

these women, and honors those who don't live in the past but remain a part of our living heritage.

Bitá died in early 1991, but her legacy lives on. Although her life has ended, Bitá left behind her two nephews, Floyd and Harry, and sister-in-law Iona, to run the ranch she loved. She was the last of the Lees that ran the ranch during the Depression and the drastic fall of sheep prices, and kept the ranch operating in the days before paved roads, cellular phones, and four-wheel drives.

Bitá was an avid horse woman; she could ride the most surly of beasts and rope the most wily of steers. Often known for her breed of Palominos and her ability to rope, Bitá was an avid worker with the 4-H of New Mexico and the New Mexico State Fair. She maintained a love for agriculture by living it and passing it on to others.

Although Bitá was not world-famous like some of her counterparts in the National Cowgirl Hall of Fame, she was famous in her corner of the world. Her neighbors knew her well and delighted in her wood-working ability, her keen and subtle sense of humor, and her composure. She was a tiny woman in stature, but she earned the respect of all her ranch employees, whom she managed with a firm hand and kind heart.

Last year, my colleague JOE SKEEN and I each sent letters of support to the Cowgirl Hall of Fame regarding Bitá's nomination. Over 600 women are nominated each year to fill four open spots. I am pleased that the National Cowgirl Hall of Fame has recognized Bitá's significant contribution to the heritage of the West by accepting her nomination. My sincere congratulations and best wishes to Bitá's family and many friends.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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 (Mr. COVERDELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

Mr. STEVENS. For how long?

Mr. GRASSLEY. For 11 minutes.

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

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

#### MILITARY HISTORY AT THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, particularly since there are on the floor people who are very interested in the military of the United States, I want

to speak to an issue that should have been discussed 2 days ago during the Interior Department appropriations bill. But the Interior Department will still be up next week when it is put back up on the calendar, or in parts of the continuing resolution, and so I alert my friends to a trend in military history that is very disturbing to me as it relates to the Smithsonian Institution.

Upon debating the Interior Department's funding, this is as good time as any to voice concern over the interpretations of American history at the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of American History. Apparently, military history has assumed a minor role in the museum's depiction of this Nation's history. The exhibit space allocated to the display of military items has slowly decreased. A large percentage of that which is currently on display remains in the cases in which they were installed for the opening of the museum over 30 years ago. Further inquiry has led me to believe that what remains of the Armed Forces' history hall is in jeopardy.

The administrators of this museum appear to be swayed by the ideology of revisionist/liberal historians. They desire to decrease even further the exhibit space devoted to U.S. military history. This is reflective of their adherence to the concept of new history as opposed to the traditional approach, which emphasizes important people, events, and movements.

History has typically been organized into areas of concentration, such as military, diplomatic, political, and economic history. But a museum devoted to a new history would, instead, reflect cultural, social, gender, ethnic, and community concentrations. Obviously, a conventional exhibit depicting our Nation's military history would not fit into this theme. This approach, in itself, is not inherently bad. But dominance of this new history to the detriment of a conventional representative display of military history is disturbing.

This overemphasis on common people and the infrastructure of their community tends to then decrease the importance of meaningful events and significant people, which have played pivotal roles throughout the history of our Nation.

Military history is, therefore, overlooked because it is a conglomeration of momentous events and distinguished soldiers. What is neglected by these historians is the detail that, throughout the history of the Armed Forces, we witnessed common people leaving the security of their communities and performing extraordinary, consequential feats in the scheme of military affairs.

This ideology is reflective of that which is popular in many liberal and academic circles. Military history is deemed evil in that it involves death and weaponry. As a result, the great impact the military has had on every American is disregarded.

Since the habitation of this country by Europeans in the 16th century, the militia and its leaders have played a prominent role. This is true not only in the defense of their people but in society as well. Weapons were an important tool of the early settlers in the defending of their families from hostile native Americans. They were important also in the task of putting food on the table. Not only has the military continually defended the Nation, but it has assisted in the exploration and opening of the frontiers to settlers.

Military contractors and arsenals played an important role in developing interchangeable parts, standardization, and mass production. In more recent years, it has played important roles in developing new technologies that we use every day, such as computers, new communication techniques, et cetera. The military has touched many facets of our lives, and this history is not exhibited in any museum.

There are various Naval, Army, Marine Corps and Air Force museums scattered across the country. But they only concentrate on the history of their particular service, not on the entirety of the U.S. Armed Forces. The National Museum of American History holds the best collection of American military artifacts, and it has the capability to recount the whole story of the armed services. What better place to develop a comprehensive exhibit of our Nation's military service and its history than on The Mall at Washington, DC.

Our Nation's military history is special. It is unique from other modes of history, such as social, cultural, political, or economic. It involves the ultimate sacrifice of one's life for his or her country. These sacrifices were incurred in the hope of a better future for generations of Americans to come.

In this sense, an exhibit devoted to our Armed Forces is not only an educational tool. More important, it is a memorial to those who risked their lives, and those who ultimately gave their lives for our freedom. The military has also touched many American families throughout our history. Millions of men and women have answered the Nation's call to duty, both as soldiers and citizens in support of war efforts. Having such a great impact on our society, a museum of American history should not slight exhibit space devoted to the Armed Forces.

In decreasing the importance of military history at the museum, we are losing a significant segment of our proud history. Storage rooms are stocked with artifacts belonging to American military heroes, many of them used during important military engagements. These artifacts bring to our Nation's Capital a little excitement and drama from the battlefields of Saratoga, the naval battles on Lake Champlain, the many fields of our Nation's Civil War, distant fields of Verdun, Normandy, Korea, Vietnam, and the gulf war. Many artifacts link us to

significant individuals throughout the span of our history: Gen. George Washington, Gen. Andrew Jackson, Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, Gen. John J. Pershing, and Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, to name only a few.

To ignore these military events and these personalities makes meaningless their struggles and the struggles of the people of this Nation who enlisted their assistance to the military. That is true whether it was service in the Armed Forces or in the support of them.

Now, if things go as planned, I fear that many of these items will be hidden from the American public despite the results of a recent visitors survey. In this survey taken at the National Museum of History, it became evident that the Armed Forces' history hall was the second most popular exhibit area in the museum. Therefore, speaking on behalf of most Americans, I urge the museum to reconsider its plan for the military history hall.

We should look at this museum, responding to the needs of the American people. If this survey shows that this is the second most popular exhibit in the museum, we should not have some revisionist at the Smithsonian Institution taking away what the American people like and enjoy and depriving American people of understanding and visualizing the sacrifice of American service men and women who do sacrifice with lives, with injuries, with time away from family for the defense of freedom, so that not only can the American people enjoy freedom, but the revisionist historians still have the intellectual environment in which they can do their work. But they ought to show more appreciation of that sacrifice, and I think the plans for this military history museum detract from that.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BINGAMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed as in morning business for 5 minutes.

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

#### GUATEMALA ACCORD

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I want to call attention to a very encouraging development that was announced in Mexico City, yesterday.

For 35 years, the conflict in Guatemala between the insurgents there and the government has produced more than 100,000 deaths, many millions have been maimed and seriously injured, and there has been scant hope that the guerrilla warfare in that country might end.

Yesterday, in the offices of the Mexican Foreign Ministry, Gustavo Porras Catejon, who is the head of the Guatemalan Government delegation, broke into a bear hug with the senior commander of the Guatemalan rebels, Rolando Moran. Although no cease-fire

was signed yesterday, the warring parties—which have produced the longest conflict in this hemisphere—reached a historic agreement that finally holds out hope for a more hopeful future and a return of civil society to Guatemala.

According to the New York Times this morning, Guatemalan military leaders agreed to reduce their 46,000 troops by one-third next year. They agreed to cut the military's budget by one-third by the year 1999. Military leaders also consented to an alteration of their mission from one that did include domestic security control enforcement—that is, security threats within Guatemala—to a mission limited to dealing with external threats, from outside Guatemala.

In 35 years of fighting, this is the most significant action we have seen that could lead to long-term peace. There are still many risks ahead, particularly how to reincorporate insurgents into the Guatemalan society. The progress made yesterday, however, lays important groundwork so that progress can be made in future weeks.

I commend the U.N. negotiators who helped to mediate between the Guatemalan Government and the rebel leaders. Yesterday's accord is the fifth that has emerged from these United Nations-mediated talks. The other agreements dealt with human rights, Indian rights, poverty and land tenure, and also to set up a commission to review some of the crimes committed during the war.

The military's agreement to downsize its forces and its budget and its mission was coupled with a commitment by the government to create a new police force with new recruits and retrain former officers to take over the army's domestic security functions.

Mr. President, there certainly will be skeptics who will not believe the military will carry through with these commitments. I, too, have concerns about how this transition may occur, but this is, nevertheless, an important turning point in Guatemalan history, given the long history and troubling encounters that our own Government has had with the Guatemalan Government.

American interests need to be encouraged with this move away from the extreme undue influence the military has previously exerted in affairs of state in that country.

I do welcome this news. I want my colleagues to know about it. I wish both sides of this negotiation well in carrying out the agreement that they announced in Mexico City yesterday.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

#### MARITIME SECURITY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, after a lot of good work by many Senators, I believe we have a unanimous consent

agreement to allow us to go forward on the maritime bill and to schedule votes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the only amendments in order to H.R. 1350, the maritime security bill, be the six Grassley amendments that are now filed at the desk; further, that the amendment relative to rates be subject to a relevant second-degree amendment to be offered by Senator HARKIN; further, those amendments must be called up and debated during today's session; further, following the disposition of all amendments, the bill be deemed read a third time.

I further ask unanimous consent that any votes ordered with respect to these amendments be postponed to occur in stacked sequence beginning at 5 p.m. on Tuesday, September 24, with 2 minutes for debate equally divided before each vote, and at 4:30 p.m., there be 30 minutes equally divided on the rates issue.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that there will be 15 minutes for Senator HARKIN before the motion to table his second-degree amendment and 15 minutes for Senator GRASSLEY before we move to table his first-degree amendment.

Mr. LOTT. That is correct.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, now that we have that agreement entered into, I will note also there is a clearly understood gentlemen's agreement about how the votes will occur in terms of what will be tabled and what will not be tabled. We have had very clear understanding and discussion on that. We will work very carefully with Senators to make sure that understanding is adhered to.

With this unanimous-consent agreement, also I announce there will be no further recorded votes today. The next votes will occur on this issue at 5 o'clock on Tuesday. It is possible that other votes will occur during the day, Tuesday. We will come in session on Tuesday at 9:30 a.m. We hope to be prepared to enter an agreement as to how we will proceed on Tuesday, with the likelihood, the possibility of votes during the day, but these stacked votes will not occur until 5 o'clock.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am going to offer my first amendment. I am going to explain the amendment before I send it to the desk, Mr. President.

Some people think that once we pay for the U.S.-flag companies, the \$2 million of corporate welfare that we pay per year, per vessel, with this bill that we will not have to pay them again to carry actual war sustainment cargoes. I think the managers of the bill have, in speaking in opposition to some of