

Elktoe, Cumberland (*Alasmidonta atropurpurea*)
 Combsshell, Cumberlandian (*Epioblasma brevidans*)
 Mussel, oyster (*Epioblasma capsaeformis*)
 Rabbitsfoot, rough (*Quadrula cylindrica strigillata*)
 Eggert's sunflower (*Hellanthus eggertii*)
 LOUISIANA
 Jaguar, US population (*Panthera onca*)
 MAINE
 Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) distinct pop. in seven Maine rivers.
 MICHIGAN
 Snake, northern copperbelly water (*Nerodia erythrogaster neglecta*)
 MONTANA (1) NOTE: 0 ON MAP
 Parish's alkali grass (*Puccinellia parishii*)
 NEVADA (2) NOTE: 1 ON MAP
 Sodaville mild-vetch (*Astragalus lentiginosus* var. *Piscinensis*)
 Spindace, Virgin (*Lepidomeda mollispinis mollispinis*)
 NEW MEXICO
 Parish's alkali grass (*Puccinellia parishii*)
 Spindace, Virgin (*Lepidomada mollispinis mollispinis*)
 Jaguar, US population (*Panthera onca*)
 OHIO
 Snake, northern copperbelly water (*Nerodia erythrogaster neglecta*)
 Snake, Lake Erie water (*Nerodia sipadon insultarum*)
 OKLAHOMA
 Shiner, Arkansas River (native population only) (*Notropis girardi*)
 OREGON
 Golden paintbrush (*Castilleja levisetta*)
 TENNESSEE
 Elktoe, Cumberland (*Alasmidonta atropurpurea*)
 Combsshell, Cumberlandian (*Epioblasma brevidans*)
 Mussel, oyster (*Epioblasma capsaeformis*)
 Rabbitsfoot, rough (*Quadrula cylindrica strigillata*)
 Bean, Purple (*Villosa perpurpurea*)
 Spring Creek badderpod (*Lesquerella perforata*)
 Eggert's sunflower (*Hellanthus eggertii*)
 TEXAS (4) NOTE: 7 ON MAP
 Salamander, Barton Springs (*Eurycea sosorum*)
 Jaguar, US population (*Panthera onca*)
 Shriner, Arkansas River (native population only) (*Notropis girardi*)
 Pygmy-owl, cactus ferruginous (*Glaucidium brasillanum cactorum*)
 UTAH
 Spindace, Virgin (*Lepidomada mollispinis mollispinis*)
 Least chub (*Lotichthys phlegethontis*)
 VIRGINIA
 Combsshell, Cumberlandian (*Epioblasma brevidans*)
 Mussel, oyster (*Epioblasma capsaeformis*)
 Rabbitsfoot, rough (*Quadrula cylindrica strigillata*)
 Bean, Purple (*Villosa perpurpurea*)
 WASHINGTON
 Golden paintbrush (*Castilleja levisetta*)

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, most of the 239 species are from California and Hawaii; 25 other States have from 1 to 9 species proposed each. If I may, I would like to just reference this chart and show you a sampling of what we are talking about.

In the State of California, you see ready to be listed 123 species. In Ha-

waii, there are 79. In State of Arizona, 8. Texas, 7 species. Alabama, 8. Georgia has 6. Florida has 7. Tennessee has 7 species. Kentucky has 6 species.

I am concerned that the President will decide to waive the moratorium. I am concerned for the people whose lives will be affected by an additional 239 species being placed on the list. These people, and those species, would fall victim to a law that does not work.

If this language passes, I urge the President to not waive the moratorium language. I hope that he will agree with me that it is better to consider these species for listing under a new reformed bill that we have worked together to create. In 23 years, since the Endangered Species Act first became law, we have made significant progress in science that has been identified, and techniques that have been utilized, and in management practices.

I remind the President that if there are species that are in imminent danger of extinction, he can still use the emergency authority to list them. Rather than exercise the waiver, I believe the administration would be wiser to accelerate negotiations with Congress on a comprehensive reform of the Endangered Species Act.

Now, should the President choose to waive the moratorium on these 239 species, there are other considerations. I think under the current law we can expect these newly listed species to be the subject of many lawsuits. The \$4 million that we have provided to accomplish emergency listing activities, to manage petitions, and deal with existing lawsuits would soon be totally exhausted. Waiving the moratorium would leave us worse off than before.

I met with my negotiating partners this week. We made a commitment to continue our talks. We have made a commitment that we are going to do everything possible to reach a reformed Endangered Species Act that will have bipartisan support. I sincerely hope the possible lifting of the moratorium on listings will not change that commitment. Now I urge all of the Members of the Senate to join Senators CHAFEE, BAUCUS, REID, and myself, in reforming the Endangered Species Act this year. This is a task we must accomplish so that endangered and threatened species can be protected for future generations and, also, so that future generations will have the quality of life that goes with a strong economy. We can and, I believe with all sincerity, we will save species without putting people and their communities at risk.

DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. President, contained in the omnibus bill is disaster relief for a number of States that have experienced recent disaster. In the State of Idaho, in February, 10 of the northern counties were deemed national disasters because of the onslaught of flooding. As of yesterday, Mr. President, 6 of those 10 counties have, once again, by the Governor of Idaho, been declared disasters because the rains, once again, are hit-

ting. In a 24-hour period, one river rose 4 feet. So, once again, we are right back in it. Therefore, these funds are so critical and the timing of this is absolutely important.

While we can rebuild and we can put back into place the infrastructure for these communities, and while people can see their homes restored, I have to point out that one of the other provisions that was lost in this omnibus bill is the fact that we no longer have the timber salvage language in there. They dropped the Senate additions made during the March conference.

I can show you in the State of Idaho miles upon miles the acres of blackened forest from forest fires. We simply wanted to get in there and be able to remove up to 10 percent of the dead trees because there is still economic value in those trees. We also wanted to remove them because they simply become new fodder for future forest fires.

That is what that language provided. It also provided jobs to the people that live in those areas that have been so devastated by the floods. Yes, we will rebuild the infrastructure. But I do not know what kind of a future is upon us now.

That is one of the implications of the passage of this omnibus bill. It concerns me deeply. And, therefore, again I urge all Members of the Senate, let us work together to find a solution to this so that we, the stewards of this land, can demonstrate our love and appreciation for this environment but also so that a good, strong environment also can produce a good, strong economy. They are not mutually exclusive.

With that, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to speak briefly about Department of Defense [DOD] infrastructure costs.

DOD is expected to spend \$152 billion in fiscal year 1996 on infrastructure. Infrastructure dollars are spent to maintain the bases, facilities, and activities that house and sustain the Armed Forces. They support costs.

The General Accounting Office [GAO] has just completed a report on DOD infrastructure costs. The report was prepared by one of GAO's best analysts, Mr. Bill Crocker.

The GAO's findings are truly amazing. Despite four rounds of base closures since 1988 and dramatic cuts in the force structure, there are no savings. DOD infrastructure costs are going up—not down.

We have had four rounds of base closures—1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995. This was the Base Realignment and Closure or BRAC process. And BRAC was quite painful for many communities.

Well, the driving force behind BRAC was “to save money by reducing overhead.”

Mr. President, that was the promise. Streamline Defense Infrastructure and save money. That was the deal. The base structure exceeded the needs of a shrinking force structure. The whole idea was to close excess, obsolete bases and save money.

Well, once again savings promised by the Pentagon have evaporated into thin air.

Now, I know that base closings require upfront costs. In some cases, these are quite substantial. But the upfront costs are supposed to be followed by down stream savings. Secretary of Defense Perry made this very point in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee as recently as March 5, 1996.

This is what he said, and I quote: “While BRAC initially costs money, there will be significant savings in the future.”

To back up his assertion, Mr. Perry points to the fiscal year 1999 budget.

Again, this is what Mr. Perry said, and I quote: “In the FY 1999 budget, the Department projects \$6 billion in savings from closing the bases, thus allowing a \$10 billion ‘swing’ in savings.”

He went on to say:

These and future savings from baseclosing will be devoted to modernization.

Well, Mr. President, what happened to those savings?

The GAO can’t find them.

The GAO audited the fiscal year 1996 to 2001 Future Years Defense Program or FYDP.

The Department’s own numbers—the numbers in the FYDP—indicate that infrastructure costs will rise in the outyears.

Infrastructure costs rise as follows, beginning with fiscal year 1998: 1998, \$147 billion; 1999, \$152 billion; 2000, \$156 billion; 2001, \$162 billion.

Where are the savings promised by Mr. Perry?

Why are not those savings reflected in the department’s books?

I think the GAO report provides a partial answer to the question.

It is true.

Base closing did produce some decreases in base support costs.

BRAC did produce some real savings.

But I underscore “did,” which is past tense.

Bureaucrats at the Pentagon don’t look on savings like the average American citizen.

To bureaucrats, it is theirs to spend. It’s not the peoples’ money to be returned to the Treasury.

Put a sponge on it, and make it disappear. That is how they see savings.

As soon as the savings popped up on the radar screen, they grabbed the money and spent it.

Those savings are not being plowed into readiness and modernization—as Mr. Perry promised.

Those savings are being diverted into new infrastructure projects.

Those savings are being used to create more excess overhead.

“Force Management” is an excellent case in point.

Force Management is one of the infrastructure cost categories.

More money for force management sounds reasonable enough, but it does not stand up too well under scrutiny.

Force management covers such things as military and departmental headquarters and public affairs.

To me, more money in force management means fatter headquarters.

Fattening up the headquarters doesn’t come cheap, either.

Spending for expanded headquarters will rise as follows, beginning in fiscal year 1998: 1988, \$13.6 billion; 1999, \$15.2 billion; 2000, \$16.1 billion; 2001, \$17.2 billion.

Now, Mr. President, why is DOD planning to beef up headquarters, when DOD continues to make dramatic decreases in the force structure?

A much smaller force structure should be much cheaper to manage.

Right?

And a smaller force should mean much smaller and fewer headquarters.

Right?

Not at the Pentagon.

As the force gets smaller and smaller, the headquarters are getting bigger and bigger. Why?

It’s needed to accommodate a top-heavy rank structure.

Base closures and realignments mean that some headquarters will have to be consolidated with others.

We know that.

But with continued shrinkage in the force structure, there still should be plenty of excess headquarters space.

There is no need to fatten up headquarters operations.

That just does not make any sense at all right now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two tables.

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

TABLE V-3—FORCE STRUCTURE^a—PART V: FORMULATING THE DEFENSE BUDGET

	Cold war fiscal year 1990	Base force plan ^b	Fiscal year 1996	Fiscal year 1997	BUR-based plan ^c
Army—active divisions	18	12	10	10	10
Reserve component brigades ^d	57	34	47	42	42
Marine expeditionary force ^e	3	3	3	3	3
Navy aircraft carriers (active/reserve)	15/1	12/1	11/1	11/1	11/1
Carrier air wings (active/reserve)	13/2	11/2	10/1	10/1	10/1
Battle force ships (active/reserve)	546	430	359	357	346
Fighter wing equivalents (active/reserve)	24/12	15/11	13/8	13/7	13/7

^a Dual entries in the table show data for active/reserve forces, except for carriers, which depicts deployable/training carriers.

^b Bush Administration’s planned fiscal year 1995 force levels, as reflected in the January 1993 Annual Defense Report.

^c Shown are planned force levels, which may differ slightly from those recommended by the BUR, but which are consistent with its proposals.

^d An approximate equivalent. The BUR plan calls for 15 enhanced readiness brigades, a goal that DoD will begin to reach in fiscal year 1996. Backing up this force will be an Army National Guard strategic reserve of eight divisions (24 brigades), two separate brigade equivalents, and a scout group.

^e One reserve Marine division, wing, and force service support group supports the active structure in all cases.

TABLE V-4—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PERSONNEL

[End of fiscal year strength in thousands]

	Fiscal year—			Goal	Percent change fis- cal year 1987–1997
	1987	1996	1997		
Active military	2,174	1,482	1,457	1,418	–33
Army	781	495	495	475	–37
Navy	587	424	407	394	–31
Marine Corps	199	174	174	174	–13
Air Force	607	388	381	375	–37
Selected reserves	1,151	931	901	893	–19
DoD civilians	1,133	841	807	728	–27

Mr. GRASSLEY. These two tables are taken from page 254 of Secretary Perry’s March 1996 report to Congress.

These tables contain the data that point to dramatic decreases in our force structure since the late 1980’s.

Those tables tell the tale:

They tell me that there should be dramatic cuts in infrastructure costs.

But the savings are nowhere in sight. Once again, the Pentagon is proving that it is incapable of allocating money in sensible ways.

Once again, the Pentagon is proving that it is incapable of saving money—even with such a golden opportunity.

Mr. President, it makes me sad to say this.

The Pentagon bureaucrats are just frittering away the money on stupid projects.

The benefits of the painful base closure process are being wasted.

If Pentagon bureaucrats have their way, the goals of base closure effort will never be reached.

The GAO has presented 13 different options for cutting defense infrastructure costs.

The GAO says these options would save about \$12.0 billion between fiscal years 1997–2001.

Mr. President, I hope the defense committees will examine the GAO options.

I hope the defense committees will consider using those options to recoup some lost savings.

I hope they will do that, rather than ask for more money in this year's defense budget.

I yield the floor.

IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3746 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3745, AS MODIFIED

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 3746 be modified, and I send the modification to the desk.

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

The amendment (No. 3746), as modified, is as follows:

At the end of the amendment add the following: "Notwithstanding any other provisions of the bill, provisions of the bill regarding the use of volunteers shall become effective 30 days after enactment".

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO M. GAYLE CORY

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senate family this week lost one of its own, Gayle Cory, the former postmaster of the Senate, who died of cancer on Wednesday evening.

Gayle's Senate career spanned 35 years. Beginning as a receptionist with Senator Ed Muskie in 1959, Gayle became the executive assistant to our former majority leader, George Mitch-

ell, before her appointment to the Senate post office.

As an officer of the Senate, Gayle reformed and strengthened the operations of the Senate post office, improving service to Members and assuring the strong financial controls so essential as a matter of public trust. The Senate lost a dedicated employee of enormous personal integrity when Gayle resigned in January of 1995.

It was not her work, however, that defined Gayle. It was her personal warmth and her generous spirit. Gayle gave of herself and her time to all who asked—colleagues at work, constituents from Maine, citizens from around the entire country. All who turned to Gayle Cory knew they were heard and that she would do her best.

She was realistic about people's behavior but optimistic about their potential. Perhaps that is why she dedicated all of her life to public service. Gayle believed that if people were given the opportunity to behave well, most of them would, so she made it her business to create such opportunities for everyone who came into contact with her. Perhaps that is why Gayle was so well loved by so many. She brought out the best in everyone.

On behalf of the Senate family, I extend my condolences to Don Cory, Gayle's husband, to her daughters and stepchildren, to her brother, Buzz Fitzgerald, and her sister, Carol. Our prayers and our thoughts are with them.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, many of us in the Senate are today mourning the loss of a very dear friend, long-time aide to Senators Edmund S. Muskie and George J. Mitchell, and former Postmaster of the U.S. Senate.

Gayle Cory died Wednesday night, succumbing to the cancer that caused her retirement in January 1995 after a too brief career as Senate Postmaster. Her death comes nearly 1 month after the death of her dear friend, former Secretary of State Edmund S. Muskie. Gayle was a member of Senator Muskie's staff from the very beginning of his Senate career in 1959, and she was at his side throughout his years in the Senate. She was one of a very few Senate aides who moved with him to the Department of State when Senator Muskie was appointed Secretary of State in 1980. But their friendship, and Gayle's friendship with Jane Muskie and the Muskie children, continued long after Senator Muskie left public life.

She returned to the Senate to join the staff of former Senator George J. Mitchell. She served as his top personal assistant until he became Senate Majority Leader, when he appointed her Postmaster of the U.S. Senate. As Senate Postmaster, Gayle oversaw many improvements in the post office security operations. She also instituted many reforms which effectively preserved the integrity of the Senate Post Office during the same period of time that the House postal services were engulfed by scandal.

Gayle Cory was very special to all of us fortunate enough to know her and work with her. She did not have acquaintances * * * to meet Gayle was to be her friend, and all of us, regardless of our political affiliation, knew we could count on her help and her wise counsel. Few of us in this body today understand the workings of the Senate as thoroughly as Gayle did, and she used her knowledge and experience to work for the people of Maine. She loved Maine deeply, and the people of Maine were always her first priority. She was the first contact for many Mainers coming to Washington, and even those meeting her for the first time were made to feel welcome, to know they had found a friend. In fact recently, my office was visited by a family from Gayle's hometown of Bath, whose sole reason for stopping by was to inquire about Gayle.

Gayle worked hard and successfully over the years but she never sought personal recognition for her efforts. She was loved and deeply respected by members of my staff, many of whom kept in touch with her after her retirement. We are deeply saddened by her passing. We have lost a wonderful friend, but she will live on in our memories and in our hearts.

I want to extend my deepest sympathies to Gayle's husband, Don, to their two daughters, Carole and Melissa, and to her brother and sister, Duane Fitzgerald and Carole Rouillard of Bath, ME.

I extend my sympathies, too, to Gayle's extended family here in the Senate—the staffs of former Senators Edmund S. Muskie and George Mitchell, and the staff of the Senate Post Office. They, too, have lost a member of their family.

THE SALVAGE LAW AND NATURAL RESOURCES DECISION MAKING

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, as part of the negotiations with the White House on appropriations for the remainder of Fiscal Year 1996, we have agreed to eliminate language designed to make the so-called Salvage Rider more workable for the Administration. To my colleagues with whom I worked to fashion this language, let me say that I did not drop it willingly. I dropped it in the face of a direct and specific veto threat by the President. I continue to believe it is sound policy and makes many desirable changes to the original salvage law.

This language would have given the Administration the authority, for any reason, to halt for 90 days the green tree sales released under Section 2001(k) of the law on which harvesting had not begun by March 28, 1996. During that 90 day period, the President would have been able to negotiate with contract holders to provide replacement timber or a cash buy out as a substitute for harvesting the original timber sale. Current law restricts the President's ability to enter into such agreements.