

Senators on my side of the aisle have informally offered to have another vote on this issue. But to no avail.

Mr. President, this is outrageous. I believe that the American people want tougher penalties for child molesters and child pornographers. And I am proud to have taken a leadership role on the issue. To the Democrat Senators who oppose minimum sentences for child pornographers, I say let's have a vote. Secret tricks like holds should not be used to drop the bottom out of the penalties for child pornographers.

I think that this is shameful, Mr. President. And I believe that the American people have a right to know why the Child Pornography Prevention Act is bottled up on the Senate floor. The roadblock to passage of this vitally important bill with tougher child pornography penalties is not the Republican caucus. It is not my side of the aisle which is blocking this bill trying to lower the penalties for child pornographers.

If the bill does not pass this year, the fault will rest squarely on the shoulders of the other side of the aisle.

I remain ready to vote on this matter. I encourage my friends on the other side of the aisle to come out and debate minimum sentences for child pornographers.

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I think the leadership of the Armed Services Committee deserves a lot of credit for wrapping up the conference on the fiscal year 1997 Defense authorization bill in record time.

This measure was ready before the August recess. We just could not get to it because of other pending business.

The chairman of the committee, Senator THURMOND, and the ranking Democrat, Senator NUNN, have done an outstanding job.

They resolved a number of very complicated and difficult issues, and they did it in a very timely and business-like way.

I would also like to thank the committee for protecting my amendments:

Section 217 that establishes a 1991 baseline for the independent cost estimate for the F-22 fighter; and

Section 809 that places a \$250,000 per year cap on executive compensation.

However, I am very unhappy with one part of the final bill—section 405.

I am very disappointed to see this provision in the final bill.

Section 405 authorizes an increase in the number of general officers on active duty in the Marine Corps.

It raises the current ceiling from 68 to 80 generals.

That is an increase of 12 generals.

I attempted to block this measure but failed. My amendment was defeated by a vote of 79 to 21.

The House had rejected it earlier but could not prevail in conference.

So we lost the fight.

The Marine Commandant, General Krulak, visited me in late July and helped to soften some of my objections.

For example, he assured me that the 12 new generals will be assigned to warfighting billets. That is good.

He promised me that the new generals will not fill mushrooming headquarters billets.

Those are the billets that Marine General Sheehan is so worried about.

But General Krulak's guarantees do not overcome my basic objection to the idea of adding brass at the top when the military is downsizing.

From that standpoint, section 405 of the bill defies understanding.

With 80 generals on board, the Marine Corps will have more generals than it had at the height of World War II when the Marine Corps was three times as big as it is today.

The Marine Corps is critically short of platoon sergeants. That is where we should add money—not for generals.

The Marine Corps is already top-heavy with brass.

That came through loud and clear during Operation Restore Hope in Somalia, according to Col. David Hackworth.

Colonel Hackworth's thoughts are presented in his new book entitled:

Hazardous Duty: America's Most Decorated Living Soldier Reports From the Front and Tells It the Way It Is.

Marine Lt. Gen. Robert Johnson was in charge of Operation Restore Hope in late 1992.

He had 12 rifle companies under his command or about 1,200 fighters.

But as Colonel Hackworth points out, General Johnson's headquarters strength was 1,141.

So General Johnson's headquarters staff almost outnumbered the fighters.

In all, he said, there were 12 American generals in Somalia, one for every rifle company.

A rifle company is commanded by a captain, and a captain does not need a bunch of generals giving him orders.

All he needs is one good colonel.

Colonel Hackworth concludes with this thought: "Never had so few been commanded by quite so many."

So why does a shrinking Marine Corps need more generals? The Marine Corps already has too many generals commanding troops in the field. Somalia proved that point. They aren't needed for combat. They are needed for bureaucratic infighting in the Pentagon budget wars.

The Committee makes that point crystal clear in its report. I quote: "The increase is intended to permit the Marine Corps to have greater representation at the general officer level on the Department of the Navy-Secretariat staff and in the joint arena."

The Marines think more generals at the table will mean a bigger slice of the pie or a better piece of the action somewhere down the road.

That's what this is all about: capturing important bureaucratic real estate.

Mr. President, in my mind, this is bad public policy. It's going to backfire—big time. Giving in to the Marine Corps's request will not lay this issue to rest. This is not the end of it. It's just the beginning.

It is an ominous sign of interservice rivalry that could ignite a war over who can get the most stars.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force are now going to complain: The Marines got theirs. Now we want ours.

The floodgates are about to open.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force are already lining up with their requests for more generals.

The Navy went on record in March, saying it has "331 valid flag officer requirements."

The Navy is authorized to have 220 today. Does this mean the Navy needs another 111 admirals?

The Navy is already topheavy with brass, having just about one admiral per ship.

The Army and the Air Force are even more topheavy—fatter with brass.

Yet both the Army and the Air Force are lobbying Secretary Perry to get their requests for more generals approved.

Now, while Mr. Perry is doing this, he is also telling the military to continue downsizing.

Does this make sense, Mr. President? Does it make sense to topsize when you're downsizing?

Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Colin Powell, shed some light on this issue back in 1990 when post-cold-war downsizing began in earnest.

General Powell's thinking on this issue was outlined in an article that appeared in the August 1 issue of the *Washington Post*.

The article was written by Mr. Walter Pincus.

I ask unanimous consent to have this report printed in the *RECORD*.

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

[From the *Washington Post*, Aug. 1, 1996]

MARINES LAND GENERALS DESPITE SOME OPPOSITION

(By Walter Pincus)

The Marines have landed their 12 more generals and despite some opposition appear to have the situation well in hand.

House conferees yesterday reached an agreement on the fiscal 1997 defense authorization bill that will allow the Corps to appoint a dozen more generals, enlarging its top tier so that the Marines will have a fair share of representatives in joint commands and be able to fill vacant positions.

If the conference report passes both houses and is signed by President Clinton, the Marines will be entitled to raise the number of active duty generals from 68 to 80. That would give the 174,000-member Corps, one more general than it had in June 1945 when the force was 475,000 strong, according to Rep. G.V. "Sonny" Montgomery (D-Miss.), who opposed the increase.

Sen. Charles E. Grassley (R-Iowa), who led the opposition in the Senate, said yesterday he was "very disappointed and frustrated" by the House conferees' action. He said he had hoped the increase could have been held off pending a study "based on recent downsizing in the rank and file."

But the Marines have insisted that the increase is warranted. "We don't ask for something unless it is truly needed," Marine Commandant Gen. Charles C. Krulak said in a letter to Grassley.

The Iowa Republican warned that other services will now be encouraged to request more admirals and generals, despite the military drawdown. "This is just a small snowball rolling down a hill that is going to expand very rapidly the number of brass in all services," he said.

Last March, Adm. Frank L. Bowman, chief of naval personnel, told the Senate Armed Services Committee, "I am convinced the Navy needs 25 to 30 more flag officers in order to have a manageable number of people to assign without having to rely on gapped billets or filling flag officer billets with senior captains."

Yesterday, Capt. Jim Kudla, spokesman for Bowman, said the Navy proposal "is not yet out of the hopper," but added that a number is under study in the office of Navy Secretary John H. Dalton.

The Navy, which this year has 428,000 officers and enlisted personnel, currently is authorized to have 216 flag officers plus four more allowed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That is down from a total force of 535,000 in 1990 when it had 256 admirals.

Under current plans, Navy personnel will go down to 395,000 by late 1998 and level off there. Nonetheless, according to Bowman, the Navy's increase in admirals is justified because "I believe we went too far in flag officer reductions in the Navy. We are feeling the pinch."

In 1990, then-Defense Secretary Richard B. Cheney and his chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Colin L. Powell, agreed that as they reduced overall service levels, they would as a "matter of good faith" look at cutting generals and flag officers "proportional to the reductions in base forces," a former senior Powell aide said yesterday.

Since the main forces were being reduced by 25 percent, Cheney and Powell looked at cutting the number of generals and admirals by at least 20 percent. Powell argued that the military services were like a pyramid. "You can't just cut at the bottom," the former aide said in describing Powell's position. "You have to take some off at every level so it still had the proper shape to it."

Powell regularly met with other members of the Joint Chiefs to have them "pledge their commitment" to the cuts which, the former aide said, "were painful." Those chiefs have now retired and the services, starting with the Marines, have begun to relieve the pain, the aide added.

The issue has led to some tough back-room politicking while House and Senate conferees worked out their differences.

Recently, House and Senate aides said they had been told by Pentagon sources that Arnold L. Punaro, minority staff director of the Armed Services panel, aide to Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) for 23 years and a Marine Corps Reserve brigadier general, had masterminded the move. The sources, from other services, alleged that Punaro was preparing a billet for himself for next year after Nunn retires from the Senate.

Punaro, who had heard the rumor, reacted sharply to it.

"The new active-duty Marine Corps general officer positions have nothing whatsoever to do with my future," he said. "I will remain a civilian when I leave my current position with the Senate Armed Services Committee."

Committee sources said Punaro stayed out of the issue other than to sit in on briefings by Krulak in Nunn's office.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will quote from the article:

As a matter of good faith, General Powell reportedly said, "you have to look at cutting generals and flag officers proportional to the reductions in base forces."

General Powell said the military services were organized like a pyramid. He said, "you can't just cut at the bottom. You have to take some off at every level so it still has the proper shape to it."

Mr. President, that is Colin Powell talking, and he should know something about how the military is supposed to be organized. Colin Powell says we should reduce the number of generals when the force structure is shrinking.

So why are we adding brass at the top when the force is getting smaller? Someone needs to provide an honest answer to that question. I have not heard one yet.

If we keep adding at the top and cutting at the bottom, pretty soon the military pyramid will lose its shape. We will have an upside-down pyramid.

Congress must not allow its decisions to be driven by interservice rivalry. There has to be a better way to determine the right number of generals.

On July 19, I wrote to the President, asking him to intervene in this matter. He is our Commander in Chief and needs to take charge and show some leadership.

I asked him to delay this decision until an independent review is conducted to determine how many general officer positions are needed, based on real military requirements. I have never received a response.

I am afraid he's been steamrolled by the generals, just like the Congress.

ILLEGAL DRUG TRADE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, a few steps from this Capitol Building is a combat zone. In just a few blocks from here lies the killing ground that is one of the consequences of the illegal drug trade in this country. On average, over 400 people in Washington are murdered every year. That is roughly 60 lives lost per 100,000 population. The national average is 6 per 100,000. That makes Washington the Nation's murder capital. Those casualties, the lives lost and maimed, occur in just a few neighborhoods. They are not spread out over the whole city. Much of this carnage is directly the result of drugs and the harm that they cause, a harm that falls disproportionately on a few neighborhoods.

Now, virtually every ounce of illegal drug you can buy within a stone's throw of here—and that is just about any drug you could want in any quantity you care to buy—is produced overseas. It is imported into this country. Washington is not on the border with Mexico. We don't grow poppies in ward 6 or coca in Anacostia. These drugs find their way here in commercial cargo, in motor homes, in peoples' stomachs. They fly, walk, drive, and float into this country every day in a thousand ways. That availability is

killing us. But the story does not stop here.

The criminal thugs that bring drugs into this country are not philanthropists. They are in the business to make money. And lots of it. That's why they come to the world's largest emporium. And they do well. But that leaves them with the problem of what to do with all the loot: how to turn all that dirty money into nice, clean cash. To do this, they exploit our banks and business. They smuggle cash out in bulk. They use our electronic highways.

As the Center for Technology Assessment noted last year, our "Financial institutions and their wire transfer systems provide the battleground to control money laundering." Criminal gangs employ a thousand techniques that fertile imaginations—the best that money can buy—can devise. They do all of this in defiance of our laws, in vicious contempt for common decency. And when these sorry riches find their way into secure havens, they are then used to corrupt and intimidate individuals, institutions, and whole governments. The vicious cycle is complete and begins again.

These criminal gangs, to push their drugs and launder their millions, make use of the very same systems that are the sources of our prosperity. They smuggle drugs in and they sneak the cash out. They exploit our financial processes and our commercial mechanisms to do this. We must not permit this to happen. There in lies our dilemma.

On the one hand, we must decide on those policies and practices that will most effectively facilitate our trade and finance. We must do this in order to sustain our continued prosperity and competitiveness. On the other hand, we must decide how best to discourage the criminal exploitation of our financial systems and our commercial arrangements. This clash of interests is no easy problem to deal with, but deal with it we must.

Unfortunately, this country has a major drug problem. As it is in virtually every other area of economic activity, the United States is the world's largest market for illegal drugs. Americans have more money and more time than do many other people. This means that every entrepreneur in the world is out to make it big in the U.S. market. Some of the most skilled, intelligent, and ruthless of these entrepreneurs are drug traffickers.

We are not dealing here with mom-and-pop operations. We are dealing with well-financed, international business enterprises with a global reach. They are sophisticated and dangerous. Let there be no mistake, the criminal organizations that traffic in drugs or other illegal goods are among the most significant threats to our well-being that we currently face.

The major international criminal organizations—based in Asia, Europe, Africa, and Latin America—now dispose