting the administration seek greater European defense spending and host nation support, yet we still find ourselves bearing the lion's share of NATO spending, even when accounting for relative size and national security interests. I believe the Europeans have come to depend on the United States to provide for their common defense, even when they are fully capable of providing at least a greater portion of that defense themselves. It is not fair to the American taxpayer to force their taxes to go to Europe in what is essentially international welfare to strong, democratic, industrially advanced countries.

It is because of the savings provided by this amendment to the taxpayer that Citizens Against Government Waste supports this amendment. They understand this issue: it is not fair to the American taxpayer to allow the Europeans a free ride on something as critical as national defense, when they are fully capable of paying their fair share. Furthermore, the only instrument that will work in forcing European support is the threat of U.S. troop pullouts. Finally, the requirements this amendment places on European support are fair, reasonable, and easily attainable. Therefore, Mr. President, I call on all my colleagues to stop this coddling of our European allies and tell them to pay their fair share. Vote for the Harkin-Abraham-Snowe amendment to rectify this inequity.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment has the potential of possibly reducing our current 100,000 troops in the European theater by as much as 50 percent.

Mr. President, let us go immediately to what that impact would be in many areas of that region.

United States troops are stationed in Europe not simply because of the interests of NATO. But they are there in the need of other areas of the world. That is often lost. They are there primarily with our allies in NATO for such missions as may be assigned to NATO, an example being, of course, that in the Bosnian region today. But they are there at the direction of the President of the United States and with the concurrence of the North American Council to operate in other areas of that region when it is in the strategic interest of the United States. They not only contribute to the stability of Europe but also allow us to more rapidly respond to contingencies in this region.

For example, in the recent past United States troops stationed in Europe have responded on a moment's notice to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, the humanitarian crisis in Somalia and Rwanda, and a variety of operations in the former Yugoslavia. Currently, United States European-stationed troops are involved in Operation Provide Comfort to assist the Kurds in northern Iraq, Operation Southern Watch to monitor Iraq activities in southern Iraq, Operation Deny Flight to enforce the no-fly zone over Bosnia, Operation Able Sentry in Macedonia, and Operation Sharp Guard in the Adriatic.

Mr. President, this amendment, while it may have some fiscal attractions on its face, would devastate absolutely, unequivocally, the ability of this President and any future President to respond very quickly to many contingencies in that region. And, therefore, I vigorously oppose the amendment.

I would like to yield such time as my distinguished colleague from Georgia may require.

Mr. NUNN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Iowa a couple of questions about the amendment and make sure I understand it.

As I understand the amendment, the Senator is setting up a formula tied to the incremental cost of stationing U.S. forces in NATO. Is that right? Is it confined to NATO countries?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes. It is confined just to NATO countries.

Mr. NUNN. The incremental costs—how would the Senator from Iowa define incremental costs?

Mr. HARKIN. Over and above what it costs to base them here in the United States.

Mr. NUNN. Do we have that kind of base cost anywhere? Has anybody computed incremental cost so that we know what that incremental cost is or how they compute the incremental cost?

Mr. HARKIN. I am told it was defined in last year's DOD authorization, that it would have to be computed by the Department of Defense.

Mr. NUNN. Would the Secretary of Defense decide the incremental cost would be based on what it would cost to station those troops at Fort Stewart, GA, or would he pick out Fort Lewis, WA, or would he pick out what it would cost to station them right outside New York City?

There is a variation in the cost all over the United States. If you stationed United States troops in Hawaii near an impacted area, or San Diego, the costs are much higher than someplace else in the United States—I suspect higher than in Europe.

Does the Secretary of Defense have total discretion to determine under this amendment what is an incremental cost and then determine where these troops would be stationed as a comparative basis in the United States?

Mr. HARKIN. I just respond that when I asked the CRS to do some studies on this—I will read from it, and I will put it in the RECORD. I thank the Senator for yielding to me on this.

It is possible to provide a rough estimate of incremental costs of U.S. forces in Europe. According to the testimony in the past by senior U.S. military officials, the U.S.-European command has estimated that it is 10 percent to 20 percent more expensive to employ U.S. troops in Europe than in the continental United States.

I can only assume they did this on some kind of weighted average depending upon what the average was based on in the United States, and add it all, take an average, then take a look at Europe and add it up. Some places in Europe are more expensive than others; add it up, add the average, and add the average here, and that is the incremental cost.

Mr. NUNN. It would be based on the average cost and add the differential cost, and the baseline year would be what year?

Mr. HARKIN. I am sorry. I believe that the baseline year would be 1996.

Mr. NUNN. The first year of application would be what year?

Mr. HARKIN. 1997, October 1.

Mr. NUNN. Would that be a fiscal year calculation or calendar?

Mr. HARKIN. Fiscal year.

Mr. NUNN. The other question I would ask my friend from Iowa is, who is the responsible party to pay for this? Is this an alliance requirement? Is this the whole NATO alliance that would be required to pay this, or is this country by country?

Mr. HARKIN. It would be paid by countries. But the assessment is shared.

I might add for my friend from Georgia that we did the same thing in Japan. So we can model it basically after what we have done in Japan. We have experience in this.

Mr. NUNN. Would, for instance, the Germans pay for all the incremental costs if you have United States forces stationed on the ground in Germany?

Mr. HARKIN. Germany would pay. That is my understanding.

Mr. NUNN. I do not read the amendment that way. That is the reason I am asking. I read it as an alliance obligation.

Mr. HARKIN. I am sorry, what was that question?

Mr. NUNN. I am trying to see whether this is an obligation of the alliance. For instance, we do not have any forces in Norway. We have very few forces in the southern flank of Turkey. We now have forces in Italy related to Bosnia.

Let us just take that, for example. We have a number of Air Force personnel in Italy related to the Bosnian situation. That is an alliance obligation. Italy allows units to use bases there for the purpose of flying those protective Bosnian flights, Deny Flight. Would Italy be responsible for reimbursing the United States for those incremental costs or would the whole NATO alliance be responsible?

Mr. HARKIN. I think that is something that could be worked out between Italy and the other member countries in that case. If in fact other countries were basing their planes there, if it was a NATO requirement that they use a base in Italy to fly out of, then I would think that all countries in NATO would be responsible for that. This can be, and would be negotiated.

Mr. NUNN. I say to my friend from Iowa, that is the way all the forces that we have in Europe are viewed by the NATO alliance. They are viewed as military personnel that really are there for an overall NATO mission.

So, for instance, the Germans would, I would imagine, be rather resentful at this stage of us saying that those troops that we have in Germany are all there to protect Germany.

There is no longer a threat to Germany as we have had in the past. Our forces are in Europe primarily, as the Senator from Virginia said, because we feel that having forward-based forces in Europe allows us to play a worldwide role, not just a NATO role. For instance, the forces in Europe that we had there were forces that deployed to the Middle East in Operation Desert Storm. Would we expect Israel to pay part of the cost of forces in Europe or would we expect Saudi Arabia to pay part of the forces in Europe because those forces are likely to go there in the event of conflict, or do we want Germany to pay the cost of those forces when they are not primarily at this stage to defend Germany; they are there basically for a much broader purpose?

That is the problem with this amendment, I say to my friend.

Mr. HARKIN. If I could——

Mr. NUNN. We have shifted considerable in the mission of U.S. forces in Europe. It used to be they were there specifically to protect invasion from the Warsaw Pact. Now they are there, about a third the number; we have drawn down from 300,000 to 100,000. So we have now supposedly leveled off.

The amendment, as I understand it, could conceivably, if nobody was willing to pay this cost, take our forces down to 25,000. Is that right?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if I could——

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

Mr. WARNER. I ask unanimous consent that the time within the control of the Senator from Virginia be increased by 3 minutes, with a corresponding increase for the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has 9 minutes and 29 seconds.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I will just close out.

That is the last question. The 25,000 would be the level below which the Senator would not go even if there was a total failure of them to pay the burden share?

Mr. HARKIN. Precisely.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, if I could just close, I understand where the Senators are coming from on this, and I agree with their overall thrust. I would like to see our allies pay more. But this amendment is a cold war amendment that is based on the concept that we are defending every country where our troops are stationed and that they should therefore pay their part, when these countries are not going to view it that way.

That may be the way the authors of this amendment view it, but that is not going to be the way the Germans view it or anyone else. If you ask someone in Poland, for instance, what they think about the United States drawing down our forces to 25,000, they will tell you in a minute that that is going to be destabilizing. But Poland is not going to be expected to pay any part of this. If you ask someone in Czechoslovakia should we draw down our forces, not from 300,000 to 100,000, but on down to 25,000, they will tell you in a minute we do not want you to draw down your forces. We feel they are needed there in a critical way now for stability purposes. If you ask someone in Hungary the same question, they will tell you the same answer.

So this is a much broader application. We are not there simply to protect Germany. We are there because we are a world leader. We play a big role in the world. If we want to see things destabilize, then we can bring all our forces home and then watch the chaos take place as we watch what is happening in Bosnia today.

Mr. President, I understand the motive of this amendment, but I urge its defeat. I think it needs to be thought through a lot more carefully than is apparently the case at this point in time.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has 1 minute and 10 seconds.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President I would like to pose a question to our colleagues to be joined by my distinguished partner here, the Senator from Georgia.

As we look at this amendment, this is an alliance-wide type of amendment, is that correct?

Now, there are 16 nations in NATO of which we are one. So with the other 15, let us take, for example, that 10 or 12 of the other 15 reach the requirements in the Senator's amendment but there were one or two that failed. The way we read the amendment, it does not make any difference if 14 of them met their requirements and one failed; the amendment is triggered.

So I ask the question to my colleague, am I not correct in that analysis?

Mr. HARKIN. If I might respond——

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

Mr. HARKIN. I will ask unanimous consent——

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say to my colleague, the Senator has 9 minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. I will answer on my time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 12 minutes and 5 seconds.

Mr. HARKIN. The Senator asks a legitimate question. To a certain extent he is partially right. Let us say they came up with 60 percent, and they were only 15 percent short. Then other countries could come in and pay that 15 percent. It would be legitimate.

Now, again, the amendment envisions that in the case of what the Senator from Georgia said, where you had, let us say, Poland might be a little disturbed or some other country that was not perhaps in NATO or something, well, this allows room for negotiation.

Ms. SNOWE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I yield to the Senator.

Ms. SNOWE. The amendment is designed to allow other countries to participate in payment of those costs, for example to assist Germany. There is nothing complicated about this amendment. The Department of Defense issues a report on host nation support. I bet they could figure it out. It is not that complicated. We are asking them to pay a fair share. They know what they pay; we know what they pay; and it is not enough. We are asking them just to pay more. It costs us $9.8 billion. The U.S.-European Command determines that incremental costs are 10 to 20 percent higher. We are saying we want you to pay eventually 75 percent of that 10 to 20 percent incremental cost. And it can be determined. It was laid out in last year's DOD bill.

I think there are tremendous disparities. We are looking at Japan that pays 77 percent. Korea pays 62 percent. We cannot ask our allies because somehow it becomes a complicated formula to pay more than 24 percent collectively?

Yes, it is for the alliance, but they have an obligation to contribute to the alliance as well. That is what this is all about.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator. She makes a good point. We heard these same arguments on Japan—heard the very same arguments. We heard it on Korea, too. It is not just for Japan; it is our interests all over Asia—China, North Korea. We heard the same arguments, that we cannot ask Japan to pay more. We did. They are paying more. They are paying more. And what is different?

Why, if that is the case with Japan, I might just ask rhetorically, why not ask the Philippines to pay? Why not ask Thailand, Malaysia? Why not ask other of our friends in that area? Why do they not help Japan pay the costs of our troops? Because obviously our troops there provide stability in that region, too.

Ms. SNOWE. If the Senator will further yield.

Mr. HARKIN. I yield.

Ms. SNOWE. Look at the foreign national labor costs that are also included in this amendment, the aggregate and incremental amount of foreign national labor costs: Germany 6 percent; Great Britain 9 percent, and Japan pays 94 percent toward those additional costs.

It is obvious we have been able to figure it out with Japan and Korea for that matter. But we are now saying in this amendment—it is very clear—the Secretary of Defense would calculate the aggregate amount of the incremental costs to the United States of permanently stationing U.S. forces ashore in European member nations of NATO, and the foreign labor costs also attributed to those forces.

I think it is only fair, and I just want to congratulate the Senator for offering this amendment because I do think it is important and I think, frankly, it is a post-cold-war amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator from Maine for the support and for bringing out these points and clearing it up.

You can ask this question or that question and make it seem like it is unworkable. But as I said, these are the same arguments made on Japan, same thing. You heard the same arguments. But when we came forth and got tough, as the Senator from Maine pointed out, they are paying 94 percent of their national costs. We are not asking Europe to do the same thing. We are not asking our allies to do the same thing in Europe.

What is the difference? Why have one standard for Japan and South Korea and another standard for Germany?

Mr. NUNN. Could I answer that question?

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has 8 minutes, 20 seconds.

Mr. HARKIN. Yes.

Mr. NUNN. Very briefly, the main reason is because the Japanese do not have military forces. Our NATO allies do. The Japanese have a very small percentage of their budget. That ends up being a lot higher percentage of their money because of the GNP, but they did not spend more than 1 percent. They did not have much of a security role anywhere else in the world.

Our allies like Britain, France, and even now Germany, they are moving and helping in Bosnia and are contributing military forces. So it has always been thought that the Japanese ought to do more in the offset area since they are doing less in the military area relative to their GNP.

Mr. HARKIN. Does the same hold true for South Korea? South Korea has a big defense force. They put a lot of their money in defense forces. Yet they pay more for our troops stationed there than Germany pays for our troops in Germany.

Mr. NUNN. This is what the post-cold-war environment is all about. During the cold war I sponsored burden-sharing amendments. At the same time we were protecting Germany, which was divided, there was a large Warsaw Pact force.

Germany had a threat. The Koreans have that kind of threat. They have 9,000 artillery tubes looking down their throats in Seoul. So we are directly protecting our national security.

What I am saying to you is that our forces in Germany today are not there directly and primarily to protect Germany. They are there for stability in all of Europe and the Middle East. So it has shifted fundamentally.

I think there may be a way to get at this, but I do not think this amendment does it.

Mr. HARKIN. I would grant, the Senator is right. I think we are all right on this issue. I do not argue with the need for our stability.

What I would say is, does anyone really believe that if we only asked them to pay 75 percent of the incremental costs or to pay 75 percent for their own people that we employ on their bases, that somehow they are going to kick us out of the country? Give me a break. They love having our troops there. We have all been to those bases in Germany and Italy and Great Britain. They love having those troops there.

It provides employment and it provides stability. It provides all the things that the Senator said. All we are saying, the Senator from Maine and I are saying, is it is time for them to pick up a little bit more of the cost of basing those. I might point out the House of Representatives passed by a margin of 117 votes something a lot stronger than this, a lot stronger. And that was done bipartisan; Republicans and Democrats voted for it.

I thought we ought to be a little more modest and only have the incremental portion, whatever it costs to base them overseas, have them pick that up rather than the full cost, which is what they did in the House. So, again, this is a very modest amendment.

Again, I want to respond on the Saudi Arabia thing. If Saudi Arabia needs our troops to come in there, then it seems to me that our NATO allies should go to Saudi Arabia and say, ''Look, you are using the U.S. troops. You ought to help us pay a little bit for keeping our troops in Italy and places like that.''

Hey, come on. We are all friends. We do negotiate. These things are negotiable. It seems to me Germany or Italy or Great Britain could negotiate with Saudi Arabia and say, ''Look, we are sending troops down there or planes down there based in Italy. You ought to help us pay a little bit.'' You could negotiate that out. I do not think this is rocket science, to tell you the truth. I think it is very simple and very straightforward.

Mr. President, might I ask how much more time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes, 48 seconds.

Ms. SNOWE. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I would yield to the Senator from Maine whatever time she needs.

Ms. SNOWE. I would like to make another point with respect to who spends what on defense. Former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger testified before the Foreign Relations Committee recently and happened to indicate that Japan has the third largest defense budget—Japan. They certainly have made a great effort toward spending on defense.

Our European allies spent 2.5 percent of GDP whereas the United States spent 4.4 percent of GDP. So they are not making as great an effort, obviously. We make 2½ to 3 times greater effort toward defense than our European allies do collectively.

So I do not think that there is any excuse in this regard. We are only talking, if you just analyze what we are talking about—as a result, the bottom line of this amendment is $1.1 billion per year, depending on those incremental costs. If you assume 15 percent as an average—$9.8 billion—you are talking about $1.1 billion a year. That is not asking too much, given what we are asking everybody else in America to do with respect the Federal cutbacks.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator from Maine.

Again, I just, in closing on our side, want to say, Mr. President, this is a very modest amendment. It is not complicated. It is straightforward. I believe it could be worked out.

I again would say with emphasis, we heard the same arguments for Japan and South Korea. We have interests around the world. I believe our European allies, with the standard of living and income they have, ought to pay a little bit more. That is all we are asking for.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. The Senator from Nebraska asks if he might be allowed, under a unanimous-consent request, 1 minute to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, he is such a great friend of mine, if I have any time remaining I will yield the time to him off my own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will get 1 minute from Senator HARKIN's time.

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend from Iowa.

Ordinarily I would be in strong support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa and by the Senator from Maine. But this is not an ordinary time. I wonder what is going through the minds of our European allies today when they hear what is going on day after day after day on the floor of the U.S. Senate. We zapped them good on a bipartisan vote that I thought was a horrible mistake on Bosnia. Now, as we zap them again at this particular time, after zapping them and leaving them adrift on a vote that we took a few moments ago with regard to nuclear testing, they might give up.

I simply say at another time this might be a good amendment. I urge a vote against this because I think we have hit our allies all we dare hit them at this particular juncture.

Mr. HARKIN. I might remind my friend that I supported his amendment on nuclear testing.

Mr. EXON. You did not on Bosnia.

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

Mr. HARKIN. It is a very modest amendment, very modest indeed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been expired——

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, it is my understanding that under the time agreement, this vote will be stacked with other votes at a subsequent time this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WARNER. Therefore, Madam President, the time agreement, as I understand it, now turns to the amendment from the Senator from Michigan Mr. [LEVIN]. And that will be under the control of the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. THURMOND.

Parliamentary inquiry.

Is a motion to table in order for the Harkin amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion will be in order at the time of the vote.

Mr. WARNER. At the time of the vote.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I wonder if I might, without taking any time from anybody—I will take it out of my leader time—propound a unanimous-consent request that has been cleared on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized for that purpose.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2020

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 9 a.m. on Saturday, the Senate begin consideration of H.R. 2020, Treasury, Postal Service appropriations bill, and at that time the pending business be the committee amendment on page 76, line 10 through page 76 line 17, and that it be limited to the following: 3 hours to be equally divided between Senators NICKLES and MIKULSKI, or their designees; and that following the conclusion or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on or relation to the committee amendment, and that no amendments be in order during the pendency of the committee amendment.

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

Mr. LEVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2122

(Purpose: To authorize funds for procurement of equipment for the reserve components according to their highest modernization priorities)

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] proposes an amendment numbered 2122.

At the end of section 105, insert the following:

The reserve components shall choose the equipment to be procured with the funds authorized herein according to their highest modernization priorities.''

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, the amendment which is now pending is aimed at allowing the Guard to make some choices in terms of their modernization equipment according to their highest modernization priorities.

This has been the effort in the committee for the last 3 years. It has been a struggle, and we might as well acknowledge openly just how difficult a struggle this is.

But for the last 3 years, starting in the 1993, 1994, and 1995 budgets, we have not divided the Guard and Reserve modernization funds, which we have been able to find, into specific line items in our report.

We had totals for each of the forces and allowed them to allocate according to their highest modernization needs.

The reason we do it this way is because we avoid the obvious desire of each of us to fight for our own home States, giving serious advantage to the members of the committee over nonmembers of the committee.

When we get a budget in February, we have a number of months to look at the line items in that budget. We have about 4 months to look at each of the items that is proposed that we buy when it comes to the active duty forces.

But then near the end of the process, near the end of our deliberation, when it comes to the Guard and Reserve package, as we call it, when we try to find some funds for modernization for the Guard and Reserve, we face an issue every year: Do we specify by line specific items, which each of us might want for our own home State Guards, or do we allow the Guard and the Reserves to use some discretion as to what their highest modernization needs are.

Year after year for the last 3 years, we have fought in the Armed Services Committee to keep this generic, to avoid some of the back-home stresses and strains, but to keep it generic when it comes to the Guard and Reserve, because we have not had the time to make the kind of decisions relative to line-by-line items as we do for the active duty forces. That is the difference. For active duty forces, we have 4 months to look at the budget request, and we make decisions line by line.

When it comes to the Guard and Reserve, I do not know that we had more than 4 hours this year to look at a proposed allocation that the majority delivered to us of $770 million. That is not the way to budget. It is wrong for the country, it is wrong for the security of this Nation to be making line-by-line decisions for the Guard based on less than 1 day's consideration. I think literally it was about 16 hours before a package of $700 million line by line was presented to the full committee and the time that the decision was made on it. It is just not the way to budget. It is wrong.

A number of years ago, we did it this way. But for the last 3 years, we have resisted this temptation. For the last 3 years, we have been generic in the Senate, and we have gone to conference. At conference, we always face the House which always does it line by line, and we fight it out in conference.

The good Government way to do this is to do it generically, because we do not have the adequate time to do it line by line and do it right and to try to avoid some of the back-home temptations, which we all have, to provide the specific items for our own back-home units in the Guard and Reserve.

Merit-based review is what the budget process should be all about, as much merit as we possibly can build into a budget process. We ought to insist upon it. When it comes to this Guard package, because it is done at the last minute, we do not know how much money we are going to have, and we have not gone over the line-by-line, specific items. It is simply not in the Nation's security interest to divide it up the way this committee report does.

We see those line by line on page 92 and 93 of the committee report. I am sure there is a good case to be made for every one of them. The Guard and Reserve, as a matter of fact, give us about $12 billion in funding requirements each year. So I am sure a case can be made for every one of these. But that is not the way that process worked. The case was not made for any of these. No opportunity existed in any real sense for the committee to take a look at these line by line, go over them the way we did all the other lines for 4 months and decide what is the highest priority for this Nation, what is the highest priority for these Reserve and Guard units.

The Appropriations Committee did it generically, and I want to pay them the compliment because they did do it generically. We ought to do the same thing in the authorization bill as closely as we can come. And this language which I have sent to the desk in this amendment is aimed at making the point in a straightforward way and not a technical way.

During the consideration of this bill, Senator COATS sponsored an amendment which had a lot of merit and is in this bill. It is section 1007 of the bill, and it says the Secretary of Defense in next year's bill should focus on and separately identify funding for Guard and Reserve equipment.

So what we are doing for next year's bill is telling the Secretary of Defense we want the Secretary to focus on specific items for Guard and Reserve and to separately identify funding for us so we can consider that as part of our budget deliberation. But that is next year. The question we face is whether to do it this year, and we should do it.

Next year, the Department of Defense as a whole is going to be able to focus more closely on requirements and the relative urgency for filling those requirements. If we allow them some leeway and keep this generic, they will be able to do it this year.

Under the Coats language, which applies to next year, there is going to be an opportunity for the Department of Defense to exercise some judgment in sending us some recommendations unless we keep this generic this year. If we do this line by line, specifically, they are not going to have that opportunity which is so essential this year relative to the application of $777 million.

So I think just good Government requires us to give some discretion to the Department of Defense to allow them to apply some judgment—not to specify line items, but to keep this generic, as the Appropriations Committee has

done, to allow the Department of Defense to apply some talent and some priorities to this money. That has been the pattern in the last 3 years.

Again, it is not easy to hold this. We had a very close vote in committee on this. I think the first vote we had on it was lost by a tie vote. The second vote, I think, we won by one vote. The third vote we lost by, I believe, one vote. So this was a very close vote in committee.

I hope that the full Senate will do what the Appropriations Committee did and what the Armed Services Committee did in the last 3 years, which is to keep this as generic as possible, so that the Department of Defense and the Guard and Reserve can apply their best talent to giving us the highest modernization priorities which may include many of these, but not necessarily, and instead will reflect more the needs of the Guard and Reserve and less the back-home wish list of each of our Guard and Reserve units.

Madam President, I do not know if I have any time remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 10 minutes 7 seconds remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, I yield myself such time as may be required.

Madam President, the Senator from Michigan offered this same amendment during our committee markup. It was opposed by all Republican members of our committee and defeated. The proponents of this amendment suggest it would be more appropriate to provide a sum of money to the Department of Defense and let them decide how to spend the money.

Madam President, I disagree. It is the job of the Congress to decide how these funds should be used. The Senate will make decisions on this defense authorization bill affecting the spending of $265 billion. I do not know why we should treat the funds we added for the National Guard and Reserve equipment differently from the rest of the bill.

Madam President, the Senator from Michigan has indicated that we should let the National Guard and Reserve components decide how to spend this money. He knows full well that if we simply turn a sum of money over to the Department of Defense, then the bureaucrats in the Department of Defense will decide how the money will be spent.

It is interesting to note, Madam President, that those who now want the Pentagon to decide these matters began to adopt this position about the same time they gained control of the administration in 1993.

Madam President, it is our responsibility and our duty to make the hard decisions on how we should spend defense dollars, including those dollars we add to the budget for specific purposes. The funds we added for the National Guard and Reserve equipment package certainly fit this category. I strongly urge all my colleagues to support this package for the National Guard and Reserve components and vote to sustain the position of the Armed Services Committee.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I wish to join with the distinguished chairman of the committee, Senator THURMOND, in opposing this amendment. I bring to the floor the text of our colleague's letter just received from the National Guard Association. The first paragraph says:

> Dear Senator THURMOND, the National Guard Association urges your support for the equipment designated for the Army and Air National Guard in the Armed Services Committee report, S. 1026, the National Defense Act for Fiscal 1994.

This is a critical part.

> We believe it is essential for the Congress to specifically identify equipment for the modernization of the National Guard. Such action has been very effective in the past and has allowed the National Guard to remain a full partner in the total defense forces of our Nation.

As the chairman said, what is the distinction between the active and the Guard and Reserve? It is a total force concept to be utilized and employed that way. National Guard forces, particularly the Air Reserve Guard forces, are on duty all over the world flying missions, many of them into Bosnia during the course of this debate. Therefore, I strongly urge that we resist this amendment.

I would like to ask my distinguished colleague a question. Given the limited time, I hope he will answer it on his time. I would pass to my colleague last year's report—it is for fiscal year 1993. If the Senator looks at the highlights, the yellow markings, there are a number of items. At the time, my distinguished colleague was in the majority, and a number of items were specifically cited. I point out the C–20 and the 130. Does the Senator see those highlighted, especially for his benefit?

Mr. LEVIN. I think we receded to the House on that.

Mr. WARNER. Whatever. The package was put together such that those items were put in there with great specificity.

Mr. LEVIN. I answer the question by saying that, in 1993, the Senate Armed Services Committee did this generically before the election of Bill Clinton, may I say. In 1994, we did this generically before the election of Bill Clinton, may I say.

So the chairman's reference to the Democratic President is not appropriate. We have done this now for 3 years generically. The first 2 years were prior to the Democratic administration. We did it generically in the Armed Services Committee. Yes, in conference there was give and take. It was not our choice. It was the House's choice.

Mr. FORD. Would somebody give me 60 seconds?

Mr. WARNER. Yes. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. Madam President, as Cochairman of the National Guard Association, I would like to make one point. Last year, we had $25 million in there for upgrade of the helicopters in the National Guard. It all went into one pot.

Did we get to the upgrade of the helicopters? Of course not. They tried to use it some other way. And we were crying for help to make our helicopters better and bring them up to speed for training. The 123d in Louisville, KY, is all over the world, with C–130H's. We had to fight to get them and make them specific in the budget. And now they have a top grade in the whole United States.

That is the National Guard for you. That is the support and the teeth and tail that we talk about in the military. So let us not cut the National Guard. There are 66 Senators in this Chamber that are members of the National Guard caucus. I just hope they listen and vote to support the National Guard.

Mr. WARNER. If I could pose a question to my colleague. From his many years of experience, has it not been the case that the National Guard package has been left to the Congress, year after year, to decide?

Mr. COATS. Exactly.

Mr. WARNER. And it has been up to the Congress to ensure that be done.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, how much time is available on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator THURMOND has 3 minutes 48 seconds; Senator LEVIN has 9 minutes 22 seconds.

Mr. COATS. I appreciate the Senator from Virginia reading the letter and the comments of the Senator from Kentucky relative to the National Guard Association and their interests.

The Senator from Virginia commented on paragraph 1 of that letter. Let me add to that by reading a little bit of paragraph 2:

> We are opposed to efforts which would merely identify a lump sum dollar amount for equipment which would then be referred to the Department of Defense for distribution. In almost every instance the work of the members of the committee and the committee staff has resulted in identification of the highest priority unfunded equipment requirements for the National Guard.

Now, we are sensitive to the question raised by the Senator from Michigan. That is why we have incorporated in the bill a request by the committee that the Department furnish us with a report indicating that they will begin to make determinations, as they submit to us on requests for the regular appropriations for the active Army and military, that they will begin to do this for the National Guard.

For years, the practice has been to defer this decision to Congress. We will have that report before the Senate. We

can evaluate that next year. We ask for it to be submitted with the budget, so we will do it concurrently with the budget and evaluate it at that time.

Do not forfeit now the practice that has been undertaken by the Congress on the request of the Guard and in support by the Guard, allowing DOD to defer that decision to us. We have made that decision for this year, and we will evaluate the report next year and be back with a recommendation.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I must say that my dear colleague from Indiana is a little modest, because that was the provision that the Senator fashioned and submitted for the Armed Services Committee. We accepted it at the very time we debated this issue and decided, as a majority of the committee, we would take the action which is incorporated in this bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, I think the Guard and Reserve are among our highest priorities. I am pleased we have a package here for the Guard and Reserve.

As I understand the Levin amendment—and I want the Senator to clarify this if I am wrong—I note the letter from the National Guard Association says, ''We are opposed to efforts which would merely identify a lump sum dollar amount for equipment which would be referred to the Department of Defense for distribution.'' That is the letter I believe the Senator from Virginia read from.

It is my understanding the Levin amendment does not do what that letter was opposed to. The Levin amendment leaves it up to the Reserve and Guard components to make that choice individually—Army National Guard, Air National Guard, Army Reserve, Navy Reserve, Air Force Reserve, and Marine Corps Reserve.

This amendment leaves it to the Department of Defense to make the choice, and if they want the items we have selected here, they could select every one of those.

Mr. LEVIN. The Senator is exactly right. The language of the amendment is very clear. The Reserve component shall make that choice. And they can, of course, choose the exact items that are in the committee report, should they choose.

There is no reduction in funds for the Government Reserve.

Mr. NUNN. My position is I support the package in the bill, but I believe the Levin amendment is a better way to go about it because, we do not go over these line items as we do in the regular budget.

The regular budget comes over, the Department of Defense has scrubbed it, the Office of Management and Budget has looked at it closely, each of the military services has basically come up with their request. It is gone over and over and over. The Guard and Reserve package is needed, in my view, but it is an add-on package. We do not have the kind of attention paid to these items that we do in the regular budget, because they are add-on items.

I think in 1993, 1994, and 1995 that this is what we did. It would be better to leave this up to the Reserve components for their priority. I believe the Levin amendment makes sense. No one should misunderstand this amendment. It does not cut the Guard and Reserve. It leaves it up to them to make that determination.

Mr. WARNER. How much time is left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute 37 seconds on your side; 6 minutes 47 seconds on the side of Senator LEVIN.

Mr. WARNER. I ask if my colleague from Michigan would answer, on his time, the following question. This amendment reads as follows: The Reserve component shall choose the equipment to be procured with the funds authorized here, and according to the highest modernization priorities.

That means some Reserve officer will make the decision. The Secretary of Defense has no input. The Secretary of the Army has no input. The Congress, then, is denied any specific input other than the allocation of funds.

Mr. LEVIN. The amendment says that the Army National Guard shall make that allocation, the Air National Guard shall make the allocation, the Army Reserve shall make the allocation. The head of each of those components has a commander. And so forth. We do not cut the money. We do not change the money. What we do is take the amount of money which is allocated in section 105. We leave it exactly as it is. Army National Guard, $209,400,000, Air National Guard, $137,000,000. We do not touch any of that money.

What the committee has done for the first time in 4 years, in its committee report, is to allocate line by line within each of those items.

The problem is exactly as the Senator from Georgia said. We had less than 1 day to even see what the allocation of the majority was here. We have avoided that temptation for the last 3 years. We ought to resist that temptation here.

The Senator from Kentucky is right. The Guard is a critically needed function. This money is essential for the Guard. I have asked General Baca, the Chief of the National Guard, point blank, whether or not he supports leaving this generic, or whether or not he wants the specific line-by-line item in this committee report. He said he wants it generic. I asked him in my office.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LEVIN. How much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes 38 seconds on your side; 1 minute 37 seconds on the side of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the quorum not be charged to either side.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Who yields time to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. EXON. Are we under controlled time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WARNER. Parliamentary inquiry: What is the order before the Senate at the moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Levin amendment No. 2122 is the order.

Mr. WARNER. My understanding is that there is about a minute left under Senator THURMOND and 3 minutes under the Senator from Michigan. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Approximately.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, will the manager yield for a question?

We have colleagues who are anticipating a vote at 8:10, and understandably that schedule slipped somewhat. In order to advise colleagues what they might anticipate, is there any up-to-date estimate on when the three votes might be held?

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, we will proceed with the next amendment in a matter of just a few minutes. Then three votes would be stacked.

Mr. DOLE. How much time do you have on the Glenn amendment?

I guess about 8:40.

Mr. CONRAD. At 8:40 the votes would start.

I thank the leader. I thank the managers.

Mr. EXON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

I thank my friend from North Dakota. That is exactly what I was trying to find out. Now we have moved from 8:10 to 8:40. It has been a very convenient arrangement that the Senate has been going through trying to meet accommodations. I will try to be back at about 8:40.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I yield back the time on this side.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, we yield back the remainder on our side.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, 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. WARNER. At this point in time it is the intention of the manager on this side to have a motion to table at the appropriate time, which I understand would be at the time of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WARNER. Under the unanimous-consent request, we now proceed to the next amendment. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WARNER. So the Chair will lay aside this pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the Levin amendment, and the motion to table will be in order at a later time.

Mr. LEVIN. I ask unanimous consent that Senator BINGAMAN be added as a cosponsor of my amendment.

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

Under the previous order, the Levin amendment is set aside so that Senator GLENN may offer an amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2123

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, I rise today to offer this amendment because I am concerned about the provision in this year's bill that would reduce the active duty service obligations for service academy graduates from 6 to 5 years.

To do this reduction from 6 to 5 years without waiting for the study that is required in this legislation, we are asking for information but we are taking action before we even get the information to know what the impact would be from the experts at the Pentagon and at the service academies.

In other words, it is sort of like ready, fire, aim, instead of the other way around.

The current policy, which requires graduates to serve 6 years, has been in effect since 1991 and it ensures that American taxpayers receive a high return on investment for the other three-quarters of a billion dollars.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GLENN. Without losing the floor.

Mr. DOLE. The time has not started running until you offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has not sent his amendment to the desk.

Mr. DOLE. The time starts to run for 30 minutes.

Mr. GLENN. That is fine.

AMENDMENT NO. 2123

(Purpose: To strike out the reduction in the period of obligated active duty service of graduates of the service academies)

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] proposes an amendment numbered 2123.

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 154, strike out line 4 and all that follows through page 155, line 20, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 502. REVIEW OF PERIOD OF OBLIGATION ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE FOR GRADUATES OF SERVICE ACADEMIES.

Not later than April 1, 1996, the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) review the effects that each of various periods of obligated active duty service for graduates of the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, and the United States Air Force Academy would have on the number and quality of the eligible and qualified applicants seeking appointment to such academies; and

(2) submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives a report on the Secretary's findings together with any recommended legislation regarding the minimum periods of obligated active duty service for graduates of the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, and the United States Air Force Academy.

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, as I say, I rise because of concern about reducing the active duty service obligation for service academy graduates from 6 to 5 years without even waiting for the required study which asks for information on which we could make a good judgment on whether this is a wise move or not.

The current policy, which requires graduates to serve 6 years, has been in effect since 1991, and it ensures that American taxpayers receive a high return on investment for the over three-quarters of $1 billion that we spend each year on our service academies. The actual figure is about $754 million. It also ensures that the candidates we select to attend the academies are committed to at least considering a career as a military professional.

The change in this year's defense authorization bill is particularly troubling in two areas. First, it changes successful legislation that has still attracted top-notch students to the academies. At the same time, it directs the Department of Defense to submit a report that provides the information needed to make such a change. In essence, what we are doing, as I said, is shooting first and asking questions later. We are making the change. Then we are seeing if we can get the data to back it up, and that is the wrong way to make intelligent decisions.

I received a letter the other day requesting my support of the 5-year obligation. One of the sentences in this letter said, and I quote, ''My guess is that with a 5-year obligation the Navy can attract more candidates from which to select.'' The key word here, Madam President, is ''guess.'' We should not change legislation because we guess it will do something.

My amendment corrects that. All it does is say that we want the information, that we will continue the present policy until we get the study next year. It provides us with the time and information we need to make an educated decision. It provides us with the opportunity to make this decision without guessing.

A second problem I have with the language in this bill is that this change will open up the possibility of attacks from groups that would like to see us totally shut down the service academies. I am not the only one who shares this concern. A former State Department official who recently stepped down from the Naval Academy's Board of Visitors said in a December 1994 Baltimore Sun article that he was also against lowering the service requirement because that move, he said, would raise the possibility of budget cuts at the Academy by those who believe we do not need academies, he said that ROTC, OCS, et cetera, can just as well provide our officer corps. In other words, if we get less use of the product, that is, newly commissioned officers, then why go to all the expense of spending all this money, a quarter of a million that we spend on each Academy graduate.

Madam President, I have long been a supporter of the academies. I am not an Academy graduate myself, but I am a big supporter of it. I think they are necessary for our military. Although we allocate a great deal of money to run these institutions, I think it is worth it. We spend up to $272,000 per student. But I still believe this money is wisely spent.

Some of our very greatest military leaders, including Eisenhower, MacArthur, Marshall, Patton, Bradley, Halsey, Nimitz, and Vandegrift are academy graduates. And if I believed for one moment there was a problem attracting qualified candidates to these schools, I would be the very first in line to make the changes necessary to keep the seats at the service academies filled.

The fact is we have not had a problem finding qualified applicants to fill these seats. We have highly qualified applicants, more than we can possibly take care of. Over 30,000 young people in our country, as I understand it, apply to the academies each year, and we do not have any problem getting good people to fill the seats at the academies.

In fact, an article in the September 16, 1994 edition of the RECORD addresses the kind of students applying to the academies, and it says the academies ''offer high-quality education as well as demanding training in military skills and discipline.'' A further quote, ''The big problem is getting in with so many well-qualified students applying.''

Madam President, there has been a decline in applications. I repeat that. There has been a decline in the number of applications to the service academies. But that decline has not impacted the quality of young people attending these schools. There are quite a lot of other reasons why the numbers have gone down, and I will address that. But we have not in any way changed the high standards required to

qualify for admittance to these fine institutions, institutions that rank with the best schools in our country, indeed, the best schools in the world.

Also, the decline in the number of high school students seeking an academy education started dropping in 1988, 3 years before the 6-year obligation was put into effect. I repeat that. The decline in the number of high school students seeking an academy education started dropping in 1988, 3 years before the 6-year obligation was put into effect.

Now, I think there are a lot of reasons why we have experienced a drop in applicants but none of them have anything to do with service obligation, or very, very little. I think a headline from an article about the Air Force Academy points to one of the real problems on why we are having problems attracting young people to the Academies. It says, ''Applications to Academy Plummet 50 Percent. Job security blamed for big decline since record high in 1988.''

No doubt about it, there has been a decline in interest in the youth of America in serving in the military. And over the last few years we have dramatically reduced enlisted and officer positions in the military, and a lot of young people are getting very concerned about job security in a military career. Indeed, I would point out they have a right to be concerned because during an Armed Services hearing this year, witnesses told us that we should continue our reduction in military force structure.

We started at a peak of about 2.1 million active duty military personnel in this country. We are down below 1.6, around 1.5 million right now, and we will go down to the current goal of 1.425 million, or they are proposing even going down to 1.2 or 1.1 million.

Taking this into account, who on Earth would want to start a career in an organization that is laying off people after only 6 or 8 years of service? In fact, a West Point spokesman, Maj. Jay Ebbeson, said in a December 1994 article, ''Kids may want to have a stable employer. We just don't think the 6 years is the reason.''

A major reason the Air Force Academy is having problems is that there has been a decline in opportunities to go to flight school. We have fewer cockpits to fill. Most of the applicants to the Air Force Academy want to fly airplanes, and when they hear that only 25 percent of the graduates will go on to flight training, it is not surprising they decline in favor of attending a civilian institution.

Another reason for declining applicants is that academy graduates are no longer guaranteed active duty commissions. After graduation, they receive a Reserve commission and then they are forced to compete for a limited number of active duty positions with other officers coming out of the OCS and the ROTC programs.

Madam President, the argument that bothers me the most on why we should reduce service obligations is the one that says this policy is having a severe impact on the academies' ability to recruit high-quality applicants, the kind that are required if our academies are to be successful in division 1A football and basketball.

Lest we think this is just a spurious thing I am tossing in here, back in 1990 when we were thinking about passing this legislation, I had visits from alumnae associations of the academies, and 2 out of 3 of those academies made a major point of this, that what I was doing was interfering with the ability to recruit high-quality athletes for the academies when I was advocating putting the required service up to 6 years.

Well, I do not think there is any question that the 6-year obligation has had a severe impact on the competitiveness of our academy teams in this conference. As the excerpts from the New York Times and the Baltimore Sun on a chart that I have in the office—that I was going to bring over and did not bring—point out, the 6-year obligation has been a major factor for football players who may have aspirations for turning pro, or basketball players.

(Mr. GORTON assumed the chair.)

Mr. GLENN. Recruiting quality athletes has been a problem, been such a problem that even some groups are saying, ''We should waive the immediate military service obligation for academy athletes, should they be good enough to play pro football following graduation.''

Well, I do not buy those arguments. We have a purpose for the academy. We know what that purpose is. It is not to be a minor league for the professional sports. Maybe it is time we take another look at having the academies compete in NCAA Division I-AA. I am not proposing that. But I think when something like the professional sports thing and how we have a problem getting people in because they are not willing to come in if they have to make a commitment after they get this education and over a quarter of a million dollars spent for their education, they will not come because it will interfere with their pro career, maybe we have to look at a different direction. However, Mr. President, I do not think you will find a lot of support out there for going to Division I-AA because college football is a big money business.

In a June 1994 report from the Defense Advisory Committee On Service Academy Athletic Programs, the committee advised the academies not to move to a lower division so as to not lose income from big time football.

There is no wonder there are organizations out there pushing for a reduction in active duty obligation. Mr. President, although I believe collegiate sports play an important part in development of our country's future leaders, I have to agree with Adm. Charles Larson, Superintendent at the Naval Academy, who said in a Washington Post interview:

Having a winning football program is something which all of us here at the Naval Academy would like to see. However, it is important to stress that our primary mission is not to produce professional athletes. Our mission is to produce future Navy and Marine Corps officers with character, men and women who are prepared to lead and show the highest standards of honesty, integrity, and professional performance.

In other words, what we are looking for, Mr. President, are those young men and women that have stars in their eyes, men and women of all races and religions who are ready to make a sacrifice for their country, young, hard-charging individuals who really do not make the fact whether it is 6 or 8 or 10 years the major factor in their service to this country. They are people that want to lead, people that want to command aircraft squadrons, infantry battalions, people that want to follow in the footsteps of some of our country's greatest leaders.

We do not want those who are looking just for a free meal ticket, those who are looking for a way to beat the system, those who basically are asking, what can my country do for me? We need people who want to do something for their country. These people, Mr. President, are not so completely focused on service requirements that the 5 or 6 makes a difference. Yet we get much more for the taxpayers' money with that extra requirement that is the law now.

I get over 1,300 applications each year from high school students in Ohio who would give their eyeteeth to attend one of the service academies. I can tell you these are not average students. They are cream of the crop. Most of them, if not selected for an academy seat, still end up attending some of the very finest civilian schools in our country.

Mr. President, I want to read an editorial from the January 10, 1995, edition of the Baltimore Sun, titled ''An Honor and a Bargain,'' that so accurately reflects my feelings on this issue.

We fail to understand the hand-wringing at the U.S. Naval Academy over the drop in admission applications.

According to a recent Sun article by reporter Tom Bowman, the academy's advisory Board of Visitors is asking President Clinton to reconsider a new requirement that increases the time academy graduates must serve in the military. The board says that by increasing the graduates's service obligation from five years to six, some of the nation's top students have been discouraged from applying to the academy.

''These kids don't think past a burger Saturday night,'' the dean of admissions said. And they're saying, ''That's 10 years of my life.''

Maybe some students are turned off by the six-year requirement, but we believe it should remain.

It costs $250,000 to educate a young person in a service academy. The additional year was added to a graduate's military service to give taxpayers more for their money. In today's political climate, it would be unreasonable to demand less.

But there are other reasons to leave it intact. The decline in applications to the academy is no tragedy because it comes at a time

when the institution is under orders to pare the size of the brigade anyway. Academy enrollment, which reached a high of 4,500 midshipmen in 1990, must be reduced to 4,000 by next September, Currently, a little more than 4,100 midshipmen attend the academy.

Understandably, U.S. Naval Academy officials want to attract this country's best and brightest young people, but an applicant's dedication to a military career ought to be considered as well as scholastic performance.

Maybe some young people cannot look beyond the next weekend, but they are not the kind of people we want to be training as military officers. For a young person aspiring to a military career, a service academy education is a tremendous bargain as well as an honor.

A midshipman at Annapolis receives one of the best educations in the country—for free. Even more important, a graduate from the Naval Academy is guaranteed a good job as a military officer. That is more than many young people can expect upon graduation from traditional college and universities these days.

We don't think it is too much to ask that Naval Academy graduates serve their country for six years in return.

Mr. President, I am sure that a few of my fellow Senators will argue that the length of obligated service for academy graduates should be reduced from 6 to 5 years. However, I believe there is more than enough evidence that justifies why we should not change our current policy.

No matter how you feel about this issue, I strongly believe we would be making a terrible mistake to change this legislation before we receive the analytical data required to make an informed decision on this matter.

The informative data that we are asking for, the analytical data, is required to be reported to us by next April by the legislation that we are working on here now. So it is not a matter of whether we are going to do it or not. They are going to make that analytical data available to us after having studied this matter as to what the impact would be. Yet we are proposing here to go ahead and make a change before we get the information. So delaying a change in this policy until we receive this report makes sense and is the right thing to do.

That is all we require with this amendment, is just say the present 6-year requirement will not be changed back until we get the information. And then next year, depending on what that information says, I may be leading the charge next year to reduce this requirement myself. But I want to make that recommendation only on the basis of the best information. If the study recommends that length of active duty service should be 6 years, which I believe it will, then next year we would be forced to revisit the issue and reverse our position for the third time in 6 years. And that makes no sense.

It seems to me that while we reinvent Government and ask Government personnel to do more with less, we cannot tell the military academies to do less with more. So I hope all our colleagues will support this amendment to maintain the current active duty obligation that has attracted top-notch candidates to our service academies.

Now, Mr. President, I know that one of things we brought up will be in a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Management Policy. I sent a letter over there asking their response—I requested their views on this matter of section 502 of S. 1026. And they wrote back and responded that—it is in response to my letter. They say:

> Enactment of this section would reduce the active duty obligation . . . of service academy graduates from six to five years.''

They said:

> As you are aware, the current six year [active duty service obligation] was mandated by the National Defense Authorization Act . . . for Fiscal Year 1990, and will be effective for graduates of the academies beginning in 1996.
>
> Neither this mandate—

This is a key section.

> Neither this mandate nor section 502 of S. 1206 were requested by DOD.

Very correct.

And then the next paragraph says:

> A review of the history of the mandate to change the ADSO—

The active duty service obligation.

> reveals that the Department appealed the Senate provision during the Senate-House conference.

In other words, they had doubts about it at the time, and during the conference between the House and the Senate they asked that not go in. Then to quote again from their letter:

> Despite that appeal, the Senate's provision to change the ADSO from 5 to 6 years was sustained.

In other words, their request lost.

> Further, the underlying rationale for the decision was apparently based on the significant defense investment in service academy graduates.

Absolutely correct. That is correct.

Then there last sentence:

> The Department maintains its original position on this matter.

I am sure that will be taken to mean the Defense Department opposes this, but that is not the case. They do not say that the new system has not worked well. They do not say that we are getting a lesser qualified academy applicant. They do not say they have even studied this matter. They do not give any data whatsoever, yes or no on this. They do not say whether it is a better deal for taxpayers or not which, as they correctly said in here, was based on the significant defense investment in service academy graduates.

What I am saying is, they have not addressed the problem yet and they do not say they have addressed the problem yet. So what I say is we are asking them in this legislation to address the problem, do a study, report back to us by next April 1.

I will say, if they cannot say when they do that for us, they will study and let us know what the best way to go is next year, that is the time to be reducing or increasing or remaining the same on the ADSO, the active duty service obligation, of academy graduates.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 7 minutes and 27 seconds.

Mr. GLENN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense be printed in the RECORD at the end of my comments.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I think there has been a misperception on a lot of these things, why recruiting is getting harder. There was a study done, called the ''Enlistment Propensity.'' There has been a misconception that the youth of the military are no longer hiring because the military is a declining industry and a lot of other events recently: Drawdown, personnel cuts, base closure, press reports of unfavorable events, such as Tailhook and so on, reduced importance of military life, domestic issues, crime, health care, economy, jobs, decline in defense-related industries in the communities, and so on.

There are many reasons why some people are not applying to the academies. But we do not have any study, other than some anecdotal evidence, that shows we have a real decline in the quality of people we are getting. In fact, quite the opposite.

I will state out of one of the studies we do have on this subject, the class of 1997 at the military academy, as far as scholastic aptitude tests go, on SAT scores, had an average for the class of 1997 of SAT scores higher than the classes of 1989 through 1992 and 1995. They were only 2 points below the classes of 1993 and 1994. So in regard to scholastic aptitude, education and intelligence, we do not have a problem recruiting highly qualified applicants.

Grade point average for the Air Force, to use another example. The grade point average for the class of 1998 at the end of the freshman spring semester was higher than the classes of 1992 through 1994 and equal to the class of 1995. The grade point average for the class in 1997, at the end of both the sophomore fall and spring semesters, was the highest in the last 6 years. The grade point average for the class of 1996 at the end of the junior fall semester was the highest in the last 5 years.

Mr. President, there is absolutely no information whatsoever, except a few anecdotal stories, that indicate that the 6-year requirement has adversely affected the type people we are getting at the academies.

I think it is incumbent upon us to say keep it at 6, do the study this year and then we will know what we are doing when we get that study next year. And if it is required that we put it down to 5 to get the kind of people we need, fine, but we will have data, we will have the study by the Pentagon of

all the academies, not just one—not just Navy, not just West Point, not just the Air Force. We will have studies from all the academies, and then we can make an informed decision of what to do.

All this amendment does, I repeat once more, is say that we will await the study that is required before we make our decision to reduce the active duty service obligation. That to me is so common sense that I hope we can almost adopt this by unanimous consent. I know that is not going to be the case.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

EXHIBIT 1

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, August 3, 1995.

Hon. JOHN GLENN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GLENN: This is in response to your request for the Department's views on Section 502 of S. 1026.

Enactment of this section would reduce the active duty service obligation (ADSO) of Service academy graduates from six to five years.

As you are aware, the current six year ADSO was mandated by the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 1990, and will be effective for graduates of the academies beginning in 1996. Neither this mandate, nor Section 502 of S. 1026, were requested by the DoD.

A review of the history of the mandate to change the ADSO reveals that the Department appealed this Senate provision during the Senate/House Conference. Despite that appeal, the Senate's provision to change the ADSO from five to six years was sustained. The underlying rationale for the decision was apparently based on the significant Defense investment in Service academy graduates.

The Department maintains its original position on this matter.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS M. RUSH, JR.,
Acting Assistant Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, the chairman of the appropriate committee is on the floor, and I will yield to him or just take a brief couple of minutes here and then let him discuss this amendment.

Let me just say that we discussed this in great detail in committee and in examining it, and as chairman of the Personnel Subcommittee, I concluded that moving the time obligation from 6 years to 5 years after graduation from the academies was a desirable thing to do.

I base that decision primarily upon information that I received from each of the Superintendents of the academies. I have with me copies of letters from the Superintendents of the academies. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT,
UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY,
West Point, NY, August 2, 1995.

Hon. DAN COATS,
U.S. Senate, Chairman, Subcommittee on Personnel, Committee on the Armed Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COATS: When legislation to extend the Active Duty Service Obligation (ADSO) for Academy graduates was proposed in the FY 1990 Defense Authorization Bill, all the Services opposed the change. We believed the extension was unnecessary.

Retention rates for Academy graduates were historically well above the Service objectives. In addition, the 5-year ADSO coincided with the probationary period for Regular officers and the promotion "up or out" point to Captain (Lieutenant in the US Navy). Finally, we were concerned that the longer obligation would harm recruiting of high school students who had many other college and career options (especially minority applicants).

To date we have not observed significant adverse consequences in the recruiting arena which can be directly attributed to the extended ADSO. However, for all the reasons cited above, we still believe the 5-year obligation is a better requirement. It helps the recruiting effort and it supports sound officer management policy.

On this basis we support the proposal to restore the 5-year ADSO. Thank you for the opportunity to contribute our perspective to your deliberations on this issue.

Sincerely,

HOWARD D. GRAVES,
Lieutenant General, U.S. Army,
Superintendent.

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY,
Annopolis, MD, August 2, 1995.

Hon. DANIEL R. COATS,
U.S. Senate, Senate Russell Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COATS: I wanted to take this opportunity to express my position as Superintendent on the Active Duty Service Obligation for service academy graduates. As you know the SASC mark of the FY–96 Authorization Bill contains legislation to reduce the current six year obligation to one of five years for all service academies. Our admissions statistics indicate that the FY–90 extension of the Active Duty Service Obligation has had a negative impact on the total number of applicants and on the number of young men and women seeking congressional appointments. Since 1989, the number of applicants decreased from 14,014 to 10,422, a 25 percent decrease. During the same time frame the number of congressional nominations, a strong indicator of interest in attending a service academy, has decreased 22 percent from 6,148 to 4,756. A recent survey of those applicants who declined an offered appointment to the Naval Academy indicated that twenty-three percent did so because of the six-year service obligation.

I strongly believe, as these statistics indicate, that the Active Duty Service Obligation issue is one of recruiting, and not retention. The Naval Academy Class of 1989 had a five year obligation, yet our records show that 75% of them are still on active duty at the six year point. We are losing good applicants by legislation that targets the 25% who get out before reaching the six year point, a false economy. If we can get the best people admitted, the challenge is to motivate a large percentage to stay 10 or 20 years, which we have done with great success over the years. A five year obligation will help in this effort.

Thank you for your continued support of the Service Academies and especially for your support for the return of the five year active duty service obligation.

Sincerely,

C.R. LARSON,
Admiral, U.S. Navy,
Superintendent.

U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY,
USAF Academy, Colorado, August 2, 1995.

Hon. DAN COATS,
Chairman, Personnel Subcommittee,
Committee on Armed Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COATS: We understand the Senate Armed Services Committee is recommending to restore the Active Duty Service Obligation for Service Academy graduates from 6 to 5 years. We support that position.

The propensity for young people to serve in the Armed Forces has declined significantly in the post-cold war era. For example, our applications in the past 7 years are down nearly 50 percent. We believe the increased service commitment to 6 years has contributed to this trend. Over the past 3 years, in telephone interviews with those who declined appointments to the Academy, over 20 percent stated that the 6-year military obligation was a major factor in their decision.

We believe returning to the 5-year service obligation will enhance our efforts to recruit quality students.

Sincerely,

PAUL E. STEIN,
Lieutenant General, USAF,
Superintendent.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I have letters from the Superintendent of the West Point U.S. Military Academy, from the Air Force Academy and from the Naval Academy. Let me just quote from those letters:

Dear Senator COATS: When legislation to extend the Active Duty Service Obligation for academy graduates was proposed for the FY 1990 defense authorization bill, all the services opposed the change. We believed the extension was unnecessary.

Now they have had some experience with this and, as a result of that, they write to us and say that there are concerns that the longer obligation would harm the recruiting of high school students who have many other college and career options, especially minority applicants. They were concerned at the time when this was put in that this would adversely affect them.

The Superintendent of the military academy goes on to say that "we * * * believe the 5-year obligation is a better requirement. It helps the recruiting effort and it supports sound officer management policy."

General Stein, Superintendent of the Air Force Academy, says:

The propensity for young people to serve in the Armed Forces has declined significantly in the post-cold-war era. For example, our applications in the past 7 years are down nearly 50 percent. We believe the increased service commitment to 6 years has contributed to this trend. Over the past 3 years, in telephone interviews with those who declined appointments to the academy, over 20 percent stated that the 6-year military obligation was a major factor in their decision.

Finally, Admiral Larson, Superintendent of the Naval Academy says:

Our admissions statistics indicate that the FY 90 extension of the Active Duty Service Obligation has had a negative impact on the

total number of applicants and on the number of young men and women seeking congressional appointments . . . A recent survey of those applicants who declined an offered appointment to the Naval Academy indicated that 23 percent did so because of the 6-year service obligation.

Mr. President, I believe we need to listen to the people who run the academies. They are the ones who are in charge of the recruiting of top-flight high school graduates to attend the academies. Each of them has specified to us that the 6-year obligation is not only unnecessary but it hurts their recruiting.

As they call and interview, those who they have selected to be at the Academy, and ask them, ''Why did you turn down a free education,'' we are finding that one-fifth or more of those who rejected the appointment have said the 6-year obligation was simply too long.

There are a lot of opportunities for bright, young people today. The people that are applying for the Academies are top-flight people that have other options, not only in terms of their educational and academic options, but in terms of employment opportunities when they leave. Those individuals are saying, ''I am not prepared at this point to commit to 6 years.''

Now, the logical response to that is, well, then that means they would not stay on as officers in the respective services. If they are concerned about a 6-year obligation, why should the taxpayer pay for their education only to have them leave 5, 6 years later? But just the opposite is true. Those individuals who do accept and graduate from the Academy, a vast proportion, and very high percentage of those graduates choose a career of service in the military.

The difference is that when you are an 18-year-old making a decision, 6 years seems like an eternity. But once you have received the education, gone through the academy and graduated, begun to serve in the service, the decision is to stay in the service. So that is not a deterrent.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arizona who initiated this proposal and was instrumental in urging the committee to adopt it.

Mr. MCCAIN. How much time do the proponents have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opponents have 4 minutes, 36 seconds. The proponents have 2 minutes, 56 seconds.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Indiana for the outstanding work he has done as chairman of the Subcommittee on Personnel, especially the personal interest he has taken in the service academies. I know of no one who has taken more time and effort to be involved in the issues surrounding the service academies than the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. President, in case the Senator from Ohio did not hear about it, I received information concerning candidates for the Naval Academy. In 1994, applicants for that class, in a comparison between the 94 and 99 applicants from the State of Ohio for the Naval Academy, dropped 21.5 percent. Candidates—those selected and then asked to be members at the Naval Academy—dropped 22.5 percent.

I am not sure where the Senator from Ohio is getting any figures. But we have received information which I will make part of the RECORD from all three service academies that both applicants and candidacies have dropped. It is a fact of life.

Mr. President, also, in the letter that the Senator from Ohio made a part of the RECORD from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, it clearly states, in a rather weaselish way, that the Department of Defense did not approve of the increase when it was enacted, and they stand by their original position on this matter. I think it is clear that they did not approve of it then and they do now.

Let me tell you what this is all about, Mr. President, and I will get right down to it. We are in an all-volunteer force. Today, a majority of the men and women in the services who are enlisted are minorities. Today, Mr. President, the overwhelming majority of the members of the officer corps are white individuals. There is a significant and dramatic imbalance between the makeup of the enlisted corps and the officer corps in the military today.

The service academies have worked night and day to try to correct that imbalance by attracting minority individuals into the service academies. It is entirely appropriate that there be some reasonable balance between the numbers of minorities, percentages of minorities in the officer corps and in the enlisted corps. I do not have to explain to Members the kinds of contradictions that evolve from that.

What the service academies are finding is that if a minority person is qualified to enter a service academy, that same person is qualified to get a scholarship to Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Berkeley, Stanford, or any other major college or university.

We are having significant problems, Mr. President—when I say ''we,'' I mean the service academies. They are having significant difficulties in recruiting members of minorities into the service academies. They are not able to reach their goals. In fact, there was a steady increase for a while, and that has now leveled off and even declined.

Now, Mr. President, I do not disrespect the view of the Senator from Ohio. But I have to tell the Senator from Ohio that I respect the view of the people who are running the admissions programs in these service academies more than I do his. Why the Senator from Ohio is hung up on this issue is not clear to me, because we are dear friends.

But I would ask the Senator from Ohio, who pretends to be an expert on this issue—which he is not—to listen to the people that are the experts on this issue and then this issue would be quickly resolved.

Mr. President, the Senate Armed Services Committee approved a provision in the Defense authorization bill that would restore to 5 years from 6 the minimum active duty service obligation for Service Academy graduates. We believe that this position will go a long way to help reverse the alarming decline in the number of applicants for the Service Academies.

Opposition to lowering the active duty service obligation comes from a mistaken belief that a longer service obligation will absolutely result in more officers making the military a career. Historical data shows, however, that there is no direct correlation between the length of the service obligation and the decision to make the military a career. In fact, in the past when there was no service obligation or a considerably shorter obligation, the military was very successful in motivating a large percentage of Service Academy graduates to remain for 20 years.

The real objective of restoring the service obligation to 5 years is to enhance recruiting efforts at the Service Academies. With the current 6-year service obligation, we are losing many good applicants. A 5-year service obligation will focus instead on getting the best people admitted. As a clear indication that a 5-year obligation is not detrimental to efforts to keep officers in the military, it is significant that 77 percent of graduates from the U.S. Naval Academy Class of 1989, which had a 5-year obligation, are still on active duty at the 6-year point.

The real issue here is recruiting, not retention, of officers from the Service Academies.

Mr. President, it may be useful to explain to this body some of the history of Senator GLENN's amendment on the 6-year active duty obligation. During the 1991 legislative session, Congress increased the active duty obligation of Service Academy graduates from 5 to 6 years.

Mr. President, my amendment steals an old argument from 1991, when the Congress recommended a provision that would require all commissioned officers to be initially appointed as reserve officers. The Congress felt that regardless of commissioning source, that all officers should compete for regular commissions on the basis of their demonstrated performance and potential. Additionally, those that argued on the side of debate for reserve commissions stated that competition is healthy and consistent with equal opportunity which allows the best officers to enter the regular component. Although, this provision was considered to be leveling the playing field with respect to reserve commissions; legislation also was included with respect to an academies' length of obligated service in the Armed Forces which would require a graduate to serve on active duty for at least 6 years

immediately after commission. In comparison, an ROTC graduate's length of obligated service in the Armed Forces is only 4 years immediately after their commission.

Mr. President, the country receives an adequate return on its investment with the 5-year obligation. However, the delicate balance between accession and attrition in the military manpower world may soon tilt for the worse when the academy classes of 1996 graduate and they incur a 6-year active duty service obligation. Because of the pyramidal shape of the officer corps, for example the progressively smaller number of officers in each rank as rank increases, we only need to keep 55 percent of our academy graduates beyond the 5-year point. History shows us that when there was little or no obligation, all the services were exceeding this 55 percent retention requirement. If too many officers are retained beyond the 5-year point, then the desired shape of the officer corps pyramid becomes distorted, there aren't enough meaningful jobs for junior officers, there is a demoralizing increased promotion passover rate, personnel management flexibility is reduced, and there are morale problems because of disgruntled officers who feel they are being kept on active duty beyond a reasonable pay back period for education.

Mr. President, the Services' own study of the 6-year active duty obligation shows that the increase in active duty obligation at the academies reduces the number and quality of young persons applying to the academies. This is because top-notch youngsters at age 17 or 18 are simply not sure what career they wish to devote their lives to and they are not willing to obligate their lives to one field, military or non-military, for a long period of time. This naive uncertainty is only exacerbated by the changing face of the military as it goes through excruciating cutbacks and is buffeted by the shifting winds of what may be called the leadership theory of the day. These teenagers want to keep their options open.

Mr. President, many fine young people will enter the Service Academies out of a spirit of patriotism and are proud to serve on active duty for 5 years with the expectation that they may make the service a career. But obligations in excess of that amount will drive them away from Service Academies to civilian colleges, who eagerly desire these quality youth and require no obligation after graduation, even after public funding. Many businesses are offering highly qualified young people free college educations today with work pay back commitments considerably below the Service Academy 6-year obligation. The adverse impact of the increased active duty obligation will become more pronounced as the 18-year-old age population in our country continues to decline beyond 1994.

Our challenge in the military is to attract the best youth we can to the service academies and then through good leadership and career satisfaction inspire them to stay in the service, rather than require them to stay in.

More importantly, Mr. President, the increase obligation has an even greater impact on minority and women applications. Minorities and women are well aware that the services were once white, male bastions and although they are patriotic and wish to serve the country, they are skeptical about a military career. A long obligation deters minorities, as well, from applying to the academies out of a concern that they would be irrevocably committed to something they may not like for a long period of time.

Mr. President, qualified minorities and women are highly sought after by many colleges in the country. With a 6-year obligation the service academies will not be competitive in minority recruiting. The military urgently needs to increase the number of minority officers. For example, today the U.S. military has 20 percent of African-Americans in the enlisted force and only 7 percent of African-Americans in the officer corps. Even more disturbing, the U.S. Navy has only 3 percent of African-Americans in the officer corps. Mr. President, service academies with their own preparatory schools to assist minorities, who require additional academic preparation, are the best way to increase minority officer representation. I firmly believe this. Many of you in the Senate know me to be a strong supporter of the service academy preparatory schools. In fact, that is because over 50 percent of the African-American students at the academy enter the academy through the preparatory schools. If a minority graduates from the service academy preparatory school, goes through the academy in 4 to 5 years, and has a 6-year service obligated commitment on top of his education, then that equals 12 years of military service. This is a near lifetime for a 17-year-old prospective candidate.

The different active duty obligation of service academies and ROTC programs, 6 versus 4 years, will create difficulties. First, high quality young people who would otherwise apply for the service academies will now seek entry into the ROTC or may not seek a career in the military. Second, having officers from the services' two prime commissioning sources, with different obligations, serving side-by-side in their various assignments, causes difficult morale and career management problems. Next, a longer obligation for service academy graduates than ROTC graduates conveys to ROTC officers that the military wants academy graduates more than them, causing them to become demoralized and possibly decide against making the service a career. A viable officer corps requires that the services attract career officers from all the commissioning sources. We must carefully avoid the perception that one source is favored over the others.

In summary, the 6-year obligation provides no advantages. It is a detriment in every respect. The service academies had little or no active duty obligations for over 100 years, and their graduates served the country well.

I hope my colleagues will vote for this amendment to return the academy active duty service obligation to 5 years.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time for Senator COATS.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes, 56 seconds. There are 31 seconds on the other side.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, the idea of minorities being influenced more by going from 6 to 5 years or 5 to 6 years, and making that particularly applicable to minorities, is a bit disingenuous, I submit. We have talked to the people at the Pentagon, who have indicated to us verbally—and I am sorry I did not get a letter—that there has not been any decline in minority applicants. The percentages remain about the same.

As far as being experts, that brings up the key point of this amendment. This amendment says to do the study, get the experts, do not go with anecdotal evidence, like a single letter from the head of an academy, but do an honest-to-goodness study that breaks it down into minorities and SAT scores, and all the other things needed to get good academy applicants. We will know what we are doing.

Next year I may join my friend to reduce it to 4 years to get the type people we need. But now we are saying ''ready, fire, aim.'' We are saying, ''OK, we are going to take it upon ourselves to say we will go from 6 back to 5.'' In this bill, it says we will do the study, and it is due in next April, and we are making the decision now even though the real study that gives us all the information will come later.

That just, to me, does not make any sense. What I would much prefer to do is do a study. It will let us know definitively what the problem is, if there is a problem, if we are having a problem recruiting minorities, or anybody else, and then next year, we can make a very informed decision as to whether we reduce the required time or not.

I was very disappointed in the letter that the Senator from Arizona referred to that came over from the Pentagon, because it certainly did not express what I had been told verbally from the Pentagon before as to what the situation was. It was my understanding that there was general support over there for the 6 years. Maybe I misread some of that. But let them do a study and it will be better information for the Pentagon as well as for us, also. Until we know what we are doing, let us not decide before we have the study done. That makes no sense whatsoever.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona made a mistake. He said the Senator from Indiana has

worked the hardest on this. That is not true. The Senator from Arizona has been passionately interested in maintaining top quality at the academies. Nobody cares more about attracting the kind of people we need to lead our armed services than him. That is why he is concerned, because we are not getting those people. The people who run the academies are saying one of the primary reasons we are losing people is the 6-year obligation. We are trying to defer to the wishes of those who run the academies and admit the students, and they are telling us, drop it from 6 to 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I do not take second place to anybody on this. The academies deserve to get the best students. It is not athletics, it is combat we are preparing people for. So our military deserves the very finest leadership possible.

This amendment does not say keep it at 6. It says to do the study, then decide next year. And a study is already required in this legislation. I do not have to put that in.

All I am saying with this legislation is, take the commonsense approach of getting the information before we make the decision, and do not rely just on anecdotal data. I believe all time has run out. I yield back the remainder of my time.

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. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the first vote in the voting sequence there be 4 minutes for debate, to be equally divided in the usual form between each succeeding vote, and that succeeding votes also be limited to 10 minutes each.

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

VOTE ON MOTION TO TABLE AMENDMENT NO. 2121

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN].

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment and 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 question is on agreeing to the motion to table the Harkin amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 365 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Ashcroft	Glenn	Lugar
Bennett	Gorton	Mack
Biden	Graham	McCain
Bingaman	Gramm	McConnell
Bond	Grassley	Moynihan
Bradley	Hatch	Murkowski
Breaux	Heflin	Murray
Brown	Helms	Nickles
Burns	Hutchison	Nunn
Byrd	Inhofe	Packwood
Chafee	Inouye	Robb
Coats	Jeffords	Roth
Cochran	Johnston	Santorum
Cohen	Kassebaum	Sarbanes
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Shelby
Craig	Kennedy	Simon
D'Amato	Kerrey	Simpson
Dodd	Kerry	Smith
Dole	Kohl	Specter
Domenici	Kyl	Thompson
Exon	Leahy	Thurmond
Faircloth	Levin	Warner
Ford	Lieberman	
Frist	Lott	

NAYS—26

Abraham	Dorgan	Moseley-Braun
Akaka	Feingold	Pell
Baucus	Feinstein	Pressler
Boxer	Grams	Reid
Bryan	Harkin	Rockefeller
Campbell	Hatfield	Snowe
Conrad	Hollings	Thomas
Daschle	Lautenberg	Wellstone
DeWine	Mikulski	

NOT VOTING—4

Bumpers	Pryor
Gregg	Stevens

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 2121) was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to table was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate there are two more votes in this series. Under the order, there will be 4 minutes, if necessary. Most of us were here and heard the debate. I do not see why it is necessary to have 4 minutes. Maybe somebody wants to take the 4 minutes and have 2 minutes on each side to review the amendment before the vote.

We will move to table the Levin amendment. But before we do that, I wanted to indicate that there have been a number of us here through the evening trying to determine how many more amendments will be offered by Members on this side of the aisle and on that side of the aisle so we can put together a finite list. We started off with 185 this morning. We have worked through a number of those. There are 26, I think, now in the process of being cleared, and 16 have been cleared, and there are 10 in the process. There may be additional amendments that can be cleared.

We are trying to determine whether we want to stay all night and finish this, if it is possible to finish it if we stay until 5 or 6 o'clock, or whether we can work out some agreement here and get some smaller list, stack some votes and have those votes following disposition of the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill tomorrow. There are a lot of people—probably 50, 60, or 75 relevant amendments—Republicans and Democrats who have put ''relevant.'' We do not know what the amendments are or whether they intend to be offered. We learned from one Senator who has six, he is going to offer all six. I hope he wins the prize so somebody else will not try to be 100 percent.

But, in any event, during these next two votes, if people have amendments they are going to offer, I wish they would tell Senator NUNN or Senator THURMOND so we can make some announcement following the last vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 2122

Mr. DOLE. I move to table the Levin amendment, and 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. Did the Senator yield back the time?

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. May we hear an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, there are about $770 million in a Guard and Reserve package. Literally in the last few hours of the deliberations in the committee, an earmarking of this $770 million was presented to the committee dividing it all up for particular projects. In the last 3 years the Armed Services Committee has been generic. We have done this generically so that the Guard and Reserve could do the most important modernization work. We did not divide it up line by line in the Senate Armed Services Committee. The House tries to do that each year. We have resisted that for the last 3 years.

So this really is a good amendment so that all of our States will have an opportunity to weigh in for this money.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate?

There should be order so we can hear the Senator explain the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LEVIN. My amendment is supported by Senator NUNN and others. It is very close to what the Appropriations Committee did in this area, trying to leave this generic so that all of our State Guard and Reserve units will have an opportunity to provide all of these components—the Army, Navy, and so forth—as to what the highest priorities are.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I will use 2 minutes.

Mr. President, the Senate Armed Services Committee reviewed this policy very, very carefully by a majority of votes and decided it would be the Senate of the United States that made the decision of how these funds should be expended, not simply some two-star Reserve or Guard commander. It is as simple as that. We are not about to relinquish that decision to a two-star general. There it is.

We strongly urge that the Members of the Senate back the Senate Armed Services Committee, a majority of the members of that committee, and move to table this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. PRYOR] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 366 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Abraham	Faircloth	McCain
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Baucus	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Brown	Grams	Packwood
Burns	Grassley	Pressler
Campbell	Hatch	Roth
Chafee	Hatfield	Santorum
Coats	Heflin	Shelby
Cochran	Helms	Simpson
Cohen	Hutchison	Smith
Coverdell	Inhofe	Snowe
Craig	Jeffords	Specter
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Thomas
Daschle	Kempthorne	Thompson
DeWine	Lott	Thurmond
Dole	Lugar	Warner
Domenici	Mack	

NAYS—43

Akaka	Ford	Lieberman
Biden	Glenn	Mikulski
Bingaman	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bond	Harkin	Moynihan
Boxer	Hollings	Murray
Bradley	Inouye	Nunn
Breaux	Johnston	Pell
Bryan	Kennedy	Reid
Byrd	Kerrey	Robb
Conrad	Kerry	Rockefeller
Dodd	Kohl	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Kyl	Simon
Exon	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Feingold	Leahy	
Feinstein	Levin	

NOT VOTING—4

Bumpers	Pryor
Gregg	Stevens

So, the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2123

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. There are 4 minutes of debate, evenly divided.

Who yields time?

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. I yield myself such time as may I require.

Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. In 1990, we required academy graduates to do active duty service beyond their academy years. We moved that requirement from 5 years up to 6. The bill this year requires the study of that, whether it has worked well, whether we are still getting good people or not, what the status is. And my idea was that we wait until we get the study before we go ahead and make that decision, so we will know what we are doing. We just have anecdotal information unless we do that.

What was put into the bill was that the bill reduces from 6 back to 5 without getting the study. And, to me, that is like ready, fire, aim. It puts the cart before the horse, or any other cliche you want to have in there.

I think we should have the best study we can. There is anecdotal information that varies all over the lot. Basically, the information I have is that the SAT scores for academy students across the average of all three academies for 1996, 1997, 1998 is 323 points higher than the national average. The class at the military academy had scores higher than previous classes. Some of the falloff in the number of applicants started in 1988 because of some of the downsizing of the military. We have the Air Force Academy in particular; their scores have remained very, very high. The grade point average at the end of the freshman spring semester was higher than the class of 1992–1994.

All I am proposing is that since we are not under duress in this area, since all the SAT scores appear to be back—I may lead the charge next year to reduce it to 5 or 4, if there is a problem. But let us do a definitive study and then decide. Let us not decide now to reduce the number and then get the study next spring. That is keeping things in the wrong order.

All I say is, get the study. We will decide next year. It is that simple.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, the evidence is in. We do not need another study. It was originally raised from 5 to 6 years by the Senator from Ohio without a study. But the superintendents of the three academies of West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy in Colorado have all said—they are the ones who are in charge of bringing the applicants to the academy and making sure that we have the top-flight people—they have written to us. And each have said that they support the reduction from 6 to 5.

The reason they do so is they are losing top-flight academy applicants. When they follow up with interviews of those who are accepted to the academies, the ones that do not come, and ask those individuals, ''Why didn't you come?'' More than 20 percent in two different surveys and studies conducted by the academies have said, ''The 6-year requirement is too much.''

Now, the logical question is, well, if they do not want to commit to 6 years, and we are paying for their education, they will not stay and be career officers. Just the opposite is true. To an 18-year-old trying to make a decision, a 6-year commitment on top of a 4-year academy experience seems like a long, long time. But once they go through the academy, and once they serve in the services, the vast majority of those, nearly 80 percent or more, become career soldiers, sailors, and airmen.

So I think we should listen to the superintendents. They are the ones that are in charge of getting the quality people to the academy. They are the ones that are saying, ''We need this help to recruit the top-flight candidates. Please drop this from 6 to 5.''

The committee supported that position. I hope the Senators will do that.

Mr. THURMOND. I move to table the amendment.

Mr. DOLE: I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. GLENN. Time has not run out yet. Will you withhold the tabling motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on both sides has expired.

Mr. THURMOND. I understood the time had expired.

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

If the Senator would want to make a point, he can do that.

Mr. GLENN. One additional minute for each side.

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

Mr. GLENN. The point I want to make is we spent a quarter of a million dollars on the people in the academy for the 4 years. This is not a small expenditure.

We require time for doctors who are going through training. We require additional years, I think it is 8 years or something like that, for flight training now. This is normal. This is not something unusual. If we make this big investment, we are expecting the academies to be the leaders of our military in the future. If they are not willing to make a commitment going in, I think we are shortchanging.

We do not have any information that indicates we are getting a lesser quality academy applicant these days than we were in the past. I think it is a good deal for the taxpayers. We stay at 6, not go back to 5, unless we have a study that shows otherwise.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment and 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 question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table amendment No. 2123. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 367 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Abraham	Gorton	Mikulski
Ashcroft	Gramm	Moseley-Braun
Bond	Grams	Murkowski
Brown	Grassley	Nickles
Burns	Hatch	Packwood
Chafee	Hatfield	Santorum
Coats	Heflin	Sarbanes
Cochran	Helms	Shelby
Cohen	Hutchison	Simpson
Coverdell	Inhofe	Smith
Craig	Kassebaum	Snowe
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Specter
DeWine	Kyl	Thomas
Dole	Lott	Thompson
Domenici	Lugar	Thurmond
Faircloth	Mack	Warner
Feinstein	McCain	
Frist	McConnell	

NAYS—44

Akaka	Exon	Leahy
Baucus	Feingold	Levin
Bennett	Ford	Lieberman
Biden	Glenn	Moynihan
Bingaman	Graham	Murray
Boxer	Harkin	Nunn
Bradley	Hollings	Pell
Breaux	Inouye	Pressler
Bryan	Jeffords	Reid
Byrd	Johnston	Robb
Campbell	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerrey	Roth
Daschle	Kerry	Simon
Dodd	Kohl	Wellstone
Dorgan	Lautenberg	

NOT VOTING—4

Bumpers	Pryor
Gregg	Stevens

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 2123) was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as I understand, I have been told by the minority leader there will not be any more time agreements—which I think is unfortunate—on any amendments. It will just take us longer. I assume that we can finally reach a point where we will be able to finish this.

If we can put together a list of the real amendments—we thought we had a list, and we were told it was not an accurate list. I do not know how many additional amendments have been added. Maybe we can make a reasonable judgment. Otherwise, I do not know what alternative the leader has. We are trying to complete action, and we are not given any assurance there is ever going to be any end to it—how many amendments and no time agreements.

How much time will the Senator from Pennsylvania need?

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, if I may respond, I am advised that this will be accepted. I will speak for not more than 6, 7 minutes.

Mr. DOLE. I understand the Senator from New Mexico may be prepared to offer amendments. Is he prepared to offer amendments?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me respond to the original comment made by the majority leader. We have polled our Members, and based upon conversations I have had in the last 10, 15 minutes, I would say we have somewhere between 45 and 60 amendments. Most of our members, at this point, are unwilling to agree to time agreements. The next amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is an amendment that deals with tobacco. I do not know how long that will take. We cannot agree to a 30-minute time agreement on our side. A lot of Members will want to be heard on that issue.

For that reason, I guess I am not able to provide any understanding at this point beyond what I have already shared with the majority leader about how long it will take to finish.

Mr. DOLE. We will just proceed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2081

(Purpose: To provide authority for the surrender of fugitives and the provision of judicial assistance to the international tribunals for Yugoslavia and Rwanda, in accordance with the obligations of the United States under certain resolutions of the United Nations Security Council)

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] proposes an amendment numbered 2081.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 403, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 1095. JUDICIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL FOR YUGOSLAVIA AND TO THE INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL FOR RWANDA.

(a) SURRENDER OF PERSONS.—

(1) APPLICATION OF UNITED STATES EXTRADITION LAWS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), the provisions of chapter 209 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the extradition of persons to a foreign country pursuant to a treaty or convention for extradition between the United States and a foreign government, shall apply in the same manner and extent to the surrender of persons, including United States citizens, to—

(A) the International Tribunal for Yugoslavia, pursuant to the Agreement Between the United States and the International Tribunal for Yugoslavia; and

(B) the International Tribunal for Rwanda, pursuant to the Agreement Between the United States and the International Tribunal for Rwanda.

(2) EVIDENCE ON HEARINGS.—For purposes of applying section 3190 of title 18, United States Code, in accordance with paragraph (1), the certification referred to in the section may be made by the principal diplomatic or consular officer of the United States resident in such foreign countries where the International Tribunal for Yugoslavia or the International Tribunal for Rwanda may be permanently or temporarily situated.

(3) PAYMENT OF FEES AND COSTS.—(A) The provisions of the Agreement Between the United States and the International Tribunal for Yugoslavia and of the Agreement Between the United States and the International Tribunal for Rwanda shall apply in lieu of the provisions of section 3195 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the payment of expenses arising from the surrender by the United States of a person to the International Tribunal for Yugoslavia or the International Tribunal for Rwanda, respectively, or from any proceedings in the United States relating to such surrender.

(B) The authority of subparagraph (A) may be exercised only to the extent and in the amounts provided in advance in appropriations Act.

(4) NONAPPLICABILITY OF THE FEDERAL RULES.—The Federal Rules of Evidence and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure do not apply to proceedings for the surrender of persons to the International Tribunal for Yugoslavia or the International Tribunal for Rwanda.

(b) ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN AND INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNALS AND TO LITIGANTS BEFORE SUCH TRIBUNALS.— Section 1782(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting in the first sentence after ''foreign or international tribunal'' the following: '', including criminal investigations conducted prior to formal accusation''.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL FOR YUGOSLAVIA.—The term ''International Tribunal for Yugoslavia'' means the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia, as established by United Nations Security Council Resolution 827 of May 25, 1993.

(2) INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL FOR RWANDA.—The term ''International Tribunal for Rwanda'' means the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighboring States, as established by United Nations Security Council Resolution 955 of November 8, 1994.

(3) AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL FOR YUGOSLAVIA.—The term ''Agreement Between the United States and the International Tribunal for Yugoslavia'' means the Agreement on Surrender of Persons Between the Government of the United States and the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of

International Law in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia, signed at The Hague, October 5, 1994.

(4) AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL FOR RWANDA.—The term ''Agreement between the United States and the International Tribunal for Rwanda'' means the Agreement on Surrender of Persons Between the Government of the United States and the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighboring States, signed at The Hague, January 24, 1995.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, as I had stated a few moments ago, it is my understanding that this amendment has been cleared on both sides. It is an important amendment. It is to provide authority for the surrender of fugitives and the provision of judicial assistance to the International Tribunals for Yugoslavia and Rwanda, in accordance with the obligations of the United States under certain resolutions of the United Nations Security Council.

Mr. President, as it is well known, there has been considerable debate in this Chamber and in the House of Representatives on the atrocities in Bosnia, and the actions there leading this body and the House to call for the unilateral lifting of the arms embargo. And while there is some substantial controversy as to what ought to be done on that subject, with the disagreement with the President and prospective veto and possible override effort, there is unanimity that the action of the International Criminal Tribunals for Yugoslavia, and also by implication for Rwanda, is something which really ought to be carried out in an efficient and rigorous and really tough manner.

Mr. President, the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, we have seen extraordinary atrocities in Bosnia, with the ethnic cleansing, the summary executions, the tortures, massive and systematic rape, attacks on medical and relief personnel, and the estimates show that some 200,000 people, mostly Bosnian Moslems, have been killed or are missing; 2.2 million are refugees, and another 1.8 million have been displaced in Bosnia.

We have seen the photographs of young women in their teens and early twenties hanging themselves by the trees in the Bosnian forest because they prefer suicide to facing the Bosnian Serbs. We have heard reports verified about the Bosnian Serbs entering the U.N. safe havens and taking 11-year-old boys, slicing their throats and leaving them in large mounds on the streets in an effort to stop the next generation of Bosnian Moslems looking ahead. It is just an extraordinary and horrible situation.

I personally have pushed, in the course of the past decade, resolutions to establish a general International Criminal Court which I think ought to be done. It ought to be done on international drug trafficking and on terrorism, where we have situations where nations will not extradite to the United States. Colombia is an example. If we had an international criminal court, we could have extradition.

This is a subject that I have worked on for many years as District Attorney of Philadelphia on a microcosm as to what I submit ought to be done internationally. But we have had the United Nations resolutions which have provided for International Criminal Tribunals for Yugoslavia and Rwanda.

With respect to the atrocities in Rwanda, this amendment would provide authority for fugitives to be surrendered, because we have no current extradition treaties with the International Court, and would provide authority for the United States to turn over evidence to the International Criminal Court.

The circumstances here are really extraordinary, Mr. President. Our colleague, Senator KOHL, recently repeated a saying that the loss of a single life is a tragedy, while the loss of 1,000 lives is a statistic. Regrettably, we are treating the atrocities in Bosnia and Rwanda as statistics, without really focusing on the individual tragedies.

There will be a hearing next Wednesday jointly by the Foreign Relations Committee and by the Senate Intelligence Committee to shed some additional light on the atrocities in Bosnia.

I submit this is a very important amendment, Mr. President. We need to get it enacted so we will have the authority to extradite these fugitives to the International Criminal Court and turn over the important evidence.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THURMOND. On this side of the aisle we are willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. NUNN. We are willing to accept the amendment on this side. If the Senator from Pennsylvania could enlighten us, I understand this is similar to the administration's legislation they have been seeking.

Mr. SPECTER. This is legislation which the administration is seeking, if I may respond.

Mr. NUNN. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. I recommend this be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further question, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2081) was agreed to.

Mr. SPECTER. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. If I could have the attention of the managers, I understand it is in order for me to submit my landmine amendment with a 10-minute time agreement equally divided.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the Senator is correct, but I wish to note that I will vigorously oppose the amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2124

(Purpose: To support proposals to implement the United States' goal of eventually eliminating antipersonnel landmines; to impose a moratorium on use of antipersonnel landmines except in limited circumstances; and to urge imposition of certain sanctions against foreign governments that export antipersonnel landmines)

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself, Senators LUGAR, GRAHAM of Florida, KASSEBAUM, SIMON, INOUYE, JEFFORDS, REID, HATFIELD, FORD, HARKIN, SARBANES, FEINGOLD, KOHL, LAUTENBERG, DODD, KERRY, BRADLEY, MOSELEY-BRAUN, BUMPERS, KENNEDY, BOXER, PELL, CHAFEE, DORGAN, MIKULSKI, WELLSTONE, DASCHLE, MURRAY, SIMPSON, BRYAN, MOYNIHAN, KERREY, FEINSTEIN, AKAKA, CONRAD, JOHNSTON, PRYOR, BREAUX, EXON, CAMPBELL, ROBB, ROCKEFELLER, LIEBERMAN, LEVIN, BYRD, GORTON, SPECTER, MCCONNELL, BINGAMAN, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. SIMON, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. REID, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. FORD, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. DODD, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BRADLEY, Ms. MOSLEY-BRAUN, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. PELL, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. DORGAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DASCHLE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. KERREY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. EXON, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GORTON, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. BINGAMAN propose an amendment numbered 2124.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . LANDMINE USE MORATORIUM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On September 26, 1994, the President declared that it is a goal of the United States to eventually eliminate antipersonnel landmines.

(2) On December 15, 1994, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution sponsored by the United States which called for international efforts to eliminate antipersonnel landmines.

(3) According to the Department of State, there are an estimated 80,000,000 to 110,000,000 unexploded landmines in 62 countries.

(4) Antipersonnel landmines are routinely used against civilian populations and kill and maim an estimated 70 people each day, or 26,000 people each year.

(5) The Secretary of State has noted that landmines are ''slow-motion weapons of mass destruction''.

(6) There are hundreds of varieties of antipersonnel landmines, from a simple type available at a cost of only two dollars to the more complex self-destructing type, and all landmines of whatever variety kill and maim civilians, as well as combatants, indiscriminately.

(b) CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS CONVENTION REVIEW.—It is the sense of Congress that, at the United Nations conference to review the 1980 Conventional Weapons Convention, including Protocol II on landmines, that is to be held from September 25 to October 13, 1995, the President should actively support proposals to modify Protocol II that would implement as rapidly as possible the United States goal of eventually eliminating antipersonnel landmines.

(c) MORATORIUM ON USE OF ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINES.—

(1) UNITED STATES MORATORIUM.—(A) For a period of one year beginning three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States shall not use antipersonnel landmines except along internationally recognized national borders or in demilitarized zones within a perimeter marked area that is monitored by military personnel and protected by adequate means to ensure the exclusion of civilians.

(B) If the President determines, before the end of the period of the United States moratorium under subparagraph (A), that the governments of other nations are implementing moratoria on use of antipersonnel landmines similar to the United States moratorium, the President may extend the period of the United States moratorium for such additional period as the President considers appropriate.

(2) OTHER NATIONS.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should actively encourage the governments of other nations to join the United States in solving the global landmine crisis by implementing moratoria on use of antipersonnel landmines similar to the United States moratorium as a step toward the elimination of antipersonnel landmines.

(d) ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINE EXPORTS.—It is the sense of Congress that, consistent with the United States moratorium on exports of antipersonnel landmines and in order to further discourage the global proliferation of antipersonnel landmines, the United States Government should not sell, license for export, or otherwise transfer defense articles and services to any foreign government which, as determined by the President, sells, exports, or otherwise transfers antipersonnel landmines.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—

For purposes of this Act:

(1) ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINE.—The term ''antipersonnel landmine'' means any munition placed under, on, or near the ground or other surface area, delivered by artillery, rocket, mortar, or similar means, or dropped from an aircraft and which is designed, constructed, or adapted to be detonated or exploded by the presence, proximity, or contact of a person.

(2) 1980 CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS CONVENTION.—The term ''1980 Conventional Weapons Convention'' means the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed To Be Excessively Injurious or To Have Indiscriminate Effects, together with the protocols relating thereto, done at Geneva on October 10, 1980.

Mr. LEAHY. I understand there are 5 minutes to a side with no second-degree amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, there are few issues that I have ever felt more strongly about than the cruel devastation of whole societies by landmines. They are the worst of human depravity, a coward's weapon. At $2 or $3 dollars each, landmines like this one I am holding are sold by the hundreds of thousands and even millions.

There are 100 million unexploded landmines in over 60 countries. Armies leave, tanks withdraw, guns are unloaded, cannons are destroyed, the fighting ends, people even forget what the fighting was about, but the landmines stay, sometimes for decades.

In one country, they describe clearing the landmines an arm and a leg at a time. The children are often the innocent civilians. Every 22 minutes, somebody is horribly maimed or killed.

Mr. President, I hope this amendment is adopted overwhelmingly by this body to send a message to the world, so the United States can take the moral leadership as we did 3 years ago, as we did in the United Nations this past fall.

My opponents will say my amendment will endanger our troops—the same argument that was made against the chemical weapons ban.

Mr. President, our troops and civilians everywhere have far more to gain by what we do here.

Landmines are a weapon of choice in the very countries where our troops are likely to be sent in the future. A $2 mine can blow the legs off an American soldier as easily as it can pulverize a child.

Mr. President, let me repeat. This is not a prohibition, it is a moratorium that does not begin for 3 years. It does not cover Claymore mines. It does not cover antitank mines. Our troops have every weapon that shoots or explodes. We have far better ways of tracking the enemy than ever before. We have the most accurate weapons.

We are dealing with a global catastrophe. People everywhere are demanding an end to this madness. The U.S. Senate has led the way. We should continue to lead. This is not a weapon we need for our national security. It is a terrorist weapon used most often against the innocent.

I ask unanimous consent that several documents related to this matter be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL
DEVELOPMENT AND WORLD PEACE,
Washington, DC, August 3, 1995.

DEAR SENATOR: We understand that the landmine issue will soon be before the Senate. As you know, at our General Meeting in June, the Catholic Bishops of the United States approved unanimously a pastoral reflection entitled Sowing Weapons of War: A Pastoral Reflection on the Arms Trade and Landmines. In it, the U.S. Bishops joined Pope John Paul II and bishops from around the world in calling for an end to the manufacture and use of anti-personnel landmines.

Two months ago, the Holy Father stated, ''I should once again like to make a vigorous appeal for the definitive cessation of the manufacture and use of * * * 'anti-personnel mines'.'' The 100 million landmines that are strewn around the world kill an estimated 500 people per week, most of whom are civilians. Landmines cannot differeniate between civilian and soldier or between periods of peace and war. From Cambodia to Angola, they render large areas uninhabitable, prevent refugees from returning home, inhibit post-war reconstruction and development, and remain a long-term threat to innocent life.

The bishops welcome the current U.S. moratorium on exports of anti-personnel landmines and urge the United States to take steps ''to further retrict its own use of landmines, while it pursues with urgency and persistence international agreements to restrict use globally.'' The Landmine Use Moratorium Act (S. 940) would contribute to this goal by prohibiting U.S. military exports to countries that continue to export landmines and by imposing a one-year moratorium on use by the United States of anti-personnel landmines, except along international borders in monitored minefields. These measures are a reasonable response to a serious problem that affects millions of lives around the world.

We urge you to support Sen. Leahy's measure and to oppose any amendments or substitutes that would weaken it.

Sincerely,

Most Reverend DANIEL P. REILLY,
Bishop of Worcester,
Chairman, Committee on International Policy.

LAND-MINE BAN WOES

In 1994, about 100,000 land mines were removed from former war zones at a cost of $70 million. At the same time, another 2 million mines were deployed elsewhere.

These and other sobering, frustrating statistics came out of a three-day international conference in Geneva last week on mine-clearing.

The daunting prospect of new mines being sown at a rate 20 times faster than they can be removed is matched by the apparently futile attempts to ban the sale and manufacture of these inexpensive weapons.

There is some momentum to enact an international ban, with 25 nations adopting moratoriums on mine exports and three—Mexico, Sweden and Belgium—calling for comprehensive bans on their sale and manufacture. But in Geneva, it was concluded that banning land mines must be a long-term goal.

Despite the clear evidence that these weapons often can serve as everlasting and deadly vestiges of wars long resolved, some countries demand the right to keep them in their inventories.

The nations that want to have land mines in their inventories typically are not the same 64 countries where collectively 100 million land mines kill or maim 500 persons each week. If they were, perhaps a comprehensive ban would not be so elusive.

SANITY MAY TAKE ROOT IN LAND MINE DEBATE

Far too many of us still see the hurt and disbelief in the eyes of someone who has just been hit by a land mine. The eyes that still bore into my mind are those of a little Vietnamese girl who set off a mine while washing clothes on the bank of the Perfume River in Hue in 1990—a full 15 years after the war was supposed to be over for her and everyone else.

The girl lay in a hospital bed in Hue with bandages over most of her body. Her mother was attending her because of the shortage of nurses. The mother looked up from her bedside chair and asked me through a translator why the ''booms'' were still going off. Her daughter just stared at me in searing silence.

I had no answer then, but have something hopeful to say now. The U.S. Senate, perhaps this week but certainly this summer, will confront the scourge that maims or kills somebody in the world every 22 minutes. As many as half of the victims are children like the one I saw in Hue.

Soldiers know how to detect and disarm mines. Children don't. Sowing mines is like poisoning village wells: The soldiers on both sides realize the danger, drink from their canteens and move on. Not so with the villagers.

Sen. Patrick J. Leahy, D–Vt., and more than 40 Senate co-sponsors have drafted legislation that would declare a one-year moratorium on sowing mines on battlefields, starting three years from now. Claymore mines, which infantrymen spread around their positions at night and use in ambushes, would be excluded from the experimental, one-year ban. So would anti-tank mines. Also, international borders, like the demilitarized zone between North and South Korea, could still be sown with mines.

The Leahy proposal is but a short step toward the goal of inspiring an international agreement to ban land mines the way the nations managed to ban the use of poison gas and dum-dum bullets. But it is a symbolic step. It will at least force the Congress, the military and the public to confront this uncontrolled sowing of poison seeds.

In the Senate, Leahy plans to tack the moratorium legislation onto another bill on the floor, perhaps the defense authorization bill.

In the House, Rep. Lane Evans, D–Ill., a Marine grunt from 1969 to 1971, is pushing a similar measure but has not decided when to push for a vote. The hawkier House—which seems determined to give the military almost anything it wants—almost certainly will reject the amendment until the Joint Chiefs of Staff say they favor it.

This hasn't happened despite expert testimony that it would do the U.S. military more good than harm if land mines were banned. No less a soldier than Gen. Alfred Gray Jr., former Marine Corps commandant, has said:

''We kill more Americans with our mines than we do anybody else. We never killed many enemy with mines—. . . What the hell is the use of sowing all this [airborne scatterable mines] if you're going to move through it next week or next month . . . I'm not aware of any operational advantage from broad deployment of mines.''

Leahy warns that ''vast areas of many countries have become deathtraps'' because 62 countries have sown between 80 million and 110 million land mines on their land. ''Every day 70 people are maimed or killed by land mines. Most of them are not combatants. They are civilians going about their daily lives.''

Yet mines are so cheap—costing as little as $2—that small armies all over the world are turning to them as the poor man's equalizer. American forces increasingly are being sent to these developing areas and would be safer if land mines were banned.

''The $2 or $3 anti-personnel mine hidden under a layer of sand or dust can blow the leg off the best-trained, best-equipped American soldier,'' Leahy notes.

At the United Nations last year, President Clinton called on the world to stop using land mines. He could weigh in heavily on the side of the one-year moratorium and push the chiefs in that direction. But don't count on it. He seems determined during his reelection drive not to offend the military and its conservative champions.

Belgium and Norway this year forbade the production, export or use of land mines. Leahy and Evans hope the upcoming debate will create a climate for a similar stand by the United States. Lest you conclude the land mine moratorium is being pushed by peacenik lawmakers, note that among the senators supporting it are decorated war veterans Daniel K. Inouye, D–Hawaii, J. Robert Kerrey, D–Neb., John F. Kerry, D–Mass., and Charles S. Robb, D–Va.

The case for the Leahy-Evans moratorium is overwhelming. Even so, Congress probably will lose its nerve and refuse to enact the moratorium this year. But I think I could tell that little girl in Hue, if she lived through her maiming, that reason is beginning to assert itself. Man is beginning to see the folly of fouling his own nest with mines. There is at least a dim light at the end of the tunnel.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I lend my strong support to Senator LEAHY's amendment to push for the eventual elimination of antipersonnel landmines. Senator LEAHY has been a longtime champion of this cause, and I admire his perseverance and hard work.

Landmines, which have been used in warfare for more than 200 years, are cheap, insidious, silent predators that continue to kill long after the cessation of conflict. Worldwide, 26,000 people are killed annually by landmines.

Landmines hold hostage the people, the land, and the economies of those countries in which they are used. At the end of conflicts, often the most immediate need is to return and reintegrate refugee populations. Landmines inhibit the travel of refugee populations. They inhibit the travel of relief and assistance organizations. They reduce the amount of land available to be inhabited by returning refugees. They kill and maim that population upon their return. Upon resettlement, landmines will inhibit the population from earning a living for many years to come.

As Americans, we believe that the cost of transitioning from conflict to peace is greater than the cost of continued conflict. Landmines multiply the cost of the transition from conflict to peace, straining the limited resources of both the country in question and the international donor communities. Moreover, uncleared landmines jeopardize new, always fragile, peace agreements by extending the causes of conflict—poverty, hunger, and despair.

The proliferation of landmines are an obstacle to economic development and political stability. Landmines prevent farmers from tilling the land—they undermine food security and create famine. They destroy the agricultural industry of a country.

Landmines undermine the national infrastructure and impede national development. They isolate transportation networks, powerlines, bridges, and waterways from reconstruction, repair, and maintenance. The quality of national infrastructure either supports or impedes economic activity and development. When railways and roadways are disrupted, the end result is heavy inflationary pressure on the currency because the costs of transporting goods and services always rises. It only takes a few landmines to render a roadway impassable. People will not choose to travel a road that is known to be mined.

Landmines create health care and other costs that strain the national budgets of developing countries. The maimed victims of landmines require medical treatment, physical rehabilitation, artificial limbs and prosthetics, and vocational training. Reduced worker productivity, additional expenditures for mine awareness training and demining activities are all financial burdens on countries attempting to recover from the ravages of war.

The sheer cost of removing landmines can be an insurmountable obstacle to economic growth. In Cambodia, the United Nations estimates that the aggregate cost of landmine clearance is from $200 to $1,000 per mine. Cambodia's annual per capita GDP is $200. To demine Cambodia would consume every penny produced in that economy for 1 to 5 years.

As you know, the continent of Africa presents some of the greatest challenges for sustainable development on the globe. Africa, a continent that has seen far too much of its share of disasters, must contend with the disasters of landmines every day:

Angola: With a population of 13 million, Angola has between 9 and 15 million landmines—about one for every man, woman and child in the country. There are between 150 and 200 landmine victims every week. Angola has more amputees per capita than any other country in the world.

Mozambique: The United Nations reports that all 28 major road systems in the country are blocked by uncleared landmines. Mozambique has about 1 million uncleared landmines.

Ethiopia: Has about 500,000 landmines and even more pieces of unexploded ordnance.

Liberia: After 5 years of civil war, Liberia is estimated to have 1,000 mines.

Rwanda: Has about 50,000 landmines that were implanted during their civil war.

Sudan: Has about 1 million landmines as of 1993. That number is expected to have grown and to continue to grow as the conflict continues.

Zimbabwe: Though the civil war in Zimbabwe ended over a decade ago, there remain areas that are not authorized for settlement due to the presence of uncleared landmines.

In addition to the social and developmental consequences of landmines I have mentioned, the basic fact about landmines is that they kill—easily and indiscriminately. I urge support for the Leahy landmine amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. I withhold the balance of my time.

Mr. THURMOND. I yield such time as the Senator from Virginia may require.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, there is no Senator that would not like to see this weapon removed. But where do you start in the series of weapons? Where do you start and where do you end?

Military history shows that whenever we move into an area—and mind you, in most instances, our troops must deploy forward, often into unknown country, against an adversary who is in place—if we were to agree to an international conference such as this, the enemy would know exactly where the mines would go, and we would lose an advantage.

Furthermore, when we deploy into an area, we, in number are less in many instances than the adversary who is in place. We need to have an advantage. We need to seal off what is known in military parlance as ''avenues of approach'' and do it very quickly, if necessary, by air, to drop landmines and other ordinances to seal off an avenue of reproach.

This would stop that. We are tying our hands. Therefore, we simply can not, with due respect to my distinguished colleague, agree to this amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the last thing I want to do in war is tie our hands, but that is not the issue. We are the most powerful nation history has ever known. This amendment allows us to use antitank mines. It allows us to use claymore mines, to use mines along borders and in demilitarized zones. It simply says let us take a step so we and other countries can get rid of these hidden killers.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, the people who are a danger are the agronomists from the University of Virginia or the doctors from the University of Vermont or the missionaries from Tennessee or any other State who try to go to these 60 countries that are infested with mines. They are the ones, they are the ones in danger.

It is usually the civilians who suffer. Face it, is somebody going to march across the Canadian border against the United States or across the Mexican border? It is the child walking down the jungle path who loses a leg. They are who clear landmines an arm and a leg at a time. It is the people in Chechnya who die from them. It is the Afghans, a million and a half of whom are on the border of Pakistan, because they cannot go back to their own country. It is the 100 million landmines that make it impossible for countries to develop. It is the landmines that the president of the International Red Cross speaks about.

It is the landmines that the Pope and the American bishops and so many others are opposed to. What I am asking is that we take a small step, a small step.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the landmines currently employed by the U.S. forces have a self-destruct mechanism, which means after a period of time, which can be fixed, they self-destruct and are no longer harmful to anyone.

That is as far as we can go, I say to my good friend from Vermont. That is as far as we can go.

I yield such time as the Senator desires.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, how much time remains? I would like to ask a couple of questions, if I could.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes and 45 seconds.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, could I ask my friend from Vermont, I think all of us agree with the purpose and motive, what he is trying to do here. But I have two or three questions.

Do we already have a prohibition on export that is in the law that the Senator from Vermont sponsored? Do we not have that in the law so the United States does not export any?

Mr. LEAHY. Not a prohibition, we have a moratorium, as do over 20 other countries.

Mr. NUNN. If I could just ask, we do have a moratorium on export?

Mr. LEAHY. Yes.

Mr. NUNN. The Leahy amendment, once it goes into effect, would it preclude the allied forces, United States and Korean forces, having any mines in the DMZ in Korea?

Mr. LEAHY. No, in fact it specifically permits the use of mines in demilitarized zones.

Mr. NUNN. Because of the international border?

Mr. LEAHY. It refers to demilitarized zones.

Mr. NUNN. Now, what if we were in Somalia? At night we used mines around the bases in Somalia to protect our troops. Would that be barred?

Mr. LEAHY. Claymore mines would be used for that, and they are permitted. There is an exception for them by definition.

Mr. NUNN. Claymore mines are excepted. We have mines around Guantanamo Bay, would that be excepted?

Mr. LEAHY. That would be excepted. It is also in a border area that is marked and guarded.

Mr. NUNN. My counsel says those are not exceptions. Your counsel says they are.

I hope this legislative record will help clarify that.

The Senator is saying the DMZ would be excepted, and Guantanamo Bay would be excepted?

Mr. LEAHY. Claymores and antitank mines would be excepted under any circumstances, anywhere, whether on such a border or not.

Mr. NUNN. When we were in the Persian Gulf war and we had an exposed right flank, we laid down a considerable number of mines to prevent the Iraqis from hitting our exposed right flank. Would that be precluded under the Leahy amendment?

Mr. LEAHY. Antitank mines are excepted.

Mr. NUNN. What about antipersonnel?

Mr. LEAHY. Antipersonnel mines would not be.

Mr. NUNN. Antitank mines are excepted but antipersonnel mines are not?

Mr. LEAHY. That is correct.

Mr. NUNN. Could the Senator tell us the difference between a claymore mine and any other?

Mr. LEAHY. A claymore mine is one where you make the determination whether it goes off. You trigger it with a triggering device.

Mr. NUNN. My counsel says that is not excepted in this amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. By the definition, I am told by counsel, by the definition it is excepted.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, there is considerable confusion about this amendment. Whatever happens on this vote, I think we are going to have to do some work on it in conference, if it passes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time has expired.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 3 minutes to be given to each side for purposes of debate.

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

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, let me read to the Senate exactly what our distinguished colleague has in his amendment.

> The United States moratorium. For a period of one year, beginning three years after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States shall not use antipersonnel landmines except along internationally recognized national borders or in demilitarized zones within a perimeter marked area that is monitored by military personnel and protected by adequate means to ensure the exclusion of civilians.

Mr. President, with no disrespect for my colleague, it is simply impossible to go to war under these rules. We are asking our young men and women to take risks which are just not fair to them as individuals. It says nothing about the other forces, be it the enemy or such allies as we may have working with us.

I say to my distinguished colleague, I do not think this amendment has been well thought through. We all recognize and join in our desire to stop this type of weaponry throughout the world, but this simply will not do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this is indeed a well thought out amendment. It is an issue we have spent years working on. There have been debates here. There have been debates at the United Nations. The President of the United States has called for the eventual elimination of antipersonnel landmines. The United States has joined with other nations, virtually all other nations, in calling for that.

We cannot pass laws and tell other countries what to do, but we can say that we will start to limit our use of antipersonnel landmines, to challenge other countries to do the same.

It is not a question of putting our young people at risk in war. It is a question of trying to protect our young people today. Today we have far more of our people in danger of being killed or maimed by the proliferation of landmines in parts of the world where we send peacekeepers, where we send medical personnel, where we send USAID

people. Can anybody imagine what it is going to be like in the former Yugoslavia, if the fighting ever stops and we have to go in and help clean up well over a million landmines?

Even with the millions that were strewn in the Persian Gulf war, that was not what won that war. Most were Iraqi mines. But in the aftermath we saw Kuwait, a wealthy country, spend $1 billion to try to clear a portion of the landmines there, and 85 people died doing it—after the fighting. Not during it, but after the fighting, from clearing landmines.

As one who testified before the Senate, a relief worker from Colorado, said, when a landmine went off under his Jeep he sat there with his foot in his hand, trying to put it back on.

Those are the people damaged. This amendment permits 3 years, as we told the Pentagon to do, to develop alternatives to landmines.

Mr. NUNN. Will the Senator yield for a brief question? I think it is important. I think the Senator will agree the mines he was talking about that the Kuwaitis cleared were not the United States mines, they were the ones laid by the Iraqis. Is that not correct?

Mr. LEAHY. That is correct.

Mr. NUNN. The U.S. mines were the ones that self-destructed.

Mr. LEAHY. No, there were mines of ours, too.

Mr. NUNN. But those mines did not cause the Kuwaitis any problem because they self-destructed.

Mr. LEAHY. I am told by the Pentagon, and you would have access to, at least, the same numbers, at least 1,700 of the self-destruct mines never detonated. We can put down 100,000 self-destruct mines and have at least 90 percent of them work and you still have about 10,000 that do not.

We have exceptions for some mines. We have 3 years to develop alternatives, as the Pentagon says it is doing. During those 3 years, if they are unable to, I will be happy to join with my colleagues, I will be here during those 3 years, to talk about other methods.

The fact of the matter is, one of the reasons why virtually every editorial writer from the left to the right, why virtually every human rights group, every church group, every medical group, veterans and others, have called for passage of this, is because they know the threat exists, not during the battle, the threat exists for decades afterwards.

Mr. President, how much time is left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 57 seconds. The Senator from South Carolina, 1½ minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Let us go ahead and vote.

Mr. WARNER. I yield back the time.

Mr. LEAHY. I yield back the time.

Mr. President, 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. There being no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment, No. 2124.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], the Senator from New Hampshire, [Mr. GREGG], the Senator from Indiana, [Mr. LUGAR], and the Senator from Alaska, [Mr. STEVENS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced, yeas 67, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 368 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Abraham	Exon	McConnell
Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Baucus	Feinstein	Moseley-Braun
Bennett	Ford	Moynihan
Biden	Glenn	Murray
Bingaman	Gorton	Nickles
Boxer	Graham	Packwood
Bradley	Grassley	Pell
Breaux	Harkin	Reid
Bryan	Hatch	Robb
Burns	Hatfield	Rockefeller
Byrd	Inouye	Roth
Chafee	Jeffords	Santorum
Coats	Johnston	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kassebaum	Shelby
Conrad	Kennedy	Simon
Coverdell	Kerrey	Simpson
D'Amato	Kerry	Snowe
Daschle	Kohl	Specter
Dodd	Lautenberg	Thompson
Dole	Leahy	Wellstone
Domenici	Levin	
Dorgan	Lieberman	

NAYS—27

Ashcroft	Grams	Mack
Bond	Heflin	McCain
Brown	Helms	Murkowski
Cochran	Hollings	Nunn
Craig	Hutchison	Pressler
DeWine	Inhofe	Smith
Faircloth	Kempthorne	Thomas
Frist	Kyl	Thurmond
Gramm	Lott	Warner

NOT VOTING—6

Bumpers	Gregg	Pryor
Campbell	Lugar	Stevens

So, the Amendment (No. 2124) was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

USUHS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, there is an issue relating to the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences which I would like to raise with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN].

As the Senator knows, I have advocated closing down the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences because I feel there are more cost-effective means of supplying our military with physicians. I have introduced legislation to close the school both in the 103rd Congress and in the 104th Congress.

This Administration, and previous administrations, have advocated closing USUHS and legislation has passed in the other body to accomplish this purpose.

During last year's consideration of the fiscal year 1995 Defense Authorization bill, I was prepared to offer an amendment, based on the legislation I have introduced, that would have phased-down USUHS. However, as the Senator from Georgia recalls, pursuant to an agreement with the distinguished Senator, as well as the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], I instead agreed to a provision directing the General Accounting Office to review certain aspects of USUHS, and to report back by June 1, 1995, in time for this coming fiscal year's cycle of Defense authorization and appropriation bills.

As the Senator knows, the GAO did not complete its work by the statutory deadline, and the resulting delay means that the USUHS study will not be finished in time for floor consideration of the fiscal year 1996 Defense Authorization bill.

Even though I am satisfied that there are more cost-effective alternatives to USUHS for our military's physicians, given the agreement we made last year, and the subsequent delay in the GAO's work, I am withholding offering an amendment with respect to the medical school at this time.

However, I want to make it very clear that I believe it is critical that this issue be confronted by the Congress in the very near future. Given the pressure to achieve a balanced budget, programs like USUHS are increasingly difficult to justify. Year after year, USUHS appears on target lists for elimination for this very reason.

In light of the fact that the GAO report is expected to be presented next month, there will be additional opportunities to revisit this issue before the end of the session. I hope the committee will joint me in pressing GAO to make sure there is no further delay in completion of its assignment.

Mr. NUNN. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his comments on this matter. I know he has had concerns about the cost-effectiveness of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, and I understand his frustration with the delay in the GAO's review of the school.

I also want to thank the Senator for approaching this issue in a straightforward and thorough manner. I think it is appropriate for this body to have the benefit of the GAO's work before acting on the school, and I appreciate the Senator from Wisconsin's willingness to wait for that anaylsis.

I assure the Senator that I fully support his resolve to have GAO complete its report at the earliest possible time so that the Congress can have the benefit of its input during this session, as

contemplated in the agreement relating to the Senator from Wisconsin's amendment regarding USUHS.

NEED FOR A CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE ON NATIONAL SECURITY REQUIREMENTS IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to talk about my view of the role of Congress in shaping the debate on our future national security.

The Congress is accustomed to dealing with national defense policy and funding in the context of annual authorization and appropriations bills, and in the process, we often lose sight of the framework in which our deliberations play such an important part. Today, because of the great volatility and complexity of relations among nations, it is imperative that we broaden our focus to reassess the role of the United States and its military forces in the world in the next century.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, it was clear that a reassessment of U.S. national security strategy and military forces was needed. The Bush Administration undertook a preliminary reassessment of our strategy and proposed the first wave of reductions in military force levels, termed the new base force. Then, in 1993, Secretary of Defense Les Aspin attempted to initiate and innovative and much-needed analysis of our military force structure in light of the changes brought about by the end of the cold war.

The concept of the Bottom Up Review [BUR] was excellent; unfortunately, the result was not as innovative as many had hoped. What was advertised as a critical review and reshaping of a new military force instead became just another top down review, unduly limited by fiscal constraints and bureaucratic inertia. It became largely an exercise in defending existing force levels and composition within established levels for future defense budgets, rather than a new approach to military strategy and requirements in a changed world. To complicate matters further, independent assessments of the cost of the BUR force show that it exceeds the funding levels in the Future Years Defense Program [FYDP] by $42 to $488 billion.

What is needed today is another attempt at conducting a bottom up review, but this time, we must not artificially and arbitrarily limit the scope of the study. We certainly cannot ignore the fiscal realities of our debt-ridden Federal Government, but we would be foolish to predetermine the defense budgets of the future in conducting this analysis. Instead, we should follow a logical thought process, starting with an analysis of potential threats, formulation of a strategy to deal with those threats, and a determination of force structure requirements, which should then drive resource allocation decisions.

I should note the significant work already undertaken in this area by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). Earlier this year, CSIS published a document entitled ''Defense in the Late 1990s: Avoiding the Train Wreck'', which concluded as follows:

> . . . there is a profound crisis in security planning and the near certainty of a defense ''train wreck'' should the U.S. defense program continue on its present course, that is, inadequate funding of a force too large for the limited objectives for which the administration seeks to employ military power.

The report states that insufficient defense budget levels combined with a flawed foreign policy approach have isolated the United States from its allies and friends.

As a nation, we face the challenge of defining the role of the United States in a world of continually shifting alliances and relationships. We face the challenge of moving beyond tactics and philosophies developed painstakingly to counter the apocalyptic threats of cold war adversaries. We face the challenge of planning for future threats in a world where the only constant is uncertainty. Finally, we face the challenge of sustaining or, in the view of some, regaining the courage to lead.

The Congress has an important oversight role in this process, well beyond the familiar but narrow choices between funding one program or another with the limited resources available for defense. We should begin to think about these ''big picture'' issues—identifying potential future threats, developing a national security strategy to address them, and building the right mix of forces to implement that strategy.

Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to outline very briefly some important points to consider as we study the issue of our national security posture in the 21st century.

The threats of the future fall into four general categories: the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them, the rise of radical Islamic fundamentalism, and the increase in regional and ethnic conflicts. Another area of concern is electronic and information warfare, where the potential for disrupting global communications and world trade could rest in the hands of one individual.

Clearly, these potential threats are more diverse, less deterrable through conventional means, and less easily defeated. Our potential adversaries are less easily identified, as are our allies. We have seen over the past decade that the adversary of today may become the ally of tomorrow. This uncertainty requires a national strategy that broadly encompasses our national interests and goals, yet is quickly adaptable to changes in the threats to facilitate early and effective action to defuse any potential crisis.

Finally, our military must be designed as a ''cache of capabilities'' from which an appropriate response to any threat to our security can be formulated. An appropriate response is one designed to affect the outcome of a situation in a manner favorable to our national interests and objectives. An appropriate response need not always entail the deployment of U.S. military personnel. Instead, an appropriate response might be as simple as redirecting overhead reconnaissance assets, providing precision-guided munitions and targeting data, selected intelligence-sharing, or providing military planning assistance.

Selectively and correctly utilizing our unique capabilities and talents may allow us to leverage the outcome of a conflict, without requiring the commitment of American lives and capital in an ongoing crisis. Acquiring the specialized capabilties—the tools—that would permit this type of selective response will allow our leaders to create and deploy a trained and equipped force, when necessary, or to tailor a lesser commitment of U.S. technological expertise to effectively defend against any threat scenario and to respond to any potential type of crisis.

To this end, I suggest a series of questions which must be answered if we are to plan properly the force of the future.

Two Major Regional Contingencies (MRCs) versus New World Disorder. Is the BUR force too rigidly structured for the two-MRC scenario? Can the BUR force respond to the potential threats of the future? Does the two-MRC strategy deal effectively with the financial and readiness drain of Operations Other Than War (OOTW), as well as the political difficulties of abandoning OOTW to respond to two MRCs? Is the two—MRC planning concept broad enough to cover the wide variety of challenges that today's world is likely to generate?

Airpower. What role doe we expect tactical air forces to play in future conflicts? How should we conduct battle management and optimize the use of these resources? Which munitions should be procured? What type and mix of aircraft platforms are most likely to be required in the future?

Naval Forces. What type of Naval force will be required to counter future threats? What will be the lead ship of tomorrow's Naval Battle Group? How should we distribute emphasis among ship platforms?

Army Modernization. How long can the Army maintain its readiness with only upgrades and modifications of existing equipment? What is planned and scheduled for procurement in the future?

Expeditionary Forces. Will the expeditionary force truly become a ''911'' force? What equipment will expeditionary forces require? Will we find ourselves facing more deployment requirements than we have forces available? How will expeditionary forces adapt to joint operations, and how will other services adapt themselves to support these forces?

Reserve Forces. What is the appropriate role of the reserve components?

Should we cease funding units that have proven to be undeployable in times of crisis? Should we restructure the missions assigned to the reserves to focus on activities that are directly related to civilian occupations, such as airlift, medical support, public affairs and information services? Should we move noncombat support functions into the reserve, maintaining only combat and combat support missions for active duty personnel.

Recapitalization versus Readiness. What are we doing to balance near-term readiness requirements against our need for future modernization? What is our R&D strategy? Are we correctly differentiating between modification and modernization of existing systems, and next generation systems?

Missile Defenses. What emphasis needs to be placed into funding this category and with what priority? What threat will be posed to the United States and our allies and friends by ballistic missiles in the future and how will we respond? Will defense of allies from ballistic missiles require us to maintain Aegis upper tier ships on station in the same manner as we now maintain carrier forces abroad?

Nonproliferation and Counter Proliferation. Are our non-proliferation policies and programs effective? What improvements should be undertaken? Will we emphasize unilateral or multilateral efforts to control proliferation? What programs are required to protect against the failure of nonproliferation policies?

Nuclear Weapons. What role will nuclear weapons have in the near-term? The far-term? What is the most effective means of eliminating the need for nuclear weapons, and of monitoring other nation's nuclear forces? How should we plan for their eventual elimination? How should we plan to maintain safe and reliable nuclear weapons until they are no longer necessary?

Industrial Base. What goods or services are unique to military readiness that cannot be supplied by the private sector, immediately or relatively quickly? What can not be provided for by a freemarket?

BASE CLOSURE

When should we mandate another round of base closings? Do we need to see the shape of the future military before proceeding with further closures? Do we really understand how to close bases and achieve savings? How can we improve the current process to respond better to the needs of both the military and the local communities?

With these questions in mind, we must now step up to the task of answering them, and the many other important issues that I have not mentioned. In its oversight role, the Congress shares in the responsibility of providing adequate forces, properly trained and equipped to deal with whatever consequences a changing world portends for the United States. We have an opportunity to chart a new course for national security, and we cannot afford inaction when offered a chance to abandon ''business as usual''.

Starting this fall, I plan to undertake a series of hearings in the Readiness Subcommittee to explore the questions discussed above. The objective of the hearings would be to formulate recommendations for a national security strategy and military force structure for the 21st century.

This year, the Readiness Subcommittee held several broad-based hearings entitled ''Readiness 2001'' which were designed to assess the readiness of our current force to meeting the projected threats of the future. The results of those hearings were not encouraging. We must recognize, as we approach the watershed of the next century, that our military forces cannot remain static in a changing world. The hearings I am proposing for this fall will attempt to divine an appropriate force structure for the future at an affordable price.

I believe the subcommittee should solicit testimony from a wide variety of national security experts, like the CSIS, as well as Administration officials, to ensure all viewpoints are considered. While I have not yet had an opportunity to discuss this matter with Chairman Thurmond, I look forward to working with him and with the other subcommittee chairmen with expertise in many of these areas.

As we undertake this effort to develop a new national security vision, we must recognize that we will fail the American public if we continue to ignore the reality of decreasing defense funding. Because of the need to balance the federal budget and reduce our nation's massive federal debt, the debate in the future will focus ever more narrowly on ''guns versus butter''. I believe that, when the subcommittee's review is complete, we may well find that less money is needed to maintain a smaller, smarter military force that can adapt to the changing threats to our security in the future.

We cannot continue to fund every new program with a unique or interesting capability. Instead, we must thoroughly assess the threats facing our nation, determine our national security interests, and then carefully select only those programs which are directly relevant to protecting those interests and which are affordable in the future.

If we do not make the hard choices in entering into commitments with our allies and friends, and if we then fail to prioritize among weapons systems to enable us to support those commitments, we will fail in our most basic responsibility—protecting the security of the American people.

ELK HILLS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, S. 1026, in compliance with the Budget Resolution, requires selling the Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 (Elk Hills) no later than the end of fiscal year 1996. The Administration recommended that the sale take place over at least two years to ensure enough time to finalize the equity shares, conduct an outside evaluation of the quantity of hydrocarbons in the reserve and the value to the taxpayers, and carry out a competitive bidding process. I commend Senator BINGAMAN for his efforts in the amendment he cosponsored with Senators MCCAIN and Campbell to title XXXIII of the bill to ensure that the government will receive full value for the assets when sold. The Elk Hills property currently generates net revenues to the Treasury in excess of $400 million a year. I hope the Armed Services Committee and the Senate as a whole will take a hard look during the reconciliation process at how this extremely valuable national asset is sold in order to meet near term budget goals.

AMENDMENT NO. 2112

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I am in strong support of the Exon-Hatfield amendment to strike the $50 million authorization for hydronuclear testing. This provision is a waste of money and is not necessary, and could potentially damage our ability to achieve a truly Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Many of my colleagues have cited the report released yesterday by the JASONs—the country's top nuclear experts—who find that ''a persuasive case has not been made for the utility of hydronuclear tests for detecting small changes in the performance margins for current U.S. weapons.'' After one thousand nuclear tests over 50 years, we have sufficient experience from which to assess the safety and reliability of our nuclear stockpile.

As I read the study, the conclusion is clear—we do not need hydronuclear testing. Any benefits that could be derived from further testing are resoundingly dwarfed by the benefits to our security achieved through a comprehensive test ban. The arguments for hydronuclear testing relate to technical measurements and scientific curiosity. The arguments against it relate to nonproliferation and the long-term security of the United States and the world. There simply is no reason for this program.

Mr. President, I urge support for the Exon-Hatfield amendment, and for a true comprehensive test ban.

MILITARY EXCHANGE STORES

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, section 372 of Senate Bill 1026 proposes to eliminate certain restrictions on the purchases and sale of items in military exchange stores. In particular, the bill prohibits any restriction on cost, prices, categories, or size of items offered for sale. I strongly oppose this provision, as does the National Federation of Independent Businesses which represents small business owners nationwide.

While I initially intended to offer an amendment to strike this section of the bill, I have since spoken with Senator COATS who is chairman of the Personnel Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. I am confidant that the chairman understands my

concerns and that they will be addressed in conference. In the interest of making progress in completing action on this bill, I will not offer my amendment. I would, however, like to briefly express my concerns about section 372 of this bill.

If enacted as currently written, this bill would permit a military exchange to sell virtually any product. As it stands, a military exchange does not have to pay rent, pay taxes on revenue, or obtain local licenses. Without these requirements typically faced by private store owners, a military exchange enjoys an unfair competitive advantage. In addition, because a military exchange does not collect State sales tax, local businesses are further disadvantaged.

As a consequence of this preferential treatment, private businesses cannot afford to offer the same low prices as a military exchange. If—as this bill would allow—a military exchange is permitted to sell a virtually unlimited variety of products at prices which are lower than those available at comparable private sector stores, then the consequences for small business owners will be devastating.

I believe that the existing regulations—while not perfect—do impose some restrictions to protect local private sector vendors against unfair competition from military exchanges. At the same time, existing regulations also ensure that military personnel have access to necessary goods at reasonable prices. I am grateful to my friend and colleague Senator COATS for working with me to address my concerns.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. I wonder if the managers might be in the position to indicate now if they have any opportunity to find out how many amendments are remaining and if we can reach some agreement on the number of amendments.

As I understand, there are no amendments on this side. Well, I think two exceptions—one, I think, may be part of the managers' amendment; one may be offered by the Senator from Colorado. He has been negotiating with the other side. So, I would say at most there are maybe two or three amendments on this side of the aisle.

I do want to commend the managers. We wasted 5 hours yesterday on this bill. Then we had 7 hours—was that yesterday?—so long ago, the day before, I guess. We had 7 hours on one amendment. So I think if you take out those 12 hours, we made a lot of progress on this bill. But I get the strange feeling that there are a number of people on the other side who do not want the bill to ever pass. If that is the case, they might as well be up front about it, and we can take the next step.

So we are down to about at least two or three amendments on this side.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I do not know, I guess I would have to go back and look and see how many amendments are offered every year on this bill normally. I would guess it is somewhere between 80 and 100.

I have been able to poll most of our colleagues. Two or three are not here and had specifically listed a number of amendments. But we have been able to tabulate the number. It is at least 41. And to my knowledge, except for Senator BINGAMAN, there are no Senators on our side who are prepared tonight to enter into a time agreement.

So, this bill will be debated for some time to come, if each of these Senators can be accommodated. But that is where we are right now.

Mr. DOLE. I would say, as far as absent Senators, if we are going to start accommodating absent Senators, we will never get anything done around here. We accommodated Senator BUMPERS because of the special circumstance. I understand Senator PRYOR has an amendment on the bill tomorrow. We are trying to accommodate him because of an illness in the family. I am not suggesting that.

But if absent Senators are going to determine what the rest of us do who stay here, then we will never finish any bill. But it is pretty clear from the leader there is no intention to let us pass this bill. That follows the pattern we have had all year long, to slow down every time you get close. ''Wait a minute. Let's don't pass this. We don't like the ABM vote. We don't like some of the other votes.'' It makes it very difficult for the majority leader, whether it happens to be a Democrat or Republican, when there is no cooperation.

And we do not have much leverage except for nominations and other things that we can hold up. And we will do that. We will do that. But I would rather work something out where we do precisely—can we get a list of the 41 amendments? That would be fewer than the 105 amendments we had earlier. Can you identify the 41 amendments?

Mr. DASCHLE. I think we would be prepared to list them. In fact, they are listed.

Mr. DOLE. It says ''relevant.''

Mr. DASCHLE. That is as good as we can do. We cannot list the specific issues in some cases because the Senators have not been prepared to list them tonight. No one told them tonight they had to list exactly what the topic is or the time agreement of which they would have to debate the amendment. All they were required to do is list the fact that they were relevant. They have done that. We are prepared to give that list to the majority leader and go from there.

Mr. DOLE. Will somebody hand it to me? Who has it?

Mr. DASCHLE. We are going to have to work through the longer list that we had. We have been able to get to the point where I think we have a list of 41.

Mr. DOLE. We ought to vote tonight. Are there any amendments on this side that we can get a time agreement on?

Does the Senator from Arizona have an amendment? We will work on this side of the aisle, if they do not want to work on that side of the aisle.

The Senator can offer his amendment.

Mr. NUNN. I can say to the majority leader one little note of at least slight encouragement. There has been a crosswalk between the ones that we have both been working on to clear and the 41 listed. We have 16 that we know we cleared on both sides. We can handle those tonight. And we have 10 more that we are working on to clear. That is 26 total amendments. The last 10 have not all been cleared. Some of them—we think that most of them will be cleared. So that is 26 amendments. We have a correlation between that list and the 41 amendments listed here. That can be done. When it is done you can have a different picture. You can have, instead of 41 amendments, you could conceivably have half that number. And that gets within reach.

Mr. DOLE. There were about 18 cleared last night. It is not that we have not taken care of a lot of amendments for, I guess, Members on both sides of the aisle. I think the managers are prepared to look at others, if they can be negotiated; is that correct?

Mr. NUNN. Right.

Mr. DOLE. I do not know what the correlation is. Are there amendments on this side of the aisle?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, I am prepared to offer one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 2125

(Purpose: To clarify restrictions on assistance to Pakistan and other purposes)

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment. I send it to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. DOLE. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] proposes an amendment numbered 2125.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section—

SEC. . CLARIFICATION OF RESTRICTIONS.

Subsection (e) of section 620E of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (P.L. 87–195) is amended:

(1) by striking the words ''No assistance'' and inserting the words ''No military assistance'';

(2) by striking the words ''in which assistance is to be furnished or military equipment or technology'' and inserting the words

''in which military assistance is to be furnished or military equipment or technology''; and

(3) by striking the words ''the proposed United States assistance'' and inserting the words ''the proposed United States military assistance''.

(4) by adding the following new paragraph:

(2) The prohibitions in this section do not apply to any assistance or transfer provided for the purposes of:

(A) International narcotics control (including Chapter 8 of Part I of this Act) or any provision of law available for providing assistance for counternarcotics purposes;

(B) Facilitating military-to-military contact, training (including Chapter 5 of Part II of this Act) and humanitarian and civic assistance projects;

(C) Peacekeeping and other multilateral operations (including Chapter 6 of Part II of this Act relating to peacekeeping) or any provision of law available for providing assistance for peacekeeping purposes, except that lethal military equipment shall be provided on a lease or loan basis only and shall be returned upon completion of the operation for which it was provided;

(D) Antiterrorism assistance (including Chapter 8 of Part II of this Act relating to antiterrorism assistance) or any provision of law available for antiterrorism assistance purposes;

(5) by adding the following new subsections at the end—

(f) STORAGE COSTS.—The President may release the Government of Pakistan of its contractual obligation to pay the United States Government for the storage costs of items purchased prior to October 1, 1990, but not delivered by the United States Government pursuant to subsection (e) and may reimburse the Government of Pakistan for any such amounts paid, on such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe, provided that such payments have no budgetary impact.

(g) RETURN OF MILITARY EQUIPMENT.—The President may return to the Government of Pakistan military equipment paid for and delivered to Pakistan and subsequently transferred for repair or upgrade to the United States but not returned to Pakistan pursuant to subsection (e). Such equipment or its equivalent may be returned to the Government of Pakistan provided that the President determines and so certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such equipment or equivalent neither constitutes nor has received any significant qualitative upgrade since being transferred to the United States.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, this is not the amendment I hoped to offer early this evening. I hoped to offer a comprehensive settlement of the outstanding question we have with Pakistan, and that results over a $1.4 billion paid to us for military hardware which has not been delivered because of restrictions and sanctions under our current law.

They are in the circumstance of—one of our best allies and most faithful friends—having paid their money, $1.4 billion, but not delivered the equipment that they paid for. I am sure every Member is uncomfortable with treating a friend that way.

There is, indeed, a reason for those sanctions. They relate to our firm commitment as a country to nonproliferation. I do not rise to express concern about that. But that aspect of our settlement with Pakistan is in dispute. There are Members who feel very strongly that any compromise on the shipment of military hardware is inappropriate. So I have not chosen to offer that aspect.

All that is offered in this amendment is the exact language that came out of the Foreign Relations Committee. It passed 16 to 2. We have been assured by the interested parties, at least most of them, that they do not object to it. What it includes is an authorization for cooperation with Pakistan for the suppression of the narcotics trade.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, that effort of suppressing the——

Mr. DOLE. The Senate is still not in order. Will Senators take their seats?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their seats. Please take conversations off the floor.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, that effort of suppressing the narcotics trade is very much in our country's interest. It talks about allowing us to proceed in dealing with them in terms of suppressing terrorism. That effort is very much in our country's interest.

Two things I think are worth emphasizing. This amendment does not in any way deliver the disputed arms that are subject to debate and which I hope to offer at a different time. It does not in any way repeal the Pressler amendment, and its restrictions on military sales continue on. But it does in the economic area try and allow discourse between the countries that we think is important.

OPIC is allowed to operate, suppression of narcotics is allowed to operate in our cooperative programs, efforts to suppress terrorism are allowed to operate with those programs. This was considered in depth by the Foreign Relations Committee. It was passed out on a vote I believe of 16 to 2.

Mr. President, I want to simply add one other thing. We have a dispute with Pakistan. It is based on very sincere and important grounds. But it is also important that we have a way of continuing relations with that country. They are a country that has stood by the United States through thick and thin. They were there when it counted for us.

Some may remember when Francis Gary Powers flew his observation missions over the Soviet Union. It was from Pakistan that his plane took off.

Some may remember that the United States, when it sought to build SEATO, found one of its first members in Pakistan at a time when other countries in the region were lucky to align themselves with the United States.

Some may remember the pivotal war in Afghanistan that preceded the fall of the Soviet Empire. Pakistan put themselves and their country on the line for us when that came about.

Time after time after time, when the United States has sought help from Pakistan, they have been there to work with us.

When we asked for troops to cooperate in Somalia, it was Pakistan who came forward and sent their troops and, incidentally, suffered large casualties. When we talked about troops in Bosnia, they came forward. When we talked about troops in Haiti where there were not a lot of volunteers, Pakistan came forward.

I mention all these things, Mr. President, because while there is a dispute and a legitimate dispute about whether or not those arms should be delivered, there should not be a dispute that is to our advantage to have some discourse with Pakistan. There should not be a dispute that they have been good friends through difficult times.

All Members may remember the threats that the leaders of the Soviet Union issued against Pakistan, and yet they stood firm by this country throughout the cold war.

So, Mr. President, this is a very small step. It only deals with economic matters, basically, but it is important, I think, as a step of moving toward developing a continuing relationship with one of America's oldest and dearest friends.

I might mention at this point the words of President Clinton as he shared them with the Prime Minister of Pakistan. President Clinton said:

> I don't think what happened was fair to Pakistan in terms of money . . . I don't think it is right for us to keep the money and the equipment. That is not right. And I am going to try to find a resolution to it. I don't like it.

The President is referring to the payment of $1.4 billion and not getting the equipment and not getting their money back. That is now resolved by this amendment. But to let this moment pass without any effort to extend our hand in friendship to Pakistan, without any effort to recognize that this is a relationship that we should not throw away, I think, would be a mistake.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I support this proposal to make whole our obligations to Pakistan, a country which is an ally of the United States.

The Pressler amendment halted the transfer of F–16 planes and other military equipment for which the Government of Pakistan has paid in full. I believe we have an obligation to equitably resolve this outstanding transaction.

Mr. President, I want the United States to be seen as a country that keeps its word. We entered into a contract with Pakistan to sell military equipment, and we accepted more than $1 billion for that equipment. Likewise, the United States has made it quite clear that we will not do business with countries that proliferate. We all understand that the transfer of the F–16's cannot be completed because Pakistan has chosen not to work with the United

States on proliferation issues. However, the United States cannot continue to retain both the planes and the money.

Since the sale cannot be completed, I believe we have an obligation to come to an agreement to reimburse the government people of Pakistan. The President has offered a thoughtful proposal, which is being offered by the distinguished Senator from Colorado. I support this proposal to provide recompense the people of Pakistan.

This proposal does not send the F–16 planes to Pakistan. The administration will seek an alternate buyer for the planes, and only after the sale is completed will the proceeds be forwarded to Pakistan. This proposal also transfers to Pakistan the $370 million in other military equipment, which, I am told, will not alter the balance of power in the region.

Mr. President, I believe this proposal is fair. It is certainly just. I will vote in favor of the Brown amendment.

Mr. PRESSLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I reluctantly must rise in opposition to this amendment. Let me say that in 1985, when we adopted the Pressler amendment, it was supported by Pakistan. Frankly, it was the Reagan administration's amendment to settle the dispute. At the time, Pakistan said they had no nuclear program, and the Foreign Relations Committee was considering the Cranston amendment to shut off aid. My colleagues will recall the Carter administration had previously shut off aid. Our former colleague from California had sought a complete cut-off. This amendment, which conditioned aid on an annual certification, was a compromise put forth by the Reagan administration. George Bush was very much involved in it, and Pakistan supported the original so-called Pressler amendment.

At that point, they began buying planes and other military equipment knowing that they, at the same time, were developing nuclear weapons. But they were telling George Bush in his trips over there just the opposite. George Bush was very disturbed about this matter.

When he became President in 1990, the United States CIA had certified that Pakistan, in fact, had been lying and had a nuclear weapon. I know Pakistan has done a lot of things for us. I have been in there many times and want to be friends with the Pakistanis. But the fact of the matter is we acted in good faith. We adopted an amendment they asked us to adopt, and it was Reagan administration policy.

Then at that point in time, in 1990, we could no longer deliver a previous order of military equipment under an agreement that they sought with us. And that is how the now infamous fleet of F–16's came to be parked on the tarmac. Those planes were part of a $1.4 billion contract of military equipment that was made prior to the Pressler amendment, but could not be delivered after Pressler was invoked.

Recently, I proposed a plan so that the Pakistanis could be paid back their money. I proposed that the President of the United States could offer for sale these planes to Taiwan or to the Philippines or to another third party, and the President has done this. That is a positive step. That is moving forward. The rationale for not seeking their delivery is obvious: F–16's are nuclear delivery vehicles. We would be more than waiving the Pressler amendment if the F–16's were delivered. We would be striking at the very heart of our Nation's nonproliferation policy.

I have been critical of both India and Pakistan in the nuclear area. In recent weeks, we have received more disturbing news: The New York Times and Defense News reported last month that Pakistan received from Communist China key components that could be used in M–11 ballistic missiles.

Without question, a nuclear war between India and Pakistan would be cataclysmic. The names of the perpetrators and their accessories would be cursed for a millennium. To its credit, Mr. President, the U.S. Senate has taken the initiative to promote peace and stability in South Asia, and the core of that is the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

A decade ago, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Indiana [Senator LUGAR], we voted to adopt an amendment that allowed United States aid to Pakistan to continue as long as the President can certify that Pakistan was not in possession of a nuclear device. That is how this came about. Why did the committee, and ultimately the Congress, take this action? Pakistan was the third-largest recipient of United States foreign assistance, receiving as much as $600 million annually. Pakistan was, and is today, an ally of the United States. The brave people of Pakistan were instrumental in channeling resources to Afghan refugees and rebels as they sought to repel Soviet invaders. United States officials rightly were concerned that the Government in Islamabad was interested in developing a nuclear weapon, a course of action not in our national interest.

Therefore, given the vast amounts of United States aid made available to Pakistan, we believe that the threat could be used to further two policy goals: First, to give Pakistan an incentive to ensure that the nuclear program serves a peaceful purpose, or the American people will stop subsidizing Pakistan. In short, the so-called Pressler amendment was designed to send one message: Nuclear proliferation has a price.

In addition, I urge my colleagues to look at some of the recent intelligence reports. I might say that there is available a transcript in this building of a recent briefing for Senators on Pakistan by the CIA. Obviously, I cannot state what that said. But I will say what the New York Times and Defense News reported last month—that Pakistan has been receiving from Communist China key components that can be used in making M–11 ballistic missiles.

To conclude my argument, it is this. This was an amendment that Pakistan asked for in good faith. George Bush went over and met with them when he was Vice President. He was very involved in this amendment. This was a Reagan-Bush amendment. And the truth has not been told and is still not being told today. That is the problem we have here.

I wish it were otherwise because I want to have good relations with both Pakistan and India. I have traveled to Pakistan and India several times. This problem will go on and on until the Pakistanis are willing to be honest with us in our dealings and to say what our intelligence people say and has been published in the New York Times and Defense News, and so I must very reluctantly oppose this amendment.

Mr. BROWN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PRESSLER. Yes.

Mr. BROWN. I appreciate the Senator's leadership on this issue and his speaking out. My hope is to at least identify where the concerns are. Subparagraph (A) makes it clear that the prohibitions in the law described in the Pressler amendment do not apply to international narcotics control. This would allow us to cooperate with them in controlling international narcotics.

Mr. PRESSLER. I have no problem with that, but the larger problem is that we are not seeking any concessions from Pakistan on the nonproliferation front.

Mr. BROWN. That is one of the primary functions. The second one—I think, the second most important—is making it clear that the Pressler amendment would not prohibit peacekeeping and other multilateral operations. Paragraph (B)——

Mr. PRESSLER. Facilitating military-to-military contact, training—including chapter 5 of par II of this act—and humanitarian and civic assistance projects.

I think that has to go into Senator MITCH MCCONNELL's appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Ooperations. I believe if we have the time to study this and the other proposal we discussed in private, we could resolve this issue.

Mr. BROWN. Part B, as I read it, facilitating military-to-military contact, training, and humanitarian and civic assistance projects.

Would the Senator have concerns about allowing military-to-military contact for the purposes of civic assistance projects?

Mr. PRESSLER. It depends on what the training means. If it is limited to humanitarian and civic assistance projects, I personally would not have a problem.

Mr. BROWN. That is the intent. Under (C) it says, ''Peacekeeping and other multilateral operations—or any provisions of law available for providing assistance for peacekeeping purposes.''

Does the Senator object to us being allowed to cooperate with the Pakistanis for the purpose of peacekeeping purposes?

Mr. PRESSLER. No, of course not. Once again, we are getting no concessions from Pakistan in the area of nuclear non-proliferation. I am basically opposed to this because it is unconditional. We are getting no concessions on nonproliferation. Indeed, according to what is happening, we are getting less cooperation lately. You can go through each of the lines, but the larger, fundamental problem remains.

Mr. BROWN. I mention that because this is not military, does not involve a package of military equipment.

Mr. PRESSLER. It says, ''The President may return to the Government of Pakistan military equipment paid for and delivered to Pakistan and subsequently transferred for repair or upgrade.'' So we are getting into a whole host of things here.

Mr. BROWN. Well, if I——

Mr. PRESSLER. I think we can get a solution if we sought the assistance of the Senator from Kentucky, MITCH MCCONNELL, and his Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. I believe we can work on this through him. Again, I am opposed to it because it is unconditional. We are getting no concessions.

Mr. BROWN. Would the Senator allow me to clarify the point he raised?

Mr. PRESSLER. Well, there is another question.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has the floor.

Mr. PRESSLER. I will yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I would like to get recognition in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] is recognized.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I would like to speak in a broader context with respect to this issue, because I think there is a failure to understand the Pressler amendment and what it did.

The Pressler amendment, at its time, was a special exception for Pakistan. The Pressler amendment, at its time—the consequence of it was to enable the United States Government to send aid to Pakistan, which otherwise would have been prohibited since the nonproliferation law said that there was no United States aid to any country that delivers or receives nuclear materials or technology, except under IAEA supervision and safeguards.

Now, what the Pressler amendment allowed was a special exception just for Pakistan that allowed the President to waive the law if he certified that Pakistan did not possess a nuclear explosive device, and that United States aid would reduce the risk that Pakistan would get one. No other country received this special waiver.

Subsequently, through the 1980's, there were other special waivers for Pakistan from the nonproliferation laws. I say to the distinguished Senator from Colorado that maybe the American taxpayers should get back the money they gave to Pakistan during this period, on the premise that Pakistan would not go nuclear. That was the premise. And the Pressler amendment allowed this aid to flow from 1985, when the Pressler amendment went into effect, through 1990, when President Bush concluded he could no longer make this certification that Pakistan did not possess a nuclear explosive device. The Pressler amendment allowed $3.3 billion in direct U.S. aid to flow to Pakistan, even though Pakistan had violated our nonproliferation laws. Over $2 billion of that aid from 1985 to 1990 went to buy weapons. And the express purpose of making that money available to buy weapons for Pakistan was so that it would not need or seek nuclear weapons. In other words, the deal was that we do not want you to go nuclear. We know you are acquiring nuclear materials and technology, not conforming to the nonproliferation laws, but we are going to provide this military aid in order to keep you from going nuclear. That was the deal.

Now, the Pressler amendment was clearly explained, it was fully publicized. Pakistan knew the consequences if it decided to pursue nuclear weapons, despite our aid and our warnings. Yet, what they did is they took the money—almost $3.5 billion over this 5-year period, and more than $2 billion in military aid—and, at the same time, went nuclear.

This has to be understood because it is portrayed as though some terrible unfairness were done and he even quoted the President to that effect. But the fact of the matter is, is that the Pressler amendment, at its time, gave Pakistan an exception to the nonproliferation law.

The premise was we will provide them very significant economic and military assistance, seek to strengthen them, greatly enhance their conventional defensive posture as part of a deal that they not go nuclear.

As long as the President could continue to certify that they did not have a nuclear explosive device, they would continue to receive assistance.

Now, what happened is in 1990 President Bush finally said, ''I can't certify this any longer. I can't certify it.'' They have gone to a nuclear device, contrary to the deal that was contained in the Pressler amendment. I invite the Senator from South Dakota, if I am misstating the situation, to correct it.

As a consequence, what Pakistan did, they accepted this aid and they continued their nuclear program anyhow. That was not part of the deal. They, in effect, flouted our laws, took our money, and then complained when we finally said ''enough is enough,'' when President Bush said, ''I cannot certify this any longer,'' and we cut off the aid.

Now, people say this was a terrible unfairness to Pakistan. The unfairness, if I may say so, was to the American taxpayers who provided $3.5 billion on the premise that Pakistan would not move to acquire a nuclear explosive device. They took the money. They went ahead and acquired the nuclear explosive device anyhow, and now they say, ''We were treated unfairly.''

Mr. PRESSLER. If my friend would yield for a question, he is stating it exactly correctly.

I might say, with some sense of humor, when this was working in the 1980's, it was known as the Reagan-Bush amendment; it was only when it became controversial that they started calling it the Pressler amendment, I point out.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I think the discussion we have had has been very helpful in giving background.

Let me emphasize a couple of things. What is offered here is not the compromise proposal that the President had asked to resolve the situation over, $1.4 billion military equipment. That is controversial. I understand there are strong feelings on both sides. I have not offered that.

I would like to offer it at a future point, but I have not offered it in deference to getting things resolved on this bill quickly tonight. What is offered is solely the portion that was worked out with the administration and with the Foreign Relations Committee. It passed 16 to 2 out of committee, and what we literally did was try and eliminate anything that was controversial.

What this does is try and go through the Pressler amendment and clarify areas where it may not apply.

Let me emphasize something. It does not repeal the Pressler amendment. It does not deliver military equipment.

Specifically, Members should know there are six things this amendment does. No. 1, it allows us to participate with Pakistan in international narcotics control. I cannot believe there is a single Member of the Senate that would object to that.

No. 2, it allows military-to-military contacts for the purposes of humanitarian and civic assistance. I have a difficult time believing anyone here would object to that.

No. 3, it allows peacekeeping and multilateral operations.

Now, Mr. President, we have gone to Pakistan and asked them as a favor to us to participate in these operations. When volunteers went to Haiti, they were not in abundance, Pakistan responded to our request. When people were losing their lives in Somalia, Pakistan responded with the largest

group. When people were asked to go to Bosnia, which is not a pleasure scene, Pakistan responded.

The third thing that it does is allow peacekeeping operations. They have been at our request.

No. 4, it allows us to cooperate with antiterrorism activity. That is in our interest. That is desperately in our interest. They have returned terrorists to us and they have worked with us.

The language of the Pressler amendment does not make it clear that they can cooperate and we can cooperate with them in those areas. That is why this amendment is necessary. It is necessary because the existing language does not clearly state that these activities can still be carried on.

There are two other items this amendment does. It allows the President—and it is may, not mandatory language—to pay for the storage costs. It simply gives him that authorization, something the President asked for, for the items of military equipment that they have paid for but not received.

Appreciate what has happened, Mr. President. We not only have contracted with them for the equipment and had it built and gotten their money for it and refused to deliver it, but we now charge them storage on the equipment that we refuse to deliver to them.

Last, Mr. President, it allows the return of other military equipment that the administration was comfortable with returning that was not involved in the sale, that was owned by Pakistan, that was returned to the United States for repairs, and it was caught in the breach. That is, returning equipment they have always had title to and was simply here to be repaired. I do not believe that is a major controversial item either with the administration or with India.

We have talked with the Indian Ambassador about this package specifically. The Indian Ambassador, I understand, has expressed less than full endorsement of the package to Senator PRESSLER. In my discussions with the Indian Ambassador, he indicated his concern was about the sale of the planes which are not included in this, and not with regard to the package.

Mr. President, I want to make it clear to Members, the items that are in this, I believe sincerely, are noncontroversial and to our advantage. They are meant to make it clear that the Pressler amendment does not prohibit us from cooperating with the Pakistanis in these areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BROWN. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCAIN. Is it accurate to say that this passed 16 to 2 through committee?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, it voted out 16 to 2.

Mr. McCAIN. Exact same package?

Mr. BROWN. Exact same language. Nothing has been added to what the Foreign Relations Committee worked on.

Mr. McCAIN. Would the Senator be ready to enter into a time agreement on this?

Mr. BROWN. I am happy to enter into any agreement that those concerned about the amendment would wish.

Mr. McCAIN. I ask if the distinguished minority leader would be prepared to propound a time agreement.

Mr. DOLE. We are making an inquiry.

Mr. LEVIN. I would like to ask before I respond whether the Senator from Colorado would tell us whether or not the question of the delivery of M–11's to Pakistan is a question he has resolved in his own mind, No. 1. If so, whether he would tell the Senator from Michigan whether or not such a delivery would violate the missile technology control regime. And if so, whether or not sanctions should then be applied to Pakistan rather than a resolution such as this.

The answer to those questions are very relevant in terms of the time agreement, if I can say so to the leader, because we recently had a briefing on this issue up in 407 and that document is very, very clear on this subject. It is very important, that if, in fact, my questions are answered a certain way by this Senator or other Senators, then that briefing and the thrust of that briefing be made available to this Senate in executive session.

Mr. BROWN. Let me respond to the Senator by quoting to those who are in a much better position to know than I. This was a July 28 statement by Secretary of State Warren Christopher. He said, ''At the present time, although there is a fairly large body of evidence, we do not think that there is the evidence that would justify the imposition of sanctions.''

Now, let me say to the Senator, he raised an important question, and I think he is rightly concerned about the missiles. Let me emphasize something: This amendment does not bar in any way sanctions or interfere with sanctions in any way. If they are justified under the Pressler amendment, they go ahead.

This will not restrict or shortchange that at all. But it does say, when we are trying to stop terrorist activity, that we are at least allowed to cooperate with the Pakistani Government to stop narcotics, to stop terrorism, to allow them to participate in peaceful forces.

So I know the Senator has legitimate concerns, and I do not mean to shortchange them at all. I do quote the Secretary of State because I think he studied this and has looked at it and is in a better position than I. But let me emphasize, this amendment does not in any way inhibit sanctions, should they be justified under existing statutes.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Senator. But the evidence that was presented—and I am not free in this setting to disclose what that evidence is—in S–407 is very relevant to that issue. And it is very critical that Members of this Senate, I believe in executive session, read what the briefing was on this issue. And I cannot say much more than that. But we hear of a resolution in front of us, which is presented suddenly to us tonight—I am not on Foreign Relations, and we were talking out in the hallway about a different formula of a resolution, and I thought there was going to be a different resolution presented to a group of six of us—suddenly this resolution is on the floor.

But the question of the delivery of M–11 missiles from China to Pakistan is the most fundamental question of missile proliferation. We are worried about missiles. We all are. That was what the debate was all about yesterday.

My question to the Senator from Colorado is this. If, in fact, we are satisfied that M–11's have been delivered to Pakistan, whether or not that would trigger sanctions under the Missile Technology Control Regime? That is my question to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN. The MTCR, Missile Technology Control Regime, does provide for sanctions for violation. Let me assure the Senator, that has nothing to do with this amendment. Those would take place if they are justified, and not take place if they are not justified. This amendment in no way interferes with those sanctions at all.

I would simply also add to the Senator, I think he is to be commended for his urgings to the Members. I think that briefing he suggested is valuable and worth going to.

Second, I think he is right to be concerned about the issue. I would not come to this body and urge that we ignore the Missile Technology Control Regime.

Mr. LEVIN. My specific question however is this. If the M–11 were in fact delivered by China to Pakistan, if that were true, would sanctions then be triggered under the MTCR?

My question is not a general one, whether MTCR provides for sanctions. My question is, if we are satisfied that the M–11 were delivered by China to Pakistan, would sanctions then be appropriate under MTCR? That is my question.

Mr. BROWN. Under our statutes, the President is charged with the enforcement of the MTCR. I read a quote from the Secretary of State. But let me assure my colleague that, at least in my understanding, is in the hands of the President. I assume it would be properly enforced if he feels there is a violation.

Mr. LEVIN. It seems to me——

Mr. COHEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. COHEN. I am just going to ask a question of the Senator from Michigan. If we were satisfied that the missiles were in fact delivered, the question I

would have for the Senator from Michigan, would he conclude that the law requires us to apply sanctions against China? I mean, there are many violations. I know the Senator has been attacked—or accused; not attacked—criticized for bringing this amendment up because it flies in the face of what we were seeking to do, namely to dissuade the Pakistanis from acquiring nuclear weapons. I think most of us voted for that, along with Senator GLENN.

But the notion that somehow the Pakistanis have deceived us does not put them in a unique category. I think we can talk about the Indians, for example, who for years said, ''We are conducting peaceful nuclear explosions,'' only to find out years later that they were, in fact, developing a nuclear capability.

We now have the Russians, with whom we have relations, who are also conducting, I believe, experiments in a field that should be of concern to this body, in the field of chemical weapons and biological weapons. The same thing with respect to China.

I think the Senator from Colorado raises a valid point this evening. He is not seeking in any way to repeal or modify the Pressler amendment. What he is seeking to achieve is maintain the kind of relations, as I understand it, with Pakistan, that they have maintained with us. He did not mention, by way of specificity, at least, the name Yusef. Here we had a major international terrorist, as such, who was involved in the terrorist bombing in New York. It was Pakistan who helped us get him back.

I think what he is trying to achieve, namely, to maintain a relationship with Pakistan that does not contradict or undermine the Pressler amendment, is something that is very worthy of our consideration this evening, tomorrow, however long it takes.

But I think, if we are talking about whether we are going to trigger the Missile Technology Control Act, we have to look at those who are selling it as well. That would involve China and perhaps even other nations.

Mr. BROWN. Let me say this to the Senator from Maine, if I could, by way of clarification. In discussions with the administration, they indicated to us that there were real questions with the Pressler amendment as to whether or not they were allowed to participate in narcotics control operations with Pakistan, real questions about participation in humanitarian assistance, real questions about allowing them to participate with them in peacekeeping, real questions about allowing them to cooperate with them in antiterrorism activity.

It was my belief that there was value in clarifying the Pressler amendment in these specific areas.

Mr. SARBANES. What about the other areas?

Mr. BROWN. I think the Members would feel comfortable that these are things that are to our advantage, and ones that I would think—at least my own view is they probably are not ones the Senator from South Dakota meant to outlaw. But, obviously, he would be a far better spokesman on that.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BROWN. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. SARBANES. Does the Senator also think there are real questions with respect to the application of the Pressler amendment with respect to the storage costs and the application of the Pressler amendment to the other arms he was talking about providing under his amendment, as I understand it?

Mr. BROWN. Yes. I think the Senator is right to point those out because they are slightly different.

The return of military equipment is a question with nothing to do with the purchase of the military equipment, as I am advised by the administration. What it involves is military equipment which Pakistan owned and which needed repairs, and they sent parts or whole pieces of equipment back to the United States, as, of course, this country would like to have done, to be repaired and sent back. So these were things caught in the transition. I think that fairly falls in an area of clarification. But I think the Senator could well question that.

The question of storage costs, though, I think the Senator is absolutely accurate. It is a different thing. It was something requested by the administration. But I must tell the Senator I do not—if there are Members who object to our trying to work out something on the storage cost for equipment they paid for that we did not deliver to them, obviously, I hope they will speak forth on this issue. But I think the Senator is right, the storage cost question is different.

Mr. SARBANES. If the Senator will yield, they got $2.5 billion—over $2 billion from us to buy military equipment. We gave them that $2 billion under a special exception to the nonproliferation law, the Pressler amendment, or, as the Senator from South Dakota pointed out earlier, called the Reagan-Bush amendment. I think the Senator was accurate in doing that. We gave them this money in order to buy weaponry, not to go nuclear. And the premise upon which the money was given was that they would not go nuclear.

They took the money and went nuclear anyhow. That is the problem, and that is why President Bush finally, in 1990 said:

> I cannot do this certification anymore, in terms of waiving the law, because I cannot waive the law because I cannot certify that Pakistan does not possess a nuclear explosive device.

So they took their money and they went nuclear anyhow.

I would like to raise a question, why does Pakistan not give us back the money which they took on the premise that they would not go nuclear, since they have since gone nuclear?

Mr. BROWN. I want to assure the Senator, if he is successful in this, he has a lot of other countries we want him to talk to in that area, and could well balance the budget if we move in that area.

Let me respond to the Senator's first question because I think he raises—the Senator is an expert in this area and I think all of us value his counsel. Specifically, he is pointing out as to why assistance may have been offered to Pakistan through the 1980's. My view is a bit different. And by stating that, I do not mean to compare my expertise to that of the Senator. But let me, at least, share what my view is of the primary motivation of why the United States offered military equipment during that period.

Members may remember that the Soviet Union and the cold war had reached an intense point. At that period of time, which the Senator described, the Soviet Union had invaded Afghanistan. As all Members know, they are neighbors next to Pakistan. Pakistan played a critical role in helping the Afghans resist the invasion and turn back the Soviet tide. They did so for their own interest in protecting their country. But they also did so at great peril to their nation, and several Soviet leaders specifically contacted the Pakistani leadership and threatened their very existence as a country if they continued to provide that. They never flinched. They never backed down.

When we needed them, when we really needed them, they were there for us. I do not dispute in any way the suggestions that there are problems and that their government at the time was not truthful in some regards.

But, Mr. President, I think we would be remiss to think that the aid that we gave them during that period was solely to urge them not to have a nuclear program. I think the aid we gave to them was preliminarily related to our own survival and our own interest and our own hope that the Soviet expansionism could be stopped, and they stood up for it. They put their neck on the line. And when you are half a world away from the United States and right next to the Soviet Union, that takes guts.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I had risen earlier to see if there was any chance of getting a time agreement on this amendment. There are a number of Senators apparently who want to speak.

Mr. GLENN. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

Mr. GLENN. We thought we were making some progress a little while ago, as the Senator from Michigan said a little while ago out in the lobby. And

I understood that we were going to have some language drawn up, and we had all agreed to determine if we could have an agreement on. The next thing I know this was going on with the Senator from Colorado on the floor presenting it.

I think just from what has happened here so far, we see this is a very, very complex issue. There was a report out of the Washington Post yesterday morning that because of MTCR violations, we should put more sanctions on Pakistan. He is right here if we want to have an executive session. I am not saying it is true. I think I would recommend that we go with the tone set by the Senator from Michigan a few moments ago. This claims that the MTCR has been violated. There is no doubt about it. This is only one item.

I have a whole file full of things that I was going to talk about on the floor if this came up. The Senator is not guaranteed that we will bring up the arms matter later on. This is just dealing with the economic matters here. But I think in the context of this particular bill that we are on here, the defense authorization bill, this is an extremely complex matter, and I could not personally agree to any time agreement on it or even give an estimate of the number of hours we would have to talk about it. This is extremely complex.

I am happy to have this brought up at a separate time and go into executive session and go into all of these things and get the same intelligence reports that some of us have been into, as I know other Members have at the agency, or whatever. But this is not something that is going to be solved I think on this.

I would have to object to any time agreement. I hate to do that. I do not like to delay. But this is a very serious matter.

Let me just add one other thing, if I might. The Senator from Maryland talked about waivers. He did not even get into them. I have nine specific waivers where we went into things for Pakistan. Each one of those should be the subject of thorough discussion here on the floor. I would be glad to go into them tonight, if you want to. But I do not think we can make any agreement for time on this at all.

Mr. DOLE. I would be happy to yield. It seems rather obvious to me that we are not going to get a time agreement. It is a very serious matter. I am not suggesting there should be. I am trying to find out if it is possible. If not, then I would hope we could have some other disposition.

Is the Senator from Iowa a supporter of the amendment?

Mr. HARKIN. This Senator is supportive of the BROWN amendment. I would like to speak on it. I feel very strongly about it.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the majority leader yield so I can put one quote in the RECORD, because I think it is very important to get the context of this correct.

The Senator from Colorado suggested that the purpose of the aid was not to dissuade them from acquiring a nuclear explosive device. I simply want to quote from letters to the Congress from President Reagan and President Bush who said:

> The proposed United States assistance program for Pakistan remains extremely important in reducing the risk that Pakistan will develop and possess such a device. I am convinced that our security relationship and assistance program are the most effective means available for us to dissuade Pakistan from acquiring nuclear explosive devices. Our assistance program is designed to help Pakistan address its substantial legitimate security needs, thereby both reducing incentives and creating disincentives for Pakistani acquisition of nuclear explosives.

So that was clearly the rationale. The nonproliferation laws would have banned any aid to Pakistan. The Pressler amendment provided an exception to that. The rationale for doing that was to try to dissuade Pakistan from going nuclear, and they took almost $3.5 billion as part of that deal and went nuclear anyhow.

So, finally, in 1990, President Bush says, ''I cannot do this waiver anymore. I cannot make this certification.'' And that is when the assistance stopped.

I have a number of other quotes from high officials in both the Reagan and the Bush Administrations during this period making exactly this point in terms of the rationale for this.

I thank the majority leader.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. I wonder if I might suggest that we set aside this amendment, and the discussion that was going on beforehand might be continued either tonight or tomorrow. There apparently is some progress being made with all the people involved. If that is satisfactory with the principal sponsor of the amendment, I would suggest we set this amendment aside and that perhaps there could be a further discussion. If they cannot agree, it would be back before us.

Would that be satisfactory?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent that amendment be set aside.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the majority leader tell us when we are going to get back to this? I have not had the chance to talk about this amendment. I feel very strongly about it. It seems like the other side wants to bash Pakistan. They have had their chance.

Mr. DOLE. There are a number of people who support the amendment. But I think just in the interest of trying to move along here, it is 11:30 p.m., and we need to decide what to do with the other 61 amendments that are directly related to the Defense Department authorization bill. This is not directly related, and I assume the others here, for the most part, are.

So I would have no objection if we are going to be here for some time—the Senator, even if it is set aside, could still speak to the amendment.

So if there is no objection, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am glad it is going to be set aside. I question whether this amendment is appropriate on this bill. This bill is a defense authorization bill. This amendment appears to be one that would be pertinent to the foreign operations bill; in other words, the foreign affairs bill. It seems to me that, if we are going to bring up all kinds of amendments that do not concern this defense bill, we could be here days and days. I think the amendment ought to be withdrawn and brought up later on an appropriate bill, and that would be a foreign affairs bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank the chairman. I think probably it is more appropriate, in the long run, on the State Department authorization bill. But if we are unable to get that, it will be on the foreign operations bill later on.

But I think that Senator BROWN has agreed to set it aside, and have further discussion with those who are directly involved. And I know it is very, very controversial and very, very complicated. I have learned a lot just listening to the debate on the floor.

I hope we can maybe have an opportunity to discuss that tomorrow and see whether it will be resolved.

Mr. President, I have been handed by the Democratic leader a revised list of the amendments on that side. As I understand, the total number is 61, and I think 5 of the 61 have already been cleared, others are in the clearance process as I understand it. I do not know how many more might be in the process, but maybe another 5 or 10.

Mr. NUNN. My guess is of the 61 there are probably around 15 or more that have been cleared or are in the process of being cleared. And I also would say that there are a number of those 61 that I do not believe will require a vote. I think a number of those will disappear. So I really think we are talking about a list that is much shorter than 61.

Mr. DOLE. I think what I need to determine, because we have to decide what course of action to follow—if it is the intent not to let us pass the bill, then there is not much reason in trying to even take up the 61 or any of the 61 amendments.

But it would seem to me, if we are serious about this bill, if we intend to pass this bill and we come back to it tomorrow after disposition of the Postal, Treasury bill, then I would be prepared to recess and take up Postal, Treasury, come in at 8:30 and have opening statements. Then at 9 o'clock we will have the first amendment offered under a 3-hour time agreement.

But I might ask the distinguished Democratic leader, is there a possibility we can finish this bill tomorrow?

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I can say in all sincerity, it is not my wish to make the job, which is extremely difficult for the majority leader, any more difficult than it already is. He has been fair, and I respect his desire to want to finish this bill.

Let me be as candid and as frank as I can. We have had debate on some very consequential amendments in the last couple of days. On the basis of the outcome of those amendments, frankly, a lot of Members on this side believe there ought to be more discussion, more debate. We have been in consultation with the White House, and I have just received a letter from the assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, Anthony Lake. I only read the last sentence:

> Unless the unacceptable missile defense provisions are deleted or revised and other changes are made to the bill bringing it more in line with the administration policy, the President's advisers will recommend that he veto the bill.

I know that for a lot of Members who would like to see a conclusion to this bill, perhaps there are other ways and other opportunities to debate this issue but for many of our Members this is a very, very critical issue. There are other amendments. We are $7 billion over budget, and a lot of our Senators would like the opportunity to see if we can bring that cost down. They are concerned about the fact that this is $7 billion more than the administration requested. And while I am somewhat apologetic for the fact that we are having a debate here at 11:30 at night, just in the last 20 minutes I have asked my staff to share with me what has happened in past years.

In 1989, we spent 7 days and 105 amendments on this bill; in 1990, it was 105 amendments; in 1992, we spent 5 days with 87 amendments; in 1993, 5 days and 105 amendments; last year we spent 5 days on this bill with 123 amendments. We have been on this bill for a couple half days, and then yesterday virtually for the whole day, and today.

And so, Mr. President, again let me reiterate it is not my desire to complicate the life of the majority leader, but I must say in all honesty that we have some real serious problems with this bill. There are a lot of Senators who believe that we ought to debate it a lot longer—I am not suggesting necessarily a filibuster, but they believe there are some very significant issues that still have not been addressed to our satisfaction.

So we are not inclined at this point, frankly, to want to accommodate the majority leader, as much as I would like to personally, because of the concerns that people have for the legislation. And that is as frank an answer as I can give the majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. I appreciate that. I know that—at least I suspected there were a couple of amendments here that troubled the administration and troubled some Members on the other side. But, of course, the bill has to go to conference. Obviously, the President has great leverage in conference—the administration—because there are not enough votes to override a veto. The ABM vote was 51 to 48, 49. The other vote was five or six votes apart.

So it would seem to me what we ought to do is go through the process, go to conference, and then the President can decide when it comes out of conference to veto the bill. But to tell us at half the way, unless they get everything they want, they are going to veto the bill, in my view is not the wise course to follow.

There are a number of Members on both sides of the aisle who have spent weeks and weeks and months and months on this legislation, and they have been in good faith. We were going along at a pretty good pace, thought we would see the finish line, and then someone moved it. And I do not suggest that that has not happened before. We had 190-some amendments this morning. Now we are down to 61. So it would appear either they have disappeared or we have disposed of 130 of them, and many of these are in the process of being disposed of.

Even though all of these are disposed of, if we agreed right now that the two managers, which I would not object to, get up and say, ''We accept all these amendments,'' then could we go to third reading?

Mr. DASCHLE. We would not be prepared to go to third reading.

Mr. DOLE. I think that answers my question. There is no desire to pass this bill. And I do not fault the Democratic leader. I have probably stood on this floor in the same position, saying, ''We do not want to pass this bill.'' But I would like to pass some bill.

I know there are a lot of frustrations about August, and I put in the adjournment resolution as honestly as I could that we would like to be out of here by August 19. I would like to be out of here before August 19, like next weekend. But I do not believe that the majority leader has any choice, if we cannot complete our work by next Friday—and that would be this bill, the Treasury, Postal bill, DOD appropriations bill, and some disposition of welfare, and the Interior Appropriations bill—than to say we will be here the week after next. I may be the only one here, but we will be here, because it seems to me that this is very important business.

I hope the President will let us at least go through the legislative process, have the conference and then make a decision. But apparently that will not happen. So I think the only—this is sort of a finite list of 61 amendments? There will not be any, cannot be any additions, I guess.

Mr. DASCHLE. Under the unanimous consent agreement, as I understand it, there would not be any additional, but that is a finite list.

Mr. DOLE. So could I send this to the desk and say this is the new—do we have any amendments on this side? Are there any amendments to add to this?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, if I could just clarify, that is as finite a list—I do not think we would be prepared to enter into a unanimous consent agreement because, frankly, we cannot even reach a couple Senators whose other amendments may or may not be added to that list. But I wanted to accommodate the majority leader as best as I could and to give him the most accurate information.

Having had the consultations I have had with virtually all of the Members of our caucus—there were some we could not talk to, could not reach—61 is my best estimate. But I would want to protect Members that I have not had the opportunity to talk with, so I would not be prepared tonight to enter into any agreement that would preclude others from, who were originally protected from being protected after this list had been submitted. Mr. President, I made reference to the letter from Mr. Lake. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 4, 1995.

Hon. THOMAS A. DASCHLE,
Democratic Leader, United States Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LEADER: On July 31, the White House issued a Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) on S. 1026, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996. In that SAP, the Administration warned that S. 1026 raises serious constitutional, national security, budget and management concerns, and that the President will not support the bill unless those concerns are addressed.

As I made clear in my remarks to the Democratic Senators policy lunch on Tuesday, first and foremost among our concerns about the bill are the unacceptable provisions relating to the ABM Treaty and National Missile Defense (NMD). In our view, these provisions, if enacted into law, would effectively abrogate the ABM Treaty by mandating development for deployment by 2003 of a non-compliant, multi-site NMD and unilaterally imposing a solution to the ongoing negotiations with Russia on establishing a demarcation under the Treaty between ABMs and theater missile defenses (TMDs). The effect of such actions would in all likelihood be to prompt Russia to terminate implementation of the START I Treaty and shelve ratification of START II, thereby leaving thousands of warheads in place that otherwise would be removed from deployment under these two treaties. For this reason, Secretary Christopher, Secretary Perry and General Shalikashvili have made their objections to these provisions clear in separate letters to the Senate.

On Thursday, the Senate voted on an amendment offered by Senator Levin and cosponsored by Senator Nunn and many other Democrats that would have struck the ABM and NMD provisions in the bill that are the most objectionable. On behalf of the President, I would like to commend Senator Levin, Senator Nunn, and all the other Democratic and Republican Senators who

made such cogent speeches in support of the amendment. Regrettably, it was defeated 51–49.

I understand that debate on S. 1026 will continue today and perhaps into next week and that other amendments relating to ABM and NMD may be offered. I hope that our serious concerns about these issues as well as others outlined in the Statement of Administration Position may yet be addressed. But let me be clear: unless the unacceptable missile defense provisions are deleted or revised and other changes are made to the bill bringing it more in line with administration policy, the President's advisors will recommend that he veto the bill.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY LAKE,
Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I do not know of any other alternative than to file cloture, which probably the Democrats have made a decision they do not want this bill to pass and that we cannot obtain cloture, but I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 1026, the Department of Defense authorization bill:

Bob Dole, Strom Thurmond, John Warner, Bob Smith, R.F. Bennett, Spencer Abraham, D. Nickles, C.S. Bond, Trent Lott, Jon Kyl, Craig Thomas, Larry E. Craig, Connie Mack, Dan Coats, Bill Cohen, John McCain.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. So, Mr. President, I do not see any reason to keep my colleagues here any longer. But it is fairly clear to this Senator that for reasons stated by the Democratic leader, we will not complete action on this bill tonight. But it will be the intention of the majority leader that after, hopefully, disposition of the Treasury, Postal bill we will go back to this bill tomorrow afternoon.

There will be votes tomorrow. There will be a lot of votes tomorrow. I do not want anybody to leave town thinking, ''Oh, well, we have got that taken care of.'' But, again, let me say to my colleagues, I would hope that we could cooperate here in the next 4 our 5 days and try to get out of here for at least part of the August recess. And I know everybody has plans or would like to have plans. Everybody asks, ''Why can't we say now we can leave next Friday?'' This is a good reason why we cannot say we can leave next Friday. We could have finished this bill by this morning or tomorrow afternoon, but we are told that is not possible. If we took all these amendments we could not go to final passage.

It is pretty obvious that there may be enough Members on the other side to prevent us from obtaining cloture. And even if cloture is obtained, you have 30 hours. That would take some time.

So there will be no more votes this evening. And we will do our best to proceed tomorrow on the Treasury, Postal bill.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE OF VERMONT'S ENVIRONMENT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, one of the most important aspects of the quality of life in my native State of Vermont is the quality of our environment. We can swim in our lakes, fish in our streams, camp on public lands, hike through the woods, and breathe fresh air without risking our health. The quality of Vermont's environment is recognized nationally and drives much of the economy for us in Vermont.

Vermont's environmental quality depends on Federal environmental laws to set standards and fund cleanups—this is an undisputed fact. The Clean Air Act has reduced air lead levels by 99 percent, carbon dioxide emissions by 50 percent, sulfur dioxide by 40 percent, and acid rain chemicals by 27 percent. However, many cities have experienced ozone levels this summer that are twice the maximum healthy limit. Some Americans simply cannot take an afternoon walk without experiencing breathing troubles. Polluters do not have the right to deprive people of an afternoon walk, and as a Senator from a State downwind of one of the country's biggest ozone generators in the country, New York City, I am concerned. Clearly, we have more work to do.

In 1970, 60 percent of Vermont's communities discharged raw sewage into the State's waterways and bacteria consumed so much oxygen that many of the State's streams could not support fish. Through the Clean Water Act and other efforts, we have provided at least secondary waste treatment facilities for all communities and reduced point-source phosphorus pollution by 80 percent. With the Department of Agriculture's help, more than 400 Vermont farmers have contributed a total of $5.8 million to match $13.4 million of Federal funding to reduce the phosphorus runoff from farms. On the other hand, 1,500 hazardous waste sites in Vermont threaten the groundwater for some of the 120,500 public and private wells, and the State recently had to issue a mercury warning for Vermont fish. We still have work to do to protect our children and our communities from water pollution.

Vermont's fish and wildlife populations are relatively healthy because of international wildlife treaties and domestic efforts to protect habitat in Vermont. Where we once had abandoned farms and woodlots during the Depression, we now have the Green Mountain National Forest—350,000 acres of habitat for black bears, songbirds, and even Atlantic salmon. In 1985 Vermont had its first nesting pair of peregrine falcons since the 1950's; last year 11 pairs fledged 31 peregrine chicks. Still, nine species of native mussels are threatened by the zebra mussel, and heavy metals such as cadmium have been found in moose and deer liver. Without constant vigilance, certain fish and wildlife populations may slip into decline as they have in other parts of the country.

I am proud to share these successes, and hope that others will join me in enjoying the fruits of our efforts to protect the environment. The results of our hard work have made Vermont a better place to live for families. Vermont's quality environment provides activities like swimming, snowmobiling, boating, fishing, hunting, hiking, and camping that keep us refreshed and entertained all year long. Many of these activities are Vermont traditions which have been passed from generation to generation. I do not want to give these up.

I also want to make people aware, however, of an effort to turn back the clock on these successes. There is a new four-part strategy in Congress to dismantle environmental protections in our great country. The antienvironment lobbyists and some Members of Congress are using indirect, backdoor efforts to gut the statutes that have helped us clean up and protect our environment. I want people to understand what the new majority is doing so that we can turn back these attacks.

The first step in this strategy is to cut the funding of environmental and natural resource agencies. This year alone, the House of Representatives cut the Fish and Wildlife Service by almost 25 percent, the National Biological Service by 30 percent, and the Environmental Protection Agency's [EPA] enforcement budget by 50 percent. Without officially repealing the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, or the Clean Air Act, the new majority has made it nearly impossible for the Government to carry out these goals.

Their second step is to create regulatory gridlock. The so-called Regulatory Reform Act forces agencies to do study after study, each one subject to lawsuits from well-financed corporate industries. The EPA estimates that the studies will require hundreds of new staff and delay new environmental rules by several years, if not indefinitely. By cutting the budget but increasing the workload, it is clear that some people want to tie the hands of the EPA so it is powerless to protect the environment. They are saying, ''Go ahead and pollute because we don't give a hoot.''