

and despite the Pentagon's contention that it would save the military a billion dollars per year to shift the focus of reserve units from fighting units to support units, the Army wants to deny that it would be cheaper and more effective to reduce the active component even further while increasing the number of troops in the reserve components.

However, don't look for this to happen and I'll tell you why.

First, it drastically would cut the number of active duty staff officer positions at the Pentagon and they are the ones who are drawing up the plans to downsize the military. No one, and I mean no one, is willingly going to say "Eliminate me and destroy my career," when an option can be made to eliminate someone else's job (even if they do it at less than half the cost).

Second, it is a matter of control. Because of its dual state-federal role, the National Guard is not totally under the control of federal army, something senior staff members resent and dream up ways to eliminate. Even though, again speaking from personal experience, Guard and reserve units often meet or exceed the standards set for active duty units, despite the fact they don't practice at the job 270 days a year.

Third, it limits the options of the executive branch to use the military in questionable operations. Note that the hue and cry about the use of U.S. forces in the Balkans and places like Somalia and Haiti are muted when the troops used are professional, full-time volunteers when compared to the times when the political leadership has to bite the bullet to tap into every village and hamlet to send forces in harm's way.

The civilian and military leadership in the Pentagon knows these things full well and, hence, would rather keep their jobs and control of careers, while keeping open the options for ticket-punching operations that are so vital to career progression.

The argument is that the combat units in the National Guard won't go to war and are ill-prepared to fight if they are sent, which—to borrow a phrase from retired Gen. H. Norman "Stormin' Norman" Schwarzkopf—is just so much bovine scatology.

When the Arm went to war in the Persian Gulf, its units were no more prepared than many National Guard units. Most used the months preceding the ground attack to "train up" in the desert and bring their troops up to the needed "combat readiness."

The three National Guard armored brigades that were mobilized during Desert Storm where held in the U.S. not so much because their training was not up to snuff but because if they had gone to the desert and acquitted themselves well . . . well, it would have disproved the myth that reserve soldiers can't perform up to the same standards as active duty soldiers.

Imagine what Congress and the budget cutters would have thought then. Gee, for 40 cents on the dollar, we can field a capable force that doesn't need all the full-time auxiliary services like housing, medical care and other benefits that we have to give the active duty force. We might be able to get a lot more bang for our buck.

Lay aside those arguments, and the arguments about all the support and benefits to national defense that come from a truly citizen army, and there is one vital reason why the political leadership in Washington and the Pentagon should not be allowed to reduce the Army to just professional soldiers: It removes the political cost on military adventures overseas.

If the civilian leadership has to go to every hamlet and village to draw men (and now women) to carry rifles and man tanks and artillery pieces, then it has to be able to justify the mission to the American people.

This can be a tough sell and can be avoided if it is just a matter of sending in the professionals that have slipped under the radar of the folks back home. Hey, they volunteered for the job and it goes with the territory.

But don't look for that argument to be made. Even though we learned that lesson in Vietnam, when we didn't have large scale mobilizations of the reserve components and paid the price in 58,000 lives, we have forgotten it again. Gone, now, is the leadership that created the "Total Force", the Army that was built so that the civilian leadership couldn't commit U.S. forces in substantial numbers without paying the political price of getting the American people on board.

The new leadership wants to be able to go anywhere, anytime and not worry about support back home. It saves their careers.

HONORING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to salute the fine work South Carolina Educational Television is doing to promote Black History Month. On Wednesday, February 21, SC ETV will feature the ninth annual Black History Teleconference live from the campus of Benedict College in Columbia, S.C.

"The Struggle Continues: African-American Women as Nurturing and Contributing Forces in America" will feature eight South Carolina high school seniors who will question a panel of nationally acclaimed African-American leaders. The 90-minute teleconference will be broadcast live via satellite to more than 500 school districts nationwide, colleges, and universities.

The eight high school panelists for South Carolina are Dion Alexander of Woodruff High School, LaShonda R. Davis of Bishopville High School, Felicia DuRante of Mauldin High School, Latasha Johnson of Baptist High School, Tahnee Johnson of Walterboro High School, Juontonio Pinckney of Battery Creek High School, Lemekia Stewart of Lockhart High School, and Joey Walker of Silver Bluff High School. I send my congratulations to each of them for their academic and civic achievements.

Also, I would like to commend Dr. Marianna Davis of Keenan High School in Columbia. She has been the driving force behind this annual event. She is an inspiring role model for our youth because she encourages them to set high goals and to work hard to reach them.

Mr. President, I also commend Henry Cauthen, president of South Carolina ETV; Dr. Davis; the students; and the panelists of "The Struggle Continues" for their continuing devotion to cultural excellence in broadcasting. We are very proud of our fine educational network in South Carolina. It serves as an example for the Nation in presenting this teleconference during Black History Month.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, about 4 years ago I commenced these daily re-

ports to the Senate to make a matter of record the exact Federal debt as of close of business the previous day.

In that report, February 27, 1992, the Federal debt stood at \$3,825,891,293,066.80, as of close of business the previous day. The point is, the Federal debt has escalated by \$1,161,545,065,098.40 since February 26, 1992.

As of the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, January 31, 1996, the Federal debt stood at exactly \$4,987,436,358,165.20. On a per capita basis, every man, woman and child in America owes \$18,930.74 as his or her share of the Federal debt.

BOX SCORE ON IMPORTS OF FOREIGN OIL BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the American Petroleum Institute reports that, for the week ending January 26, the U.S. imported 6,895,000 barrels of oil each day, 5 percent more than the 6,550,000 barrels imported during the same period 1 year ago.

Americans now rely on foreign oil for more than 50 percent of their needs, and there are no signs that this upward trend will abate.

Since a barrel of oil is 55 gallons, this means that the United States purchased 379,225,000 gallons of oil from foreign countries this past week.

Anybody else interested in restoring domestic production of oil—by U.S. producers using American workers? If the American people don't become concerned perhaps they had better ponder the economic calamity that will occur in America if and when foreign producers shut off our supply, or double the already enormous cost of imported oil flowing into the United States—now 6,895,000 barrels a day.

UNITED STATES-GERMANY AVIATION RELATIONS

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a critically important international aviation matter I have raised in this body on numerous occasions. I refer to the significant opportunity that has presented itself to fully liberalize our aviation relations with the Federal Republic of Germany.

I am delighted to inform my colleagues that this morning the United States and Germany agreed on a framework for an open skies agreement. This is a major step in liberalizing aviation relations with one of our most important trading partners. A United States-Germany open skies agreement would produce significant new air service opportunities for all U.S. passenger carriers. Now that the mutually agreed upon structure for a liberalized air service agreement is in place, a round of formal talks has been scheduled for February 22 in Washington to finalize any remaining details.

Mr. President, I would like to praise both the Department of Transportation

and the State Department for the excellent work they are doing in pursuing this opportunity. Also, I would be remiss if I failed to recognize the outstanding leadership German Transport Minister Matthias Wissmann has provided. I appreciate fully that Germany's membership in the European Union creates an added challenge in accomplishing our shared goal of securing an open skies agreement. For that reason, I commend Minister Wissmann for the great political courage he and the German Government have shown in pursuing this initiative.

An open skies agreement with Germany is tremendously significant since it would benefit the U.S. economy, our airline industry and consumers. Let me briefly expand on each point.

First, both immediately and from a long-term perspective, a United States-Germany open skies agreement would produce significant economic benefits for the United States. Due to the competitiveness of U.S. passenger and cargo carriers, they consistently generate for the United States significant net trade surpluses. I fully expect the same will continue to be true under a fully liberalized aviation regime with Germany. In fact, the performance of our cargo carriers under the liberalized air cargo agreement we signed with Germany in 1993 has been very impressive.

Germany also would benefit greatly from such an agreement. To confirm this point, one need only look to the Netherlands which continues to reap enormous economic benefits from the open skies agreement we signed with the Dutch several years ago. Unquestionably, the economic benefits of open skies agreements are a two-way street. I believe a United States-Germany open skies agreement is an excellent long-term economic investment for both countries.

Second, an open skies agreement with Germany would create tremendous new international air service opportunities for the U.S. airline industry. As I have previously explained to this body, such an agreement would generate both direct and indirect benefits for all U.S. passenger carriers.

In terms of direct benefits, an open skies agreement with Germany would immediately produce new air service opportunities between the United States and Germany. Is there pent-up demand among U.S. passenger carriers to serve Germany? Absolutely. Recently, eight U.S. passenger carriers sought to offer 316 roundtrip flights between the United States and Germany each week during the 1996 summer season. Under the current bilateral aviation agreement, however, U.S. passenger carriers can only offer 276 weekly roundtrip flights to Germany. Under an open skies agreement, there would be no such limit and the number of roundtrip frequencies would be set by market demand, not governments.

Equally important, German airports would provide well-situated gateway

opportunities for our carriers to serve points throughout Europe, the Middle East, Africa and the booming Asia-Pacific market. Is it realistic to think that German airports will provide key gateways to the rapidly expanding Asia-Pacific market? Absolutely. In fact, Japan Airlines recently announced it intends to initiate new service between Osaka and Frankfurt. Non-stop service is presently available from Frankfurt-Main Airport to cities throughout the Asia-Pacific market including Hong Kong, Seoul, Bangkok and Singapore. Moreover, non-stop service to the Asia-Pacific market also is currently available from Munich Airport. These examples illustrate my point well.

With respect to indirect benefits, an open skies agreement with Germany would be an important catalyst for further liberalization of air service opportunities throughout Europe. Since it is such a critical fact, let me reiterate a point I have made in this body before. An open skies agreement with Germany—in combination with liberalized air service agreements we already secured with the Netherlands in 1992 and with nine other European countries last year—would mean nearly half of all passengers traveling between the United States and Europe would be flying to or from European countries with open skies regimes. Under such a scenario, competition would be our best ally in opening the remaining restrictive air service markets in Europe.

Will an open skies agreement with Germany, or any other country for that matter, benefit all U.S. passenger carriers equally? Of course not. A market-oriented framework only guarantees carriers the opportunity to compete. As should be the case, the market will determine which carriers will benefit most under an open skies agreement with Germany. Overall, however, I do predict with confidence that the U.S. aviation industry as a whole will benefit immensely from unrestricted opportunities to serve Germany.

Third, undoubtedly consumers in the United States and Germany would be the biggest winners. Due to enhanced service options as well as the assurance of competitive air fares, consumers always benefit most under open skies agreements.

In conclusion, I am very pleased that we are well on our way to an open skies agreement with Germany. Such an agreement would be in the best economic interest of the United States and it would create considerable new international air service opportunities for all U.S. passenger carriers. Of great importance to me, consumers would reap significant benefits as well. I hope an open skies agreement with Germany will soon be in hand.

Let me add that I know some of my colleagues are frustrated that we have not made more progress liberalizing air service opportunities with several other major trading partners. I share this frustration but do not believe it

results from a lack of effort on the part of our negotiators. In fact, our successful talks with the Germans illustrate a critical element which has been lacking in those other negotiations. I refer to the keen vision the Germans have shown in recognizing that the economic benefits of an open skies agreement with the United States are a two-way street.

In this regard, I believe my colleagues who are frustrated about the continued reluctance of the British to permit U.S. carriers greater access to London Heathrow Airport should be very pleased by this development with Germany. As I said earlier, competition will be our best ally in expanding air service opportunities with European countries such as the United Kingdom that continue to restrict the access of U.S. carriers. An open skies agreement with Germany will add great force to this market dynamic.

TRIBUTE TO LOWELL KRASSNER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of the late Lowell Krassner of Burlington, VT, who passed away unexpectedly on January 15, 1996. As a longtime activist with the Vermont chapter of the Sierra Club, Lowell dedicated much of his life and energy to the conservation and stewardship of our natural resources—both in Vermont and nationally.

Lowell, together with his wife and partner Diane Geerken, worked tirelessly to protect the Vermont they loved, making major contributions to the eventual passage of the Vermont Wilderness Act of 1983 and the Green Mountain National Forest Management Plan of 1986.

Lowell and Diane functioned as a two-person citizen oversight committee, making sure that the actions of State and Federal public lands and natural resource managers were carefully reviewed. Indeed, friends and colleagues have often remarked how their South Burlington home served as both a hub of environmental activism and a Vermont conservation archive for so many years.

Lowell stood as a staunch defender of the Long/Appalachian Trail. He could also be both a strong supporter and sharp critic of the U.S. Forest Service, depending on the issue at hand.

In his commitment to the environment, Lowell Krassner also looked well beyond the Green Mountains, Lake Champlain, and the Connecticut River. He was well read on the various national environmental debates of the day—clean water, clean air, endangered species, wetlands, ANWR, Forest Service timber policy—and readily shared his views with his congressional representatives.

Lowell was particularly concerned with the recent attacks on our Nation's environmental laws represented by such actions as the timber salvage rider on the fiscal 1995 rescission legislation.