

AIDS education, the kind of education that would be used to promote homosexuality. And, believe me, it was going on.

This amendment passed the Senate 94 to 2. I certainly can think of no reason why this amendment, the pending one, should not pass by a similar margin. But if any Senator wishes, he or she can come by this desk and we can look at the rollcall of 7 or 8 years ago. We do have it.

The promotion of homosexual conduct as acceptable or permissible or just another lifestyle flies directly in the face of what a sound AIDS policy ought to be. Mr. President, 53 percent of AIDS cases, more than half of the AIDS cases in America, have come about through male/male sexual relations. This being true—and the Centers for Disease Control has documented it to be true—then why on Earth should any Federal money, even a penny, be used to promote activity that has proven to be the leading cause of AIDS?

Mr. President, I wish I had a nickel for every time I have come on this floor and implored Senators to treat the AIDS disease as a public health issue instead of a civil rights issue. But, judging from the clamor and shouting over the past several weeks, these words continue to be ignored—certainly in the media, and certainly by the AIDS activists. They have run up and down the corridors of the Senate, buttonholed Senators, and all the rest of it. We will see how effective they have been.

If this bill passes without any one of the amendments that I intend to offer, we will know something about the effectiveness of the AIDS lobbyists.

I am going to say it again and be through. AIDS is not a civil rights issue, it is a public health issue and a serious one, and the money ought to be spent in that regard, not for the promotion of homosexuality or the advocacy that homosexuality is just another lifestyle. The last thing Congress should do is to allow any of the American taxpayers' money to be used to promote the very behavior that is responsible for spreading this disease.

What homosexuals do behind closed doors is their own business. But they have no claim—none—on the taxpayers' money. This amendment simply prevents the use of tax money to portray homosexual conduct as acceptable or permissible. The Federal Government has no business financing the promotion of homosexuality, it never should, and as long as I am a Member of the Senate, I am going to be on my feet protesting the use of moneys in that way—or the misuse of it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I was trying to get a copy of the language that had been used. The Senator from North Carolina mentioned we had passed that before? He mentioned it had passed by a large vote before. I was

just wondering if it was the same language as in this, the exact same language?

I do not think anyone could quarrel with the language that would say none of the funds authorized under a title should be used to fund AIDS programs or to develop materials to promote, encourage, directly or indirectly, homosexuality or intravenous drug use. But I was uncertain about getting into a definition of homosexuality. But I clearly have no objection to say that no funds should be authorized to be used for promotion. If I may, I want to look at the language that we passed before.

Mr. HELMS. If the Senator, the manager of the bill, let me know if we can get the yeas and nays, to set this one aside, and make it one back-to-back rollcall vote at 6 o'clock.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is 20 minutes of. We have been interested in getting to this amendment. I was just handed this amendment. It is on a subject matter that I am hopeful that we can work through in terms of what I think would be an agreeable—may not be agreeable to all—but at least an approach which I think would achieve the stated objective but would not necessarily prohibit medical services, for example, to a targeted community. But quite frankly I did not have this. We just received this amendment, and I have no idea what the next amendment is. So as much as I would like to move this along, we could move along much faster if we did have an opportunity to examine the amendments prior to the time that they are addressed and called up.

Mr. President, we all agree that it is not the business of the Federal Government to promote or encourage any kind of sexual activities whether they are homosexual or heterosexual, and it is certainly not the business of Government to promote or encourage illegal activities such as drug use. I hold that view, as do 99 of my Senate colleagues, I am sure. But that is not to prohibit desperately needed funds for organizations on the front lines of this epidemic. The thrust of the amendment has been to deny funding to organizations that serve gay communities or HIV drug users, like the highly respected AIDS Action Committee in Boston or AIDS Atlanta. Over the years similar amendments have been offered to restrict the use of AIDS prevention funds under the theory that targeted AIDS education that acknowledges the existence of homosexuality or drug use somehow promotes such activity.

That is the nub of the concern that we would have, or at least I would in terms of the reaction to the Senator's amendment.

We have, as the Senator from Kansas pointed out, addressed this at other times. If we had had the opportunity to at least know that this was going to be up, we would have been able to be perhaps more relevant. But the thrust of this amendment has been to restrict

the use of any AIDS prevention funds under the theory that targeted AIDS education that acknowledges the existence of homosexuality or drug use somehow promotes such activity.

If you had an organization, for example, that is providing services, and that included volunteers, are you encouraging, are you promoting or are you not promoting? Are you effectively limiting the opportunities for those organizations that are attempting to try and deal with the public health issue? Are you curtailing their opportunities to have some kind of impact in a public health way?

I think this is the principal concern that we would have on this particular issue.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I appreciate being able to see a copy of what perhaps was before, which was an amendment on the appropriations bill, not the Ryan White legislation. And it did not have a definition in it either. Again, it was language designed to prohibit funds to be used for promotion activities. As I said, I certainly think there would be concurrence with that.

If the Senator from North Carolina wants the legislation in the amendment that he has presented to be voted on without any need of amending it, I certainly respect that and we will have an up-or-down vote. I will intend later on to offer an amendment which would be the same language as the Senator from North Carolina but without the definition part, and would suggest perhaps, if we want to go ahead with the second amendment, as the Senator says, we could have back-to-back votes.

Mr. HELMS. It is not necessary to get the yeas and nays yet on this pending amendment.

So we will lay that aside, if the Chair will permit us to do so, and I ask unanimous consent to do so.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator be good enough to yield for the purpose of a quorum call?

Mr. HELMS. Certainly.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. DORGAN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

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

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

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KOREAN WAR

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the 40th anniversary of the Korean war will

be celebrated in the Nation's capital, indeed in Korea, and in many other places this week. I was privileged to have a small and modest participation in that war as a member of the U.S. Marine Corps. I volunteered for a second period of active military service, having served briefly at the end of World War II.

The three of us in the Senate—as far as I know, there are only three who served in the Marines in Korea—are going to address the Senate in sequence over the next 3 days. It is my privilege to make brief remarks today. My understanding is that the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. GLENN, who was in Marine Corps aviation, will speak tomorrow, and on the third day our distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, Senator CHAFEE.

Mr. President, it is most fitting at this time to pause to reflect on the service and sacrifice of America's 5.7 million Korean war veterans and those from 21 other nations which made up a multinational force that responded to the call of freedom with the invasion by North Korea into the South Korean province.

I take great pride in having had the opportunity to have served in the U.S. Marine Corps. I entered service on October 3, having volunteered during the summer of 1950. I went to Quantico with a group of officers, most of whom had, like me, served for a brief period in World War II. And then eventually most of us saw service in Korea.

To go back historically, on June 25, 1950, the North Korean People's Army had invaded the Republic of Korea in a forceable effort allegedly to unify that landmass into a Communist state. The North Koreans swept over the 38th parallel and occupied Seoul, South Korea's capital, in a very short period of time.

The U.N. Security Council immediately called upon the free world to render assistance to the struggling South Korean Government. President Harry S. Truman, a very courageous President and one who was a strong foe of communism, saw this as an effort of communism to spread in the world, and immediately he responded to the U.N. call for assistance and ordered the 7th Fleet and the Far Eastern air units to support the South Korean military forces.

Truman's Far Eastern Commander, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, made it clear that only American ground forces could prevent the complete collapse of the Republic of Korea. The President agreed. And in early July American forces joined the South Korean military forces on land, sea and air, and in operations against the North Korean's People's Army. At the outbreak of the Korean war the U.S. Marine Corps was in the condition of less than full readiness.

Recalling that period of history very vividly, because having served for approximately 2 years in the Marine Corps Reserve prior to this, I was well aware, as were all other marines, that

our funds had been cut back severely in that period of time, and the readiness was at less than full state. That was because of 5 years of declining budgets. The Marine Corps' strength had dropped from nearly half-million men and women in 1945 to only 75,000 men and women in June 1950.

Nevertheless, Gen. Clifton B. Case, then Commandant of the Marine Corps, felt that the marines, many of whom were seasoned veterans of World War II, could effectively meet the challenge of battle. He therefore, together with the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Forrest D. Sherman, advised MacArthur that the 1st Marine Division would be ready for action whenever called.

General Case foresaw MacArthur's response and put his marines worldwide on alert. He recommended additionally a recall of Reserves in an effort to bring the Marine Corps' strength up. And how well I recall the first basic class of which I was a member in October 1950. They were all Reserves recalled to active duty, as I said, many having served for periods during World War II. Within a very brief period, the marines once again would be sailing across the Pacific to answer their Nation's call to arms to defend freedom.

Mr. President, as I rise to make these brief remarks today, I am reminded of those with whom I was privileged to serve who gave their full measure, who gave their life in the cause of freedom in that conflict.

I was, for a brief period, with a squadron in the 3rd Marine Air Wing, and eventually with an air group, Marine Air Group 33. And each day sorties were flown. And, regrettably, periodically a number did not return.

I shall recall one individual very well. His name was Captain Cole. Captain Cole had been a member of VMF 321, a marine squadron operating out of Anacostia, prior to its transformation to a helicopter base. We had been very close friends, as I likewise was a member of the Reserves in that squadron. Captain Cole was a school teacher. He had served in World War II but when his squadron, VMF 321 was called to active duty, he unhesitatingly responded and joined.

On November 11, 1951, by chance the airplane in which I was then an observer landed at an airfield where Captain Cole was stationed. And that was the last time I saw him. Four weeks later he was killed in the line of duty in Korea. And I am everlastingly grateful that his family has allowed me to hang in my office a picture of my dear friend, Captain Cole. I mention him only because there were many others, but he was an example of an American having come back from World War II, remaining in the Reserves so this country could be strong. Dedicating his life to teaching children. And unhesitatingly responding to the call of battle. I recently had the opportunity to meet with his son who was a

very young person at the time of his death. So that I could convey to him some of my recollections about his father.

Mr. President, I am privileged to join here in these remarks. And I look forward to hearing the remarks of two other veterans of that conflict, Senators GLENN and CHAFEE, who were far more active in the combat role than I. And who deserve the great respect for having made their contribution in this conflict in the cause of freedom.

I yield the floor. And I thank very much my colleagues for allowing me to make these brief remarks.

RYAN WHITE CARE REAUTHORIZATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry.

Are we back now on the Helms amendment?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. We would be. My understanding, Mr. President, is that there are some negotiations on the Democratic side of the aisle that are ongoing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the present time the Chair announces the Helms amendment No. 1854 has been set aside.

So we are simply on the bill.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I wanted to speak briefly.

First of all, in transition, let me thank the Senator from Virginia for his remarks. I did not mean to make such an abrupt transition from your very personal and powerful remarks. I apologize. Sometimes we rush so much we are impolite. I hope I was not.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I was unaware. I was totally absorbed in what I was saying. But I thank the Senator.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, this amendment, which I gather has been set aside, and I gather there are some negotiations going on, would set a prohibition on the use of Federal funds. And, as I look at this, community-based organizations—part of the definition would be the promotion or encouragement of certain activities—"No funds authorized to be appropriated under this act may be used to promote or encourage, directly or indirectly, homosexuality, intravenous drug use." Let me talk about "encourage, directly or indirectly, homosexuality." We went through this debate before, Mr. President, when we were talking about any activities in schools that would promote directly or indirectly homosexuality.