

fleet with the same loyal Americans to crew them whose predecessors have never let us down in the more than 200 years of our Nation's history.

The Maritime Security Act of 1995 is essential to the military security of our Nation.

Specifically, this legislation will do the following: It will guarantee a pool of American citizen crews and a 50-ship fleet of militarily useful U.S.-flag commercial sealift vessels for our national security; it will also provide that the companies' entire intermodal logistical support systems—containers, rail cars, computer tracking, port operations, and management—will be available to the DOD when needed; it will guarantee the availability of American mariners to crew the DOD's sealift fleet of fast sealift ships, prepositioned ships and Ready Reserve Force vessels; and it will ensure that military supplies are on reliable U.S.-flag ships with patriotic, dependable American citizen crews. Many people are unaware that even our DOD reserve fleet vessels are operated by civilian merchant marines, because they cost less to operate than vessels directly controlled by the Navy.

This Maritime Security Act will cut costs by more than 50 percent compared to today's program. It will reduce burdensome Government regulations that hamstring U.S.-flag operators which give competitive advantage to foreign-flag companies.

And it will save the Defense Department billions of dollars—because the DOD will be able to use modern, state-of-the-art commercial assets rather than buying and maintaining this capability on their own. It is eight times cheaper to have the private sector perform this vital national security task—and this point alone makes the Maritime Security Act a commonsense bargain for America.

My fellow colleagues, in the past we have often taken for granted the role of the merchant marine in the economy and security of the United States. We cannot afford to do so today—nor can we suddenly rebuild a maritime capability in the future if we need it urgently.

It is simply not economically feasible or realistic to repeat the mistakes—the ups and downs of maritime support—we have made in the past.

We need a merchant marine in place that is strong and reliable in both peacetime and wartime. The new maritime security program will help our Nation reach this goal in a cost-effective, more efficient and more competitive manner. So I urge all my colleagues to support this program, and to enact it into law.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I think the Senate will note my partner across the aisle and I have been involved in a lot of issues together, particularly defense issues. With regard to these

issues, at times the Senator from Hawaii has been chairman of the subcommittee. At other times, I have, depending upon the political winds of our country. But the Senator from Hawaii and I, as I have said in my opening statement, spent many hours over the last two decades trying to find a way to solve this problem.

At one time when I was both chairman of the subcommittee of Appropriations and the subcommittee of Commerce, I secured the approval of the Senate, not once but twice, of a special program, the Eisenhower Build and Lease program. We tried to put it back into effect. We actually had the Congress appropriate more than \$1 billion in a reserve to start that program. It was not possible to get it started because of the various conflicts within our merchant marine industry.

We are now in a position of, really, suggesting to the Senate what amounts to a proposal like the Civil Air Reserve Fleet that we use in the event of emergency, where we have preexisting contracts with airlines that enable us to, really, commandeer our civilian airline fleet in order to meet our emergency needs. That is what we are talking about.

We have now switched over to a concept of relying upon the private sector to build and we will lease. The Eisenhower program was building and then leasing. That went on for a period of time, but it just did not work because of the problem within the industry of subsidizing one line and not subsidizing another. It led to, really, problems within the merchant marine fleet.

This answer that has come to us from the House, I think, is the most worthwhile approach that I have seen. It has taken a long time to work out. I am hopeful we will see approval of it today.

Does the Senator from Iowa seek the floor at this time?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Shortly.

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

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I have checked with the participants in this piece of legislation. It may be some time before they will be able to start their deliberation. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I might proceed for up to 10 minutes, as in morning business.

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

#### AMENDMENT TO THE FISCAL YEAR 1997 INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, when the Senate returns to the consideration of

the Interior appropriations bill, I intend to offer an amendment that would redirect the bill's earmark of \$3 million to create a 20,000 acre national wildlife refuge in western Kentucky.

On Monday, the Senate approved the energy and water appropriations bill that, due to budget constraints imposed by this Congress, will not adequately fund an important, existing environmental project in western Kentucky called the Land Between the Lakes. LBL is a 170,000-acre preserve located just 15 miles east of the Interior bill's proposed wildlife refuge.

I fail to see the logic of what some people are proposing here: inadequately fund one outdoor facility, the Land Between the Lakes, on Monday, and then, just days later, try to appropriate funding for a new facility just 15 miles away. In Marshall County, where most of the proposed refuge would be located, the judge/executive has asked me, "why don't we take care of what we've got before we open a new nature preserve?" I could not agree more. The fact of the matter is that we are not taking care of the Land Between the Lakes. Its appropriation has dropped by one-third since 1994 even as millions of dollars' worth of maintenance projects pile up.

The rider in the Interior appropriations bill will ensure that LBL and other wilderness projects continue to go begging in years to come. That is because the \$3 million earmarked in the Interior appropriations bill is just a fraction of the \$15-20 million it will cost to actually create the refuge. That is not just me talking. Those estimates are from the Congressional Budget Office and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. So, Mr. President, supporters of the earmark will be back next year, and the year after, looking for more money for this new project.

What is worse is that Kentuckians living in the surrounding counties do not even support the proposed wildlife refuge created by the bill. I have already mentioned the statement of the Marshall County Judge executive. Well, the Marshall County Soil and Water Conservation District has also gone on record, saying, "Our opposition to making a Federal Wildlife Refuge of the East Ford of Clark's River stems from the overwhelming opposition of land owners and tenants in the proposed area."

The sentiment if the same in Murray, KY, located in the adjacent county of Calloway. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Murray Ledger-Times.

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

[From the Murray Ledger & Times, Feb. 8, 1996]

#### NATIONAL REFUGE AT ODDS WITH LBL DILEMMA

We're scratching our heads over the latest from Sen. Mitch McConnell.

What could McConnell be thinking?

We know it's an election year, but can his plan to create a national wildlife refuge just

15 miles west of Land Between the Lakes be serious?

The senator wants to buy up to 20,000 acres of land located on the east fork of Clarks River which is the site of the only major bottomland hardwood area left in Kentucky.

Listening to McConnell's plans for the area reminds us of a brochure for LBL.

The senator stresses the environmental and educational benefits of such a wildlife refuge.

Hmmm—they say the same thing about LBL.

McConnell's proposal is puzzling in light of his involvement in securing operational funds for LBL.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has been under a constant barrage from congressional critics the last two years. We don't expect that scrutiny to lessen in the future.

McConnell has created his own catch-22 with a plan to spend federal money to establish a wildlife refuge while TVA officials are busy peddling a commercialized LBL.

If adequate funding can be assured for both wildlife areas, we gladly embrace McConnell's plan.

However, Washington, D.C. becomes a twilight zone for such promises.

Unless LBL's status becomes more secure, we'll have to say thanks, but no thanks, Mitch.

Mr. FORD. The Ledger-Times reminds us that the refuge and the project at Land Between the Lakes would provide very similar services and that the creation of the refuge will put future LBL funding at risk.

Mr. President, supporters of the refuge have compiled a seemingly impressive list of endorsements. But listen to who is on the list: Mall Interiors, the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, and Pride, Inc. I have no doubt that these are fine organizations, but how are they qualified to speak to a proposed wildlife refuge in western Kentucky?

Of course, there is also a list of Kentucky environmental organizations who support the refuge. But again, you will not hear the name of a single county or county organization in or near the proposed wildlife refuge that supports it. In fact, the closes organization is located over 80 miles and five counties away from where the refuge would be located.

We should listen to the people of western Kentucky before creating a refuge that currently includes at least 7,000 acres of cropland. What will happen to that cropland? What about the communities and families in and around the refuge? At a minimum, we should be holding official public hearings in the community and inviting public comment before establishing a wildlife refuge instead of creating it through an appropriations earmark.

Mr. President, my amendment redirects the bill's earmarked funds toward Land Between the Lakes projects that already enjoy wide support in Kentucky. First, my amendment provides \$2.25 million for the repair and maintenance costs of "the Trace," which is the north-south roadway in the Land Between the Lakes. Over 2 million people visit the LBL every year and they ought to be able to get from one end to the other on a decent, safe road.

Second, my amendment directs \$275,000 to repair the Brandon Springs Resident Center, which serves as a youth camp for underprivileged and disabled children. Brandon Springs is a great resource that we need to protect and preserve, but its facilities are inadequate and overextended. We need to make a commitment to Brandon Springs, not just for children from Kentucky, but for the children who come from Tennessee, Alabama, the Carolinas, Arkansas, Missouri, Illinois, Virginia, and Ohio for a real wilderness experience. This is not just a local operation. It is a national operation, Mr. President.

Last, my amendment directs \$475,000 to provide water and sewer service and disabled access for the youth station in the Land Between the Lakes. Mr. President, it was heartbreaking to see this facility closed due to lack of funds, which gave kids the chance to live in the great outdoors and learn how to be good stewards of our natural resources. Until it was closed due to lack of funding, the youth station provided environmental education to thousands of schoolchildren, including my own grandchildren—and I have that personal experience, Mr. President—as well as adults. Teachers came to youth station to receive valuable training in environmental education at the facility and took that information back to their students. If the center is reopened, I understand that at least two different universities in the area have offered to assume the operational and programming responsibilities of the facility, which will allow programs to continue with virtually no Federal cost.

I have letters of support for what I propose today, and 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:

MAYFIELD, KY.

Senator WENDELL FORD,  
Russell Senate Office Building, Washington,  
DC.

TO SENATOR FORD: I am writing this letter to you about a matter I feel is of great importance to our region in Western Kentucky. My name is Tawnya Hunter and I am a teacher at Graves County High School in Mayfield, Kentucky. The matter which I would like to inform you about is the closing of the Youth Station in Land Between the Lakes.

As you know TVA has been cutting back on its funding of LBL and one of its major cut backs was the closing of the Youth Station. The Youth Station has been serving children and adults of this area as well as across the country for about twenty years. Children come and stay for various camps though fewer and fewer have been offered to them in the last five to six years. Murray State has been using the Youth Station for about twelve years for several different teacher training courses. This is how I got involved. I attended a week long class on Environmental Education in which I got graduate credit for. The experiences and materials obtained during that week far surpass other classes and courses that are required

to take for masters classes. The same course taught in a regular classroom would not have the same effect.

Since the impending closure Murray State has come up with a proposal to run the Youth Station for TVA. TVA turned the proposal down stating it could not afford what Murray State proposed. What was proposed was that TVA allow Murray State to run the facility and take over all costs after TVA restored the place to a running condition (i.e., fix the plumbing, telephones). This is where TVA said they could not afford this. To let a facility like this go would be a tremendous waste. If TVA truly cannot afford this proposal then maybe Congress could pass a one time appropriation to cover the initial cost to fix the Youth Station. This is where I need your help. I am not in the habit of writing Congressmen about problems but this is something that I feel very strongly about, and I do not know where else to turn. If there is anything that you could do to help, it would be well worth your time and would be greatly appreciated. Dr. Joseph Baust is the contact person at Murray State and has been working extensively on saving the Youth Station since 1991. He would be more than willing to meet with you or talk to you about this any place and at any time. He can also tell you much more about this than I can. I have really only told you the very basics of this issue. Irene Riley is my "Granny" (my husband's Grandma but I consider her mine too) and I know that she talked to you on your trip to Mayfield. Thank you in advance for any consideration you give this issue.

Sincerely yours,

TAWNIA HUNTER.

HOPKINSVILLE ELECTRIC SYSTEM,  
Hopkinsville, KY, May 7, 1996.

Ms. MOIRA SHEA,  
Senator Ford's Office, Russell Senate Office  
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MOIRA: Thank you for your call and Senator Ford's interest in Land Between the Lakes (LBL). As I mentioned, the LBL budget request for this year is \$6.6 million which includes \$900,000 for TVA police services not included last year.

As a user of LBL, I personally think the budget has already been cut too far. Attractions have been closed and roads and facilities continue to deteriorate.

For example, "The Trace", which is the major north/south roadway, is falling into disrepair. The cost to repave this year is \$2.15 million which is not in the budget request.

The Brandon Spring Group Camp had to be closed because there was just not enough money to keep it in repair. This facility was used by Murray State and other schools as a youth camp, including under-privileged and disabled kids. There, these kids could feel the great outdoors and study the protection of our natural environment. The cost to refurbish this facility, which includes repairing the ceilings, a new HVAC unit, along with trail, fishing pier and parking lot renovation (handicapped access), is \$261,000—also not in the budget request.

Funding of the above projects would go a long way toward restoring LBL to a more usable state and would be much appreciated by this region. However, this needs to be an add-on to the budget request as funding of TVA's other Land and Water Stewardship projects has already been cut to the bone. We, the friends of LBL, certainly would be obliged by any assistance Senator Ford could provide. Say "hello" to Senator Ford and Charles for me.

Sincerely,

AUSTIN B. CARROLL,  
General Manager.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I am not opposed to the creation of a wildlife refuge, as proposed in the bill. What concerns me is the idea that we here in the Senate can or should designate thousands of acres of cropland—over 7,000 acres of cropland—as a wildlife refuge without even consulting affected farmers. What concerns me is that we would make this designation without consulting or seeking the consent of the affected localities. What concerns me is a proposal that results in Kentuckians writing to me to say, “no one seems to listen” isn’t that something?—“no one seems to listen to what the majority of landowners and farmers, who are directly involved, are saying.”

With my amendment, we will be listening to the people of western Kentucky. My amendment, unlike the proposal in the bill, has the support of citizens in Kentucky who live around the Land Between the Lakes and helps to preserve a vital natural resource we already have.

I urge my colleagues, if we get to the Interior bill, that they support the adoption of my amendment.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREE- MENT—VETO MESSAGE TO AC- COMPANY H.R. 1833

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the veto message to accompany H.R. 1833 be temporarily set aside to be called up by the majority leader after consultation with the Democratic leader.

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

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

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

#### MARITIME SECURITY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the maritime bill that is before us. I, first of all, want to compliment the leadership of the Senate, plus the managers of this legislation, because we are bringing up maritime legislation in the daylight. The last time it was brought up it was the last item on an omnibus bill, a very big omnibus bill. It was at 9 o'clock at night. It was just before we were taking a week's recess. And it was to finance a subsidy for the maritime industry.

For something that costly, for something that important, it seems to me it is not something that we should try to sneak through in the dark of night as the last piece of business because con-

troversy that is connected with it might not be so welcomed to be answered. And, consequently, we just avoided all the necessary discussion we ought to have of very costly legislation.

So here we are not doing it on a Friday. We are not doing it late in the evening. And I want to compliment the leadership for bringing up a very important new program, a very costly new program, at a time when it can be given some legitimate consideration.

I also want to compliment our majority leader because he has been very forthright with me and very open with me in making sure that I had opportunities to present my point of view and to offer amendments. And it was not handled in the stealth manner that I have teased him about in the past as this bill was working its way out of committee. So I think again it is being done in an open and very forthright manner so we can have discussion on this.

I see the leader has come in. And if he is here to do other business, I would be happy to yield to him for that sole purpose.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, would the Senator yield just briefly?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will yield, not losing my right to the floor, yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa for his comments. I know that this is an issue that he has an interest in. We talked about it. And I had indicated to him earlier, even though we picked at each other for years on this subject, that this would certainly be something that he would be given notice on and that we would meet with him and talk to him about the substance, about what was within it and not within it, and to give him ample time to study it and prepare remarks and amendments.

The only reason we are starting as late in the afternoon as we are is because I believe he had a conflict, and we wanted to try to accommodate him earlier. We are going to continue to proceed in that way. We want to make sure everybody has a chance to make their case and look at this legislation very carefully. I appreciate his attitude and his comments very much. I just wanted to thank him for that.

Mr. GRASSLEY. While we are talking about accommodating me, from 8 to 8:30 I have my monthly town meeting via television satellite with the people of Iowa. I would like to be able to keep that.

Mr. LOTT. If the Senator would yield for me to respond to that, and for no other purposes, Mr. President, we certainly have other Senators that want to make statements and maybe debate on amendments. We will make sure that nothing happens during that time that would be a problem for him. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, why are the taxpayers up in arms about

Washington, DC? I think it is because they know how to spend their money better than Washington does. Americans are overtaxed. Ask any of them. Washington is also overweight. Today American workers work longer, they work harder, just so that Washington can spend more of their money. Taxpayers sacrifice more, I am sorry to say, so that Washington can spend more. That is just not right.

I want to make it possible for taxpayers to keep more of their own money. Part of that is to get Congress then to stop spending so darn much of it in the first place. That is why whenever I see a grossly wasteful program, I feel obliged to squeeze the fat out of it. And I urge my colleagues to help in that effort.

Maritime subsidies, the subject of this legislation, is one, one blatant example of how Washington wastes taxpayers' hard-earned money. It is a case study in how Washington turns common sense upside down. Instead of competition for lower costs, this program creates a monopoly that raises costs. Now we all expect competition to lower costs, and in most instances it does lower costs, but the program that is in this legislation creates a monopoly. And you know what happens most of the time when you have a monopoly? That ends up raising costs.

Instead of supporting the national security, as this program purports to do, this program is becoming irrelevant to national security.

This program delivers to the taxpayers higher costs and no national security benefit. Should that not be a clue that this program is wasteful? I know how the taxpayers would answer that question, Mr. President, but I am not sure yet how my 99 other colleagues will answer that question.

There is an old way and a new way of doing business in Washington. The old way is to spend money to get reelected. Just tax the citizenry more to pay for that effort. The money goes to wealthy companies—we call that corporate welfare—and it goes to powerful unions. It becomes corporate and union welfare. They keep getting more money from the Treasury and then they have clout. They pay contributions to reelect friends; that way they do not have to be accountable for the taxpayers' money.

A very ineffective program can exist and survive in Washington simply because it has so much clout. That is the political game in Washington. That is the political game that the grassroots of America, if people are candid with you, are sick and tired of. That is also how Washington wastes the taxpayers' money. To Washington, it is not waste. No, it is not waste. It is currency. It is the cost of getting reelected. That is the old way of doing business in Washington.

The new way, beginning with this Congress, is to be frugal. The era of big Government is over. Even President Clinton said that in his State of the