

Secretary of Defense is recommending that will be closed for the consideration of the Base Closing Commission.

Mr. President, this will make it very difficult, if not impossible, for the remaining nominees to the Base Closing Commission to be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. President, I view failure to move forward with the base closing process as an unconscionable act that will deprive the young men and women in the military today of their ability to defend this Nation's vital national security interests. We cannot spend money on bases and infrastructure which are no longer needed in light of the reduction of some 40 percent in the defense budget.

We have, in the words of former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Colin Powell, reduced our defense spending somewhere around 40 to 45 percent since 1985. At the same time, we have reduced our base infrastructure by some 10 to 15 percent.

We have gone through two painful rounds of base closings and now the third one, hopefully the last, will be facing us. If we do not move forward with this base closing process, we will not close bases in this country. We have proven that to anyone's satisfaction, which is why we went to the base closing process to start with.

Mr. President, there are people on both sides of the aisle and both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue who do not want to see this process move forward.

I believe that there is one egregious incident, for example, of a nominee, Gen. J.B. Davis, where incorrect information was spread around Hill offices which tied him to an organization that had considerable financial interests at many installations. I do not know who originated the memorandum setting out this flawed data, but it was further disseminated by consultants and others who somehow failed to check the facts of this matter.

But the primary fact is, Mr. President, if we do not move forward with the base closing process, we have forgotten several things. The cold war is over. The defense budget is small. We have excess infrastructure that needs to be closed. The BRAC will go on regardless of Senate action, but will suffer in quality if the names are not brought to a vote immediately. I believe my constituents and our national security interests deserve the best possible Commission we can provide. I hope that all my colleagues will agree with that.

Mr. President, if we do not approve the nominees, then former Senator Alan Dixon, who is the Chairman of the Commission, by law must proceed with the process. That will leave the review of the entire base closing proposals in the hands of one individual. He will have only one choice and that will be to rubberstamp whatever the Defense Department has recommended.

I am convinced that that is not what the Congress had in mind when we set

up the BRAC process. And I am convinced that the American people will thereby be shortchanged and bases may be closed that do not need to be closed and bases will be kept open that do not need to be kept open.

Mr. President, I think that it is clear that the fact that one of the names was removed almost without cause—or at least for some period of time there was no information—from the nominating list by the White House contributed to this problem significantly. But I think there are ways that we could have worked it out, maybe, by withholding one name nominated by the other party as well as one nominated by the Republicans, and the other names sent forward, we could have worked effectively in that fashion.

I am convinced that if we do not move forward today on these nominations, it places the entire concept of base closing in significant jeopardy.

Mr. President I hope that the leadership will reconsider their decision on this issue and move forward today with the nominees for the Base Closing Commission for the sake of national security and for the sake of young men and women that are in our military today.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from North Dakota what remaining time I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### WELFARE REFORM

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I do not intend to use all the time.

I just wanted to observe that the Senator was wondering whether we felt the election meant anything about welfare reform. Well, there will not be that kind of debate, because we will not have that kind of debate. Most of us feel we should reform the welfare system.

My point was not the welfare system. My point was that I do not believe the last election was a message from the American people that hunger among our children is not a national priority, nor would I expect the Senator from Arizona would interpret the election that way, either.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of my friend from North Dakota. I wish that he had taken some measures during the 1986-94 period when he was in the majority to bring forward meaningful welfare reform of the welfare system. And since he did not, this side of the aisle will, both from the other body as well as from this one.

I thank the Chair and I yield back the remainder of my time.

#### RAY NATTER

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, since 1989, Ray Natter has been the Republican general counsel on the Senate Banking Committee. Ray came to the

Senate in 1987 after mastering the complicated area of banking law as special counsel to the House Banking Committee and senior counsel at the Federal Reserve. Prior to coming to the Hill, Ray also spent 10 years as a legislative attorney at the Congressional Research Service. Without a doubt, Ray knows banking law and the legislative process.

Ray worked on several important issues in the last Congress, including interstate banking, fair trade in financial services and community development banking. In previous years, he had a significant impact on various important pieces of legislation, including the drafting of the Resolution Trust Corporation Completion Act, which helped end the savings and loan crisis.

When Ray worked for Chairman Garn he not only wrote significant portions of FIRREA and FDICIA, he also worked on the important issue of lender liability, which was particularly critical to bankers in my State.

Regardless of how busy he was or how many major banking bills Ray was working on, he always had time for the problems that I needed help with. Sometimes New Mexicans had ideas for legislation that I would ask Ray to review. Sometimes I would have a constituent who felt the RTC needed a little congressional oversight. Ray always gave me good counsel and advised me of all the pertinent laws.

When I was new on the Banking Committee, Ray helped me and my staff navigate the complicated world of financial institution regulation. He was always knowledgeable, accurate and willing to give his time to ensure that we became as well-informed as he was on these difficult issues.

I am not going to serve on the Banking Committee this Congress. I would have preferred to stay on the Banking Committee but too many others wanted an opportunity to participate under Chairman D'AMATO's leadership.

I want to thank Ray for his 8 years of service to the Senate Banking Committee, three chairman, and through passage of numerous public laws. Ray will be joining the staff of the general counsel of the Comptroller of the Currency. The Senate will miss Ray's expertise and his willingness to help members of the Banking Committee and the Senate. I have no doubt that the Comptroller's Office will recognize immediately that they have landed one of the best banking lawyers in Washington.

#### THE 1995 BIRD HUNTING SEASON

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, on the Senate floor today, one of my colleagues challenged my concern shared by thousands of Minnesotans that S. 219, a bill that would create a moratorium on new regulations, would have the effect of limiting or eliminating the 1995 migratory bird hunting season. I take strong exception to my colleague's comments and will continue to

fight to protect this cherished annual Minnesota event.

The divergence in our two views apparently comes down to this: The junior Senator from Texas apparently believes that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's annual rulemaking process required by current law to open the hunt fits under some exclusion in S. 219 for routine administrative matters. I see no such exclusion.

Presumably, the language in S. 219 that my colleague thinks exempts the annual migratory bird hunting rulemaking from the strictures of the moratorium is found in the section which excludes "any agency action that the head of the agency certifies is limited to repealing, narrowing, or streamlining a rule, regulation, or administrative process, \* \* \* or otherwise reducing regulatory burdens \* \* \*." Clearly, the duck hunting rulemaking does not "repeal[], narrow[], or streamlin[e] \* \* \* [an] administrative process." In my view, reading this language to exempt the duck hunting rulemaking is forced, at best.

I might point out that my colleague is from a southern State, where the normal duck hunting season opens later than it does in Minnesota. If the Fish and Wildlife Service's estimated best-case scenario proves correct, S. 219 would serve to delay the necessary rulemaking, and thus the opening of the season in Minnesota, by no less than 30 days. Since Minnesotans do the majority of their hunting at the local shoot early in the season—beginning around the beginning of October—before the local ducks fly south, such a delay would effectively cancel this part of the season. On the other hand, in Texas the regular duck season opens in mid-to-late November. Therefore, the Texas season may not be as affected by the delay in the rulemaking process.

If S. 219 becomes law without being changed to clearly exempt the 1995 duck hunting rulemaking from the moratorium, here is a possible—perhaps even likely—scenario: The Fish and Wildlife Service proceeds, as it has been, with rulemaking action to open the 1995 season on time. Somebody opposed to duck hunting sues to stop the hunt—that's right, the moratorium bill also allows lawsuits for people adversely affected by an agency violation of the moratorium. The whole thing winds up in court.

Yesterday, I introduced a bill to protect the 1995 hunting season from S. 219's moratorium provision. If the sponsors of S. 219 do not mean to threaten the 1995 duck hunt, then why don't they come on board my bill? I say S. 219 is perfectly clear—it would negatively impact the 1995 season in Minnesota.

So I challenge the sponsors of S. 219 to ask the Governmental Affairs Committee to adopt explicit language exempting the 1995 duck hunting season rulemaking from the moratorium. The language of my bill would do that nicely. If they would just fix the problem

they created in the moratorium bill, then this whole issue would go away. If it is not the intent of the sponsors of S. 219 to impact the 1995 duck hunting season, then surely they should have no objection to my request.

#### WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES!

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, for nearly 3 years I have reported to the Senate the exact total of the Federal debt as of the close of business the previous day.

This debt has been run up by the liberal big-spenders in Congress.

Mr. President, as of the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, February 22, the Federal debt stood at exactly \$4,835,998,510,879.83, meaning that on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,357.53 as his or her share of the Federal debt.

Mr. President, a little over 2 years ago—January 5, 1993—the debt stood at \$4,167,872,986,583.67—\$15,986.56 for every American. During the 103d Congress the Federal debt increased by more than \$6 billion.

The point is that so many politicians talk a good game at home about bringing the Federal debt under control, but support bloated spending bills when they get back to Washington.

#### TRIBUTE TO FRED DALLIMORE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to pay tribute, today, to a native son of Nevada, Fred Dallimore. Fred is completing his 26th year, as a baseball coach, at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. He has served as the head coach for the last 22 years. His career is a distinguished one. Under his guidance, UNLV has made 6 NCAA appearances and has had 16 winning seasons. The 728 career victories he has attained ranks him 36th among the NCAA all-time winningest division I coaches. More than 80 young men, coached by Fred, have advanced to professional baseball. Several have made it to the major leagues including the San Francisco Giants, Matt Williams, a Nevadan from Carson City.

Fred's success at UNLV is the result of dedication, loyalty, and a lot of hard work. Over the years it was not unusual to see Fred out on Roger Barnson Field mowing the grass, dragging and watering the field, and performing every duty necessary to prepare the field for practice and games. The brand new Earl E. Wilson Baseball Stadium at Barnson Field is a state-of-the-art facility made possible by a gift from the Wilson estate. It is also the culmination of a dream come true for Fred.

Fred comes from a long line of native Nevadans. He was born in Reno, NV on October 21, 1944. He attended Reno High School where he was an all around athlete lettering in football and baseball. An All State pitcher, in his senior year, he led Reno to the State AAA

baseball championship. During his 4 years at the University of Nevada, Reno he earned All West Coast and All Far West honors as a left handed pitcher. His 11-1 record his senior year earned him All American honors as chosen by the American Association of Collegiate Baseball Coaches, Player of the Year, as selected by the San Francisco Examiner and the Sierra Nevada Sportswriters and Broadcaster Athlete of the Year. The University of Nevada, Reno honored him in 1982 by inducting him into the UNR Athletic Hall of Fame. In 1994 UNLV honored him by inducting his 1980 baseball team into the UNLV Athletic Hall of Fame.

Fred and his wife Alice are the proud parents of two children, Jamie and Brian.

Fred is a husband, father, teacher, and coach. I am proud to have him as a friend.

#### COMMENDING THE CENTENNIAL OF THE CHIROPRACTIC PROFESSION

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the chiropractic profession which was founded on September 18, 1895, and is celebrating 100 years of providing chiropractic services to Americans across the country.

The chiropractic profession was founded in Davenport, IA, when the first chiropractic adjustment was performed in an office building on a janitor named Harvey Lillard. One hundred years later, the chiropractic profession is now recognized by Congress which included chiropractic care under Medicare and authorized the commissioning of chiropractors as officers in the military.

Today, the chiropractic profession is practiced by doctors throughout the world, including 50,000 chiropractic physicians throughout the United States. As the number of chiropractors continues to grow, so do the standards in chiropractic education, research, and practice. This has led to broadening acceptance of the benefits of chiropractic health care by the public and the health care community.

According to health care experts, as many as 80 percent of Americans will suffer back pain at some point in their lives. Low back problems are the most common health complaints experienced by working Americans today. For this reason, every year millions of Americans choose chiropractic health care for the restoration and maintenance of their health. For many who suffer from pain, chiropractic care is a natural method of alleviation that does not require the use of drugs or surgery. Chiropractors around the country have made and continue to make a significant contribution to the health and welfare of many people whose lives would not be the same without their services.

On March 18, members of the chiropractic profession will gather in Las