

vote or two necessary to pass this amendment.

So, Mr. President, I am very sincere in saying I think this is probably the most important vote we have had in decades. It is unfortunate it did not pass today. It did not fail for a lack of effort or leadership on behalf of Senator DOLE. He showed great patience and, I think, great leadership. I also wish to compliment Senator HATCH and Senator CRAIG for the hours and hours that they spent on the floor. It is just unfortunate we were not successful.

I hope that the American people help us succeed, not just for Republicans in the Senate, not just for the idea of a balanced budget but really succeed for American taxpayers, for our children. People should not be confused about claims that, "I would vote for that except I want to protect the Social Security trust funds."

That is one of the most absurd arguments made on the floor of the Senate. How can they protect Social Security trust funds which do not exist? The Social Security trust fund is a falacy. There are no trust funds. There is not a bank account where any person in America can go look at the billions of dollars accumulating there. The trust fund is full of IOU's. And very soon, perhaps by the year 2013, we are going to be paying out more than is coming in.

At that point it is assumed that we will start cashing in on the trust fund IOU's. But what is really there? There is nothing in the trust fund but an IOU. How do we pay off Government IOU's? We borrow more money. By the year 2013, we are going to be paying more in social security benefits more than we take in from social security payroll taxes, and for each IOU we cash in to pay benefits we are going to have to borrow to pay off the IOU. That will put an enormous burden on younger generations.

I think my colleagues who say they voted against this amendment to protect the trust funds do not understand that there are no real trust funds, there is no bank account, there is no fund where money is actually accumulating. There is just a Government IOU, and that Government IOU is going to be paid for like we pay other Government IOU's. It is going to be paid for with additional borrowing.

Maybe that was the political cover they needed to excuse them from voting against this amendment, but it is very deceptive and very misleading. I think we have to be truthful with the American people.

Again, those same people who voted "no" today voted "yes" last year, and we had no special protection for social security. We had no such exemption for Social Security. I hope that the people will speak out loud and clear to their elected officials, and maybe we can reverse the result that we had on the floor today.

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. 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.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S LEADERSHIP IN REDUCING THE NUCLEAR THREAT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, yesterday, in a speech before the Nixon Center For Peace and Freedom's policy conference held here in Washington, President Clinton spoke eloquently about America's leadership role in the post-cold war era and the importance of America remaining engaged in world affairs. The President placed particular and appropriate emphasis on the need to continue to make strong efforts to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons.

The President's remarks regarding his concerns over the new isolationism creeping into the debate over American foreign policy and the outline of his ambitious agenda to reduce the international nuclear threat are especially significant for members of the Senate. In the coming weeks we will be beginning debate on major foreign policy issues and may vote this year on ratification of the START II treaty as well as consider the Chemical Weapons Convention.

As President Clinton has rightly pointed out, American leadership is vital to continued international efforts to promote peace and reduce the threat of nuclear weapons. Since the days when President Truman began American efforts to curtail the threat of nuclear war, every American President has worked to reduce that threat to world peace. President Clinton has sought to advance that goal and exploit the additional possibilities for peace and prosperity provided by the end of the cold war.

There have been some notable successes. For the first time in a generation, no Russian missiles are targeted on American cities. Under the START I treaty negotiated by President Bush and placed into force by President Clinton, the United States and Russia are dismantling thousands of nuclear weapons. Former Soviet republics that were potential nuclear powers have now pledged to rid their countries of nuclear weapons.

This year President Clinton has started a vigorous program to reduce the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction. He has called for an indefinite world-wide extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. And he has urged the Senate to quickly ratify the START II treaty, and the Chemical Weapons Convention to ban poison gas. He has promised to push for conclusion of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and to fight for a global ban on the pro-

duction of nuclear material for weapons.

The President's efforts to keep America engaged as the world's leader in the pursuit of peace and in reducing the threat of nuclear weapons are of vital importance to the national security of the United States and deserve the support of every American.

I commend his remarks to my colleagues' attention, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE NIXON CENTER FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM POLICY CONFERENCE

The President. To Tricia and John Taylor, and all the people from the Nixon Center; our distinguished guests from Germany and from Russia; of course, to Henry Kissinger—I was thinking when he said we both spoke with accents, judging from the results of the last election, his native country is still claiming him more than mine is claiming me. (Laughter.) but I'm a big one for reconciliation. (Laughter.) And there's plenty of time to achieve it.

I am honored to be here tonight. Just a month before he passed away, President Nixon wrote me the last letter I received from him about his last trip to Russia. I told some people at the time that it was the best piece of foreign policy writing I had received, which angered my staff but happened to be the truth. (Laughter.) And as with all of our correspondence and conversations, I was struck by the rigor of his analysis, the energy of his convictions, and the wisdom of the practical suggestions that he made to me.

But more than the specifics of the letter, which basically argued for the imperative of the United States continuing to support political and economic reform in Russia, I was moved by the letter's larger message—a message that ran throughout Richard Nixon's entire public life and all of his prolific writings. President Nixon believed deeply that the United States simply could not be strong at home unless we were strong and prepared to lead abroad.

And that made a big impression on me. When I was running for President in 1992, even though there was this little sticker up on the wall of my campaign headquarters that said, "It's the economy, stupid," I always said in every speech that we had to have two objectives. We had to restore the American Dream for all of our people, but we also had to make sure that we move into the next century still the strongest nation in the world, and the world's greatest force for peace and freedom and democracy.

Tonight I want to talk about the vital tradition of American leadership and our responsibilities, those which Henry Kissinger mentioned and those which President Nixon recognized so well. Our mission especially I want to discuss—to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons.

Today if we are going to be strong at home and lead abroad, we have to overcome what we all recognize I think is a dangerous and growing temptation here in our own land to focus solely on the problems we face here in America. I want to focus on the problems we face here in America. I've tried to do it for the last two years. I look forward to working with this new Republican-led Congress in the next two. But not solely.

There is a struggle now going on between those of us who want to carry on the tradition of American leadership and those who would advocate a new form of American isolationism. A struggle which cuts curiously across both party and ideological lines. If we're going to continue to improve the security and prosperity of all our people, then the tradition of American leadership must prevail.

We live in a moment of hope. We all know that. The implosion of communism and the explosion of the global economy have brought new freedoms to countries on every continent. Free markets are on the rise. Democracy is ascendant. The slogan says, "after victory." Today, more than ever before, people across the globe do have the opportunity to reach their God-given potential. And because they do, Americans have new opportunities to reach theirs as well.

At the same time, the post-Cold War world has revealed a whole web of problems that defy quick or painless solutions—aggression of rogue states, transnational threats like overpopulation and environmental degradation, terrible ethnic conflicts and economic dislocation. But at the heart of all these complex challenges, I believe, lies an age-old battle—for power over human lives. The battle between the forces of freedom and tyranny, tolerance and repression, hope and fear. The same idea that was under attack by fascism and then by communism remains under attack today in different ways all across the world—the idea of the open society of free people.

American leadership is necessary for the tide of history to keep running our way, and for our children to have the future they deserve. Yet, there are some who would choose escapism over engagement. The new isolationists oppose our efforts to expand free trade through GATT or NAFTA through APEC and the Summit of the Americas. They reject our conviction that democracy must be nurtured with investment and support, a conviction that we are acting on from the former Soviet Union to South Africa. And some of them, being hypocritical, saying that we must trumpet the rhetoric of American strength; and then at the same time, they argue against the resources we need to bring stability to the Persian Gulf or to restore democracy to Haiti, or to control the spread of drugs and organized crime around the world, or even to meet our most elemental obligations to the United Nations and its peacekeeping work.

The new isolationists both on the left and the right would radically revise the fundamentals of our foreign policy that have earned bipartisan support since the end of World War II. They would eliminate any meaningful role for the United Nations which has achieved, for all of its problems, real progress around the world, from the Middle East to Africa. They would deny resources to our peacekeepers and even to our troops, and, instead, squander them on Star Wars. And they would refuse aid to the fledgling democracies and to all those fighting poverty and environmental problems that can literally destroy hopes for a more democratic, more prosperous, more safe world.

The new isolationists are wrong. They would have us face the future alone. Their approach would weaken this country, and we must not let the ripple of isolationism that has been generated build into a tidal wave.

If we withdraw from the world today, mark my words, we'll have to contend with the consequences of our neglect tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow. This is a moment of decision for all of us without regard to our party, our background or our accent. This is a moment of decision.

The extraordinary trend toward democracy and free markets is not inevitable. And as we have seen recently, it will not proceed easily in an even, uninterrupted course. This is hard work. And at the very time when more and more countries than ever before are working to establish or shore up their own freedom in their fragile democracies, they look to us for support. At this time, the new isolationists must not be allowed to pull America out of the game after just a few hours of debate because there is a modest price attached to our leadership. (Applause.)

We know now, as President Nixon recognized, that there must also be limits to America's involvement in the world's problems—limits imposed by clear-headed evaluation of our fundamental interests. We cannot be the world's policemen; we cannot become involved in every problem we really care about. But the choice we make must be rooted in the conviction that America cannot walk away its interests or its responsibilities.

That's why, from our first day in office, this administration has chosen to reach out, not retreat. From our efforts to open markets for America to support democracy around the world, to reduce the threat posed by devastating weapons and terrorists, to maintaining the most effective fighting force in the world, we have worked to seize the opportunities and meet the obligations of this moment.

None of this could have happened without a coalition of realists—people in both Houses of Congress and, importantly, people from both parties; people from coast to coast in our towns and cities and communities who know that the wealth and well-being of the United States depends upon our leadership abroad. Even the early leaders of our republic who went to great pains to avoid involvement in great power conflicts recognize not only the potential benefits, but the absolute necessity of engaging with the world.

Before Abraham Lincoln was elected President, our farmers were selling their crops overseas, we had dispatched the trade mission all the way to Japan trying to open new markets—some problems don't go away—(laughter)—and our Navy had already sailed every ocean. By the dawn of this century, our growing political and economic power already imposed a special duty on America to lead; a duty that was crystallized in our involvement in World War I. But after that war, we and the other great powers abandoned our responsibilities and the forces of tyranny and hatred filled the vacuum, as is well-known.

After the second world war, our wise leaders did not repeat that mistake. With the dawn of the Nuclear Age and the Cold War, and with the economies of Europe and Japan in shambles, President Truman persuaded an uncertain and weary nation, yearning to shift its energies from the front lines to the home front, to lead the world again.

A remarkable generation of Americans created and sustained alliances and institutions—the Marshall Plan, NATO, the United Nations, the World Bank, the IMF—the things that brought half a century of security and prosperity to America, to Europe, to Japan and to other countries all around the world. Those efforts and the special resolve and military strength of our own nation held tyranny in check until the power of democracy, the failures of communism, and the heroic determination of people to be free, consigned the Cold War to history.

Those successes would not have been possible without a strong, bipartisan commitment to American's leadership.

Senator Arthur Vandenburg's call to unite our official voice at the water's edge joined Republicans to Truman's doctrine. His im-

pact was all the more powerful for his own past as an isolationist. But as Vandenburg himself said, Pearl Harbor ended isolationism for any realist.

Today, it is Vandenburg's spirit that should drive our foreign policy and our politics. The practical determination of Senators Nunn and Lugar to help Russia reduce its nuclear arsenal safely and securely; the support from Speaker Gingrich and Leader Gephardt, from Chairman Livingston and Representative Obey for aid to Russia and the newly-independent states; the work of Senators Hatfield, Leahy and McConnell, and Chairman Gilman, and Representative Hamilton for peace in the Middle East; the efforts of Senator Warner to restructure our intelligence—all these provide strong evidence of the continuing benefits and vitality of leadership with bipartisanship.

If we continue to lead abroad and work together at home, we can take advantage of these turbulent times. But if we retreat, we risk squandering all these opportunity and abandoning our obligations which others have entrusted to us and paid a very dear price to bring to us in this moment in history.

I know that the choice to go forward in a lot of these areas is not easy in democracies at this time. Many of the decisions that America's leaders have to make are not popular when they're made. But imagine the alternative. Imagine, for example, the tariffs and barriers that would still cripple the world trading system for years into the future if internationalists coming together across party lines had not passed GATT and NAFTA. Imagine what the Persian Gulf region would look like today if the United States had not stepped up with its allies to stop Iraqi aggression. Imagine the ongoing reign of terror and the flood of refugees at our borders had we not helped to give democracy a second chance in Haiti. Imagine the chaos that might have ensued if we had not moved to help stabilize Mexico's economy. In each case, there was substantial and sometimes overwhelming majority opinion against what needed to be done at the moment. But because we did it, the world has a better chance at peace and freedom.

But above all now, I ask you to imagine the dangers that our children and grandchildren, even after the Cold War is over, still can face if we do not do everything we can to reduce the threat of nuclear arms, to curb the terrible chemical and biological weapons spreading around the world, to counter the terrorists and criminals who would put these weapons into the service of evil.

As Arthur Vandenburg asked at the dawn of the Nuclear Age, after a German V-1 attack had left London in flames and its people in fear, "How can there be isolation when men can devise weapons like that?"

President Nixon understood the wisdom of those words. His life spanned an era of stunning increases in humankind's destructive capacity, from the biplane to ballistic missiles, from mustard gas to mushroom clouds. He knew that the Atomic Age could never be won, but could be lost. On any list of his foreign policy accomplishments, the giant steps he took toward reducing the nuclear threat must stand among his greatest achievement. As President, I have acted on that same imperative.

Over the past two years, the United States has made real progress in lifting the threat of nuclear weapons. Now, in 1995, we face a year of particular decision in this era—a year in which the United States will pursue the most ambitious agenda to dismantle and fight the spread of weapons of mass destruction since the atom was split.

We know that ours is an enormously complex and difficult challenge. There is no single policy, no silver bullet, that will prevent or reverse the spread of weapons of mass destruction. But we have no more important task. Arms control makes us not only safer, but it makes us stronger. It is a source of strength. It is one of the most effective insurance policies we can write for the future of our children.

Our administration has focused on two distinct, but closely connected areas—decreasing and dismantling existing weapons, and preventing nations or groups from acquiring weapons of mass destruction, and the means to deliver them. We've made progress on both fronts.

As the result of an agreement President Yeltsin and I reached, for the first time in a generation Russian missiles are not pointed at our cities or our citizens. We've greatly reduced the lingering fear of an accidental nuclear launch. We put into force the START I Treaty with Russia that will eliminate from both our countries delivery systems that carry more than 9,000 nuclear warheads—each with the capacity to incinerate a city the size of Atlanta.

START I, negotiated by two Republican administrations and put into force by this Democratic administration, is the first treaty that requires the nuclear powers actually to reduce their strategic arsenal. Both our countries are dismantling the weapons as fast as we can. And thanks to a far-reaching verification system, including on-site inspections which began in Russia and the United States today, each of us knows exactly what the other is doing.

And, again, through the far-sighted program devised by Senators Nunn and Lugar, we are helping Russia and the other newly-independent states to eliminate nuclear forces in transport, safeguard and destroy nuclear weapons and material.

Ironically, some of the changes that have allowed us to reduce the world's stockpile of nuclear weapons have made our nonproliferation efforts harder. The breakup of the Soviet Union left nuclear materials dispersed throughout the newly-independent states. The potential for theft of nuclear materials, therefore, increased. We face the prospect of organized criminals entering the nuclear smuggling business. Add to this the volatile mix, the fact that a lump of plutonium the size of a soda can is enough to build a bomb, and the urgency of the effort to stop the spread of nuclear materials should be clear to all of us.

That's why from our first day in office we have launched an aggressive, coordinated campaign against international terrorism and nuclear smuggling. We are cooperating closely with our allies, working with Russia and the other new-independent states, improving security at nuclear facilities, and strengthening multilateral export controls.

One striking example of our success is Operation Sapphire, the airlift of nearly 600 kilograms of highly-enriched uranium—enough to make dozens of bombs from Kazakhstan to the United States for disposal. We've also secured agreements with Russia to reduce the uranium and plutonium available for nuclear weapons, and we're seeking a global treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons.

Our patient, determined diplomacy also succeeded in convincing Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty and give up the nuclear weapons left on their territory when the Soviet Union dissolved. One of our administration's top priorities was to assure that these new countries would become non-nuclear nations, and now we are also achieving that goal.

Because of these efforts, four potential suppliers of ballistic missiles—Russia, Ukraine, China and South Africa—have all agreed to control the transfer of these missiles and related technology, pulling back from the nuclear precipice has allowed us to cut United States defense expenditures for strategic weapons by almost two-thirds, a savings of about \$20 billion a year, savings which can be shifted to vital needs such as boosting the readiness of our Armed Forces, reducing the deficit, putting more police on our own streets. By spending millions to keep or take weapons out of the hands of our potential adversaries, we are saving billions in arms costs and putting it to better use.

Now, in this year of decision, our ambition for the future must be even more ambitious. If our people are to know real lasting security, we have to redouble our arms control, nonproliferation and antiterrorism efforts. We have to do everything we can to avoid living with the 21st century version of fallout shelters and duck-and-cover exercises to prevent another World Trade Center tragedy.

In just four days we mark the 25th anniversary of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Nothing is more important to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons than extending the treaty indefinitely and unconditionally. And that's why I've asked the Vice President to lead our delegation to the NPT conference this April and to work as hard as we can to make sure we succeed in getting that indefinite extension.

The NPT is the principal reason why scores of nations do not now possess nuclear weapons; why the doomsayers were wrong. One hundred and seventy-two nations have made NPT the most widely subscribed arms limitation treaty in history for one overriding reason—it's in their self-interest to do so. Non-nuclear weapon states that sign on to the treaty pledge never to acquire them. Nuclear weapons states vow not to help others obtain nuclear weapons, to facilitate the peaceful uses of atomic energy and to pursue nuclear arms control and disarmament—commitments I strongly reaffirm, along with our determination to attain universal membership in the treaty.

Failure to extend NPT indefinitely could open the door to a world of nuclear trouble. Pariah nations with rigid ideologies and expansionist ambitions would have an easier time acquiring terrible weapons, and countries that have chosen to forego the nuclear option would then rethink their position; they would certainly be tempted to reconsider that decision.

To further demonstrate our commitment to the goals of the treaty, today I have ordered that 200 tons of fissile material, enough for thousands of nuclear weapons, be permanently withdrawn from the United States nuclear stockpile. Two hundred tons of fissile material that will never again be used to build a nuclear weapon.

A second key goal of ours is ratifying START II. Once in effect, that treaty will eliminate delivery systems from Russian and American arsenals that carry more than 5,000 weapons. The major reductions under START I, together with START II, will enable us to reduce two-thirds the number of strategic warheads deployed at the height of the Cold War. At my urging, the Senate has already begun hearings on START II, and I am encouraged by the interest of the senators from both parties in seeking quick action. I commend the Senate for the action taken so far, and I urge again the approval of the treaty as soon as possible.

President Yeltsin and I have already instructed our experts to begin considering the possibility after START II is ratified of additional reductions and limitations on remaining nuclear forces. We have a chance to fur-

ther lift the nuclear cloud, and we dare not miss it.

To stop the development of new generations of nuclear weapons, we must also quickly complete negotiations on a comprehensive test ban treaty. Last month I extended a nuclear testing moratorium that I put into effect when I took office. And we revised our negotiating position to speed the conclusion of the treaty while reaffirming our determination to maintain a safe and reliable nuclear stockpile.

We will also continue to work with our allies to fully implement the agreement we reached with North Korea, first to freeze, then do dismantle its nuclear program, all under international monitoring. The critics of this agreement, I believe, are wrong. The deal does stop North Korea's nuclear program, and it does commit Pyongyang to roll it back in the years to come.

I have not heard another alternative proposal that isn't either unworkable or foolhardy, or one that our allies in the Republic of Korea and Japan, the nation's most directly affected, would fail to support.

If North Korea fulfills its commitment, the Korean Peninsula and the entire world will clearly be less threatened and more secure. The NPT, START II, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the North Korean Agreement, they top our agenda for the year ahead. There are other critical tasks we also face if we want to make every American more secure, including winning Senate ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention, negotiating legally binding measures to strengthen the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, clarifying the ABM Treaty so as to secure its viability while permitting highly effective defenses against theater missile attacks, continuing to support regional arms control efforts in the Middle East and elsewhere, and pushing for the ratification of conventional weapons which, among other things, would help us to reduce the suffering caused by the tens of millions of anti-personnel mines which are plaguing millions of people all across the world.

My friends, this is a full and challenging agenda. There are many obstacles ahead. We cannot achieve it if we give in to a new isolationism. But I believe we can do no less than make every effort to complete it.

Tonight, let us remember what President Nixon told the joint session of Congress when he returned from his historic trip to Moscow in 1972. He said, "We have begun to check the wasteful and dangerous spiral of nuclear arms. Let us seize the moment so that our children and the world's children can live free of the fears and free of the hatreds that have been the lot of mankind through the centuries."

Now it is within our power to realize the dream that Richard Nixon described over 20 years ago. We cannot let history record that our generation of Americans refused to rise to this challenge, that we withdrew from the world and abandoned our responsibilities when we knew better than to do it, that we lacked the energy, the vision and the will to carry this struggle forward—the age-old struggle between hope and fear.

So let us find inspiration in the great tradition of Harry Truman and Arthur Vandenburg—a tradition that builds bridges of cooperation, not walls of isolation; that opens the arms of Americans to change instead of throwing up our hands in despair; that casts aside partisanship and brings together Republicans and Democrats for the good of the American people and the world. That is the tradition that made the most of this land, won the great battles of this century against tyranny and secured our freedom and our prosperity.

Above all, let's not forget that these efforts begin and end with the American people. Every time we reduce the threat that has hung over our heads since the dawn of the Nuclear Age, we help to ensure that from the far stretches of the Aleutians to the tip of the Florida Keys, the American people are more secure. That is our most serious task and our most solemn obligation.

The challenge of this moment is matched only by its possibility. So let us do our duty. Thank you very much.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4 1995, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 1, 1995, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 257. An act to amend the charter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to make eligible for membership those veterans that have served within the territorial limits of South Korea.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1994, the enrolled bill was signed on March 1, 1995, during the recess of the Senate by the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:04 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House of Representatives has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1022. An act to provide regulatory reform and to focus national economic resources on the greatest risks to human health, safety, and the environment through scientifically objective and unbiased risk assessments and through the consideration of costs and benefits in major rules, and for other purposes.

The message also announced, that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 84-372, the Speaker appoints as a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission the following Member on the part of the House: Mr. LEWS of California.

The message further announced that, pursuant to the provisions of 22 United States Code 276h, the Speaker appoints the following Member as a member on the part of the House of the United States Delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the First Session of the 104th Congress: Mr. KOLBE, Chairman.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1022. An act to provide regulatory reform and to focus national economic resources on the greatest risks to human health, safety, and the environment through scientifically objective and unbiased risk as-

sessments and through the consideration of costs and benefits in major rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on March 1, 1995 she had presented to the President of the United States, the following enrolled bill:

S. 257. An act to amend the charter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to make eligible for membership those veterans that have served within the territorial limits of South Korea.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SIMPSON, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

Special Report entitled "Legislative and Oversight Activities During the 103d Congress by the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs" (Rept. No. 104-11).

By Mr. HATFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments and an amendment to the title:

H.R. 889. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 104-12).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Herschelle Challenor, of Georgia, to be a Member of the National Security Education Board for a term of 4 years.

Sheila Cheston,* of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Air Force.

Josue Robles, Jr.*, of Texas, to be a member of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission for a term expiring at the end of the first session of the 104th Congress.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed, subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-446. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-447. A communication from Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Defense Business Operations Fund; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-448. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant

to law, notice relative to the report on the manpower request for fiscal year 1996; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-449. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on proposed obligations for facilitating weapons destruction and non-proliferation in the Former Soviet Union; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-450. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on monetary policy; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-451. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Programs; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-452. A communication from Assistant Administrator for Weather Services, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the National Weather Service; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-453. A communication from the President of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the legislative report and the Federal Grant request for fiscal year 1996; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. 480. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Gleam*; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BAUCUS:

S. 481. A bill to limit the amount of expenditures required under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 and other laws for the protection of fish and wildlife made by the Bonneville Power Administration that may be recovered from ratepayers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 482. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation and coastwise trade endorsement for the vessel *Emerald Ayes*; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. THOMPSON):

S. 483. A bill to amend the provisions of title 17, United States Code, with respect to the duration of copyright, and for the other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

S. 484. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to establish a national clearinghouse to assist in background checks of applicants for law enforcement positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. 485. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide and clarify the authority for certain municipal solid waste flow control arrangements; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.