

by ensuring taxpayers that they are going to get fair treatment by the tax collector, the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. President, in closing, I would like to this morning pay a very, very special tribute to a fine gentleman who has worked for years to make certain that the taxpayers' bill of rights No. 2 became the law of this land. This fine gentleman is Steve Glaze. He is a member of my staff. He sits to my left at this moment on the floor, and I can say without reservation that without Steve Glaze's constant help and support, his inspiration many times when we thought the taxpayers' bill of rights 2 would never see the light of day and never become law, Steve Glaze was always that optimistic individual, knowledgeable, inspired and committed to making certain that the American taxpayer got a fairer break.

So, Mr. President, I thank my very worthy staff member, Steve Glaze, for his magnificent contribution to this bipartisan piece of legislation.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand morning business will be completed at 11 o'clock. I will attempt to keep my time to that. If you will advise me when the time is up, I would appreciate it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Morning business does expire at 11 o'clock. The Chair will advise the Senator.

Mr. DOMENICI. I had contacted Senator THURMOND about the last 5 minutes, and he is not coming, so that is why I am using his time.

#### FOREIGN OWNERSHIP OF U.S. TREASURIES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, while much attention has been given to the trajectory of our budget deficit in recent months, very little has been said about how we are financing this deficit. I think this latter point is crucial because there are some very troubling trends in the ownership of U.S. Treasuries which could spell trouble down the road.

Foreign ownership of U.S. Treasuries has surged in the last 3½ years. As a percent of the total private holdings, this ratio soared from 19 percent in 1992 to 25 percent by 1995. To put this in perspective, foreign treasuries and their holdings held within a fairly stable, and narrow range of 15 to 20 percent during the 12 years previous to 1992.

Some may argue that this recent rise is not worrisome. Indeed, we should be grateful, some would say, for foreign participation. However, this ignores two very key facts.

One, this money must be paid back with interest at a future date, and in-

terest payments abroad are an unambiguous loss to American incomes. This is not the case with interest paid to domestic residents and domestic institutions. As such, continued purchases of Treasuries amount to mortgaging away our future standard of living a little bit at a time.

The second reason is that it is usually a bad sign to see a country find itself predominantly with foreign central bank money, because when they buy our Treasuries, they lend us their money. So it is usually a bad sign to see a country find that a foreign central bank is a predominant lender of money to us.

This usually bespeaks a lack of sufficient private investment and is a warning of unsustainable fiscal policies. Witness Mexico in 1995. That is why I view the first quarter's current data with such alarm. It showed that foreign central banks bought \$55 billion in U.S. Treasuries from January to March of this year alone—\$55 billion. That is nearly double the amount that central banks bought in all of 1994 and is over 80 percent of 1995's yearly total.

Let me put it another way. First quarter foreign official bond purchases amounted to 6.5 percent of the entire stock of foreign treasury holdings which had been built up over time. This goes a long way toward explaining why the treasury market was so resilient initially to the collapse of the balanced budget talks that we were having with the administration at the start of this year.

Why were central banks buying so many of our Treasury bills, so many of our IOUs? While some may have viewed United States debt as a good investment, the main player was the Bank of Japan. It was not buying our Treasury bills because it wanted to, but only did so to prop up the dollar and keep the yen weak as a way of aiding its ailing exporters and its banking sector.

The Bank of Japan has been forced into such defensive dollar buying ever since the Clinton administration forcibly devalued the dollar in 1993. Since 1993, the Bank of Japan's reserves have tripled from \$69 billion, Mr. President, to \$208 billion, underpinning our bond market with those huge quantities of purchases.

Since these reserves are held in dollars, this translates into a similar amount of treasury purchases. At present, these Japanese treasury purchases are very stable. The Bank of Japan cannot sell them without precipitating a fall in the dollar versus yen. However, once its banking sector reserves and its exporters adjust to the current yen level, there will be less need for the Bank of Japan to be buying Treasuries. Since the U.S. bond market has been accustomed to their steady purchases, this will come as a blow to the Treasury market of the United States. Indeed, we have already seen a mild example of what might happen when foreign central banks scale back their dollar purchases.

In April through June of 1996, official Treasury purchases were only one-tenth as large as in the first quarter. It was no accident that bonds fell sharply during this period, with the 30-year yield soaring from 6.6 to 7.2 percent.

The recent example stresses the importance of reducing the amount of U.S. debt issuance now. Only in this way will we be able to prevent a sharp future bond market selloff if foreign central banks scale back their enormous appetite for our securities, which appetite is not singularly predicated upon their confidence in us but, rather, in this case, the Japanese purchases are in their own self-interest for the time being, for they are attempting to effect the value of the yen versus the dollar their way.

When that all gets stabilized, who will fill the gap as they begin to dispose of these inordinate holdings of American Treasuries?

Mr. President, I yield the floor and thank the Senate for the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. What is the pending business now?

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1894) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Stevens amendment No. 4439, to realign funds from Army and Defense Wide Operation and Maintenance accounts to the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, my understanding as to the vote on the cloture motion that was filed last week, it has been temporarily set aside and could be called back by the leadership after notice to the minority; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator from Hawaii and I are now at liberty to proceed with the bill; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. When we were interrupted by the proceedings on the cloture motions last week, I had an amendment pending which had been set aside. Is that still the situation with regard to this bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is amendment No. 4439, as the Senator has stated. Is there further debate on the amendment?

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4439

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask the clerk to lay before the Senate the amendment that was set aside, No. 4439.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the pending question.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this is a technical amendment that transfers funds from one account to another to assure that the contingency operations of the Department will be met.

AMENDMENT NO. 4589 TO AMENDMENT NO. 4439

(Purpose: A second degree amendment to amendment number 4439 filed by Mr. Stevens)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I now send to the desk an amendment which was proposed by Senator INOUE and introduced on Friday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. INOUE, proposes an amendment numbered 4589 to amendment No. 4439.

The amendment is as follows:

In lieu of the matter to be inserted by amendment number 4439, at an appropriate place in the bill insert:

SEC. 8099. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the number for Military Personnel, Navy shall be \$16,948,481,000, the number for Military Personnel, Air Force shall be \$17,026,210,000, the number for Operation and Maintenance, Army shall be \$17,696,659,000, the number for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force shall be \$17,326,909,000, the number for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide shall be \$9,887,142,000, the number for Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund shall be \$1,140,157,000, the number for Defense Health Program shall be \$10,251,208,000, the number for Defense Health Program Operation and maintenance shall be \$9,931,738,000. (b) Of the funds appropriated under the heading Aircraft procurement, Air Force, \$11,500,000 shall be made available only for modifications to B-52 bomber aircraft. (c) Of the funds appropriated in title VI of this Act, under the heading Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense for Research, development, test and evaluation, \$3,000,000 shall only be for the accelerated development of advanced sensors for the Army's Mobile Munitions Assessment System. (d) Of the funds appropriated in title IV of this Act, under the heading Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide,

\$56,200,000 shall be available for the Corps Surface-to-Air Missile (CORPS SAM) program and \$515,743,000 shall be available for the Other Theater Missile Defense/Follow-On TMD Activities program. (e) Funds appropriated in title II of this Act for supervision and administration costs for facilities maintenance and repair, minor construction, or design projects may be obligated at the time the reimbursable order is accepted by the performing activity: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, supervision and administration costs includes all in-house government costs. (f) Of the funds appropriated in title IV of this Act, under the heading Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy, \$2,000,000 is available for titanium processing technology. (g) Advance billing for services provided or work performed by the Navy's defense business operating fund activities is prohibited: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under the heading Operation and Maintenance, Navy, \$2,976,000,000 shall be available only for depot maintenance activities and programs, and \$989,700,000 shall be available only for real property maintenance activities. (h) The Secretary of Defense may waive reimbursement of the cost of conferences, seminars, courses of instruction, or similar educational activities of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies for military officers and civilian officials of foreign nations if the Secretary determines that attendance by such personnel, without reimbursement, is in the national security interest of the United States: *Provided*, That costs for which reimbursement is waived pursuant to this subsection shall be paid from appropriations available for the Asia-Pacific Center. (i) Of the funds appropriated in title IV of this Act, under the heading Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, \$3,000,000 shall be available for a defense technology transfer pilot program. (j) Of the funds appropriated in title IV of this Act, under the heading Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy, \$4,000,000 is available for the establishment of the National Coastal Data Centers required by section 7901(c) of title 10, United States Code, as added by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997. (k)(1) Of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for the Department of the Air Force, \$2,000,000 shall be available to provide comprehensive care and rehabilitation services to children with disabilities who are dependents of members of the Armed Forces at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas.

(2) Subject to subsection (3), the Secretary of the Air Force shall grant the funds available under subsection (a) to the Children's Association for Maximum Potential (CAMP) for use by the association to defray the costs of designing and constructing the facility referred to in subsection (1).

(3)(a) The Secretary may not make a grant of funds under subsection (2) until the Secretary and the association enter into an agreement under which the Secretary leases to the association the facility to be constructed using the funds.

(b)(1) The term of the lease under paragraph (1) may not be less than 25 years.

(2) As consideration for the lease of the facility, the association shall assume responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the facility, including the costs of such operation and maintenance.

(c) The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the lease as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

ries of amendments that I will articulate after we adopt this amendment. This is a managers' amendment. It has been drafted and prepared by Senator INOUE. With his consent, I have called it up as an amendment in the second degree to the pending amendment.

I want to give notice to all Senators that it is being brought up and it is a technical amendment. However, it does cover a series of amendments that were filed in cloture. This amendment, if adopted, covers amendments Nos. 4466, 4439, 4467, 4468, 4469, 4470, 4471, 4472, 4473, 4474, 4475, 4476, 4477, 4478, 4481, 4482, 4483, 4484, 4485, 4486, 4487, 4488, 4511, 4565, 4567, and 4576. I believe that is the list.

Because of the cloture requirements, we filed separate amendments to achieve the same objective as the managers' amendment we had worked out before the cloture motion was filed. These were a series, not totally technical, of amendments that had been worked out on both sides and cleared on both sides for inclusion in this bill by unanimous consent. If we adopt this amendment, I will ask that the amendments I have just read be withdrawn.

I turn to my friend from Hawaii to seek his concurrence in this procedure.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I have no objection, and I wish to advise my colleagues that this procedure and these amendments have been cleared by both sides.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I want to wait a minute in total fairness. We are trying to contact one Senator. I want to make sure there is no disagreement. We have the list here, if anyone who is observing these proceedings is concerned. This will, in effect, adopt the amendments that we were prepared, before the cloture motion was filed, to recommend to the Senate as one managers' amendment. That is our proceeding now.

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

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I restate my request. I have an amendment at the desk. I ask unanimous consent that it be considered as a substitute for the pending amendment.

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, the plasma quench technology amendment will yield valuable results for our defense and aerospace industries in the near future. I understand it has been accepted by the committee, so I will keep my remarks brief. I sincerely appreciate the help and support of the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator STEVENS and the ranking member, Senator INOUE.

Mr. President, my amendment would provide \$2 million from funds available under title IV of the legislation before

us, to support development of an innovative metallurgic technology called plasma quench developed at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, to be used in producing ultra fine titanium powder and developing an injection molding of titanium metal.

Titanium metal is of critical significance to a wide variety of strategically important manufactured products, and the need for titanium in the production of such products is set to increase dramatically. In the transportation and aerospace areas the feasibility of many advanced products is predicated on a high-quantity, low cost supply of titanium that simply does not currently exist. At the same time that U.S. aerospace companies and other manufacturers are becoming more dependent on titanium, the sources for processed titanium metal are increasingly moving offshore, becoming more expensive. High capital and operational costs, in addition to the waste disposal costs associated with the standard Kroll process for titanium production are largely to blame for this migration. This situation threatens to seriously diminish the leverage and control exercised by U.S. manufacturers over this important strategic material.

The plasma quench process represents an alternative to the Kroll process that could have a radical impact on the world's titanium market by dramatically reducing the capital and process costs, and eliminating the waste stream associated with titanium production. While commercial-scale production of other metals using this process has already been demonstrated, much developmental work is necessary to prove the viability of the process with regard to titanium.

Mr. President, this is an important step in assuring the cost-effective, viable, and readily accessible production in the United States. As I mentioned before, I thank the committee for accepting this amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Now, Mr. President, I will announce, once again, that this is the managers' amendment. It incorporates a series of amendments that we had agreed to accept on both sides prior to the cloture motion being filed. It has been checked with the persons that had some question about it. I now believe that it is still cleared on both sides. With that concurrence from the Senator from Hawaii, I ask if he concurs that it be adopted.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I concur.  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, amendment No. 4589 is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4589) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4439, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, amendment No. 4439, as amended, is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4439), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I read the series of amendments that have been proposed in the cloture mode, and I recall all of those amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, those amendments are recalled.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we have a series of amendments that have been filed, and we have been notified of a series that Members will seek to debate. We have an understanding with the leadership that a cloture motion will continue to be set aside so long as we proceed expeditiously with this bill.

Senator INOUE and I are prepared to debate and consider any amendments that Members have indicated they wish to bring before the Senate. We will announce to the Senate that if there are no Members that wish to bring the matters before the Senate, we will go to third reading.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, I will. Does the Senator from Hawaii have any remaining amendments he wishes to consider?

Mr. INOUE. Not personally.

Mr. President, I want to advise my colleagues that the managers of this measure are prepared to not only debate but to pass this measure today. If we cooperate, we should be able to do so by a reasonable time this evening.

That would mean tomorrow and the weekend would be free for our colleagues to do what they normally wish to do at this time of the year. So, Mr. President, I hope that the staff on both sides will send the message out to those who are interested in presenting amendments to come forth to the floor and do so expeditiously.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if I can have the indulgence of the Chair, I have three small amendments that I will present.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4563

(Purpose: To require a study regarding the F-22 advanced tactical fighter)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] proposes an amendment numbered 4563.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 30, line 2, before the period, insert: "Provided, That not less than \$1,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be made available only to assess the

budgetary, cost, technical, operational, training, and safety issues associated with a decision to eliminate development of the F-22B two-seat training variant of the F-22 advanced tactical fighter: *Provided further*, That the assessment required by the preceding proviso shall be submitted, in classified and unclassified versions, by the Secretary of the Air Force to the Congressional defense committees not later than February 15, 1997".

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this amendment allocates \$1 million for the Air Force to assess comprehensively the implications of the service's recent decision to terminate development of a two-seat trainer variant of the F-22 advanced tactical fighter.

I might state to the Senate that we have been informed that, if there was a proposal to eliminate the two-seat variant of the F-22 advanced tactical fighter, that would leave us without a training vehicle for this very sophisticated new aircraft.

We are not mandating that the decision be changed. We are mandating that there be a study made of that decision with regard to safety and training problems, as well as budgetary and technical problems, and that the Appropriations Committees and the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate receive this study by February 15, 1997.

The Air Force normally acquires fighter aircraft in single-seat and two-seat variants so that the latter may be used for pilot flight training. Although the twin-seat trainers cost more than the single seat aircraft, they are considered necessary for the effective and safe training of pilots in the demanding air-to-air and air-to-ground tactical environments. Should a student pilot experience difficulties, the instructor pilot can assume control of the aircraft and safely demonstrate the required procedures and maneuvers.

Recently, the Air Force decided to cease development of the two-seat F-22—known as the "F-22B"—in order to constrain costs.

Mr. President, there are serious safety, operational, and training issues associated with this decision. The F-22 is the most complex fighter aircraft ever developed. The pilots flying it must be the best trained to operate and fight the aircraft safely and effectively. The loss of a single pilot in a training accident would be a tragedy and would deprive the nation of a talented Air Force officer needed to accomplish important military missions.

There also are major cost, budgetary, and technical issues associated with the decision. Every F-22 fighter will cost at least \$111 million to procure. The entire program will cost at least \$70,092,947,000. In addition to the high cost of training a pilot, the loss of just a few F-22's in training or operational accidents caused by inferior training would more than offset the savings generated by terminating the F-22B. In retrospect, this decision may well come to be seen as penny wise and fiscally and militarily pound foolish.

The amendment I am offering is intended to provide the Congress with sufficient information to enable us to fully understand the many serious implications of the Air Force decision. Congress should have the opportunity to consider, and to act on, this decision in a timely manner.

The amendment mandates that the required report be submitted in classified and unclassified versions.

Does this have my friend's support?

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, this amendment has been cleared by both sides.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4563) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4489

(Purpose: To reduce by \$100 million the maximum amount allowed for Pentagon renovation)

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 4489 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], for Mr. BINGAMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 4489.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 70, line 8, strike out "\$1,218,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,118,000,000".

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, this amendment will bring the defense appropriations bill into conformance with the authorization bill on the total cost of the renovation of the Pentagon reservation. My amendment reduces the cost cap in the bill by \$100 million to a total of \$1.118 billion. This is identical in purpose to the amendment passed by the Senate on June 25 during debate on the defense authorization bill.

The amendment is very simple and straightforward. It reduces the funds for the Pentagon renovation project by \$100 million. As we have realigned our defense programs to meet changing needs, funds for many projects have been reduced or eliminated. Despite big reductions in defense spending and defense personnel, the Pentagon renovation project has enjoyed a steady flow of cash.

The time has come to impose greater financial discipline on the Pentagon, just as the Pentagon has asked other military organizations to be more frugal. This would be the first reduction in funds for this expensive project since

its inception half a decade ago, and it amounts to less than 10 percent of the total.

Many things have changed since this 15-year project began, and I believe Pentagon renovation plans can be better aligned with today's realities. There are many factors which ease the impact of a reduced renovation budget. For example, the Department of Defense is downsizing. As the civilian and military workforce is steadily reduced, demands on workspace have eased. Construction costs in the Washington DC area have fallen and contract costs for the renovation have turned out to be considerably lower than the original estimates. On one construction contract alone, for example, costs were 36 percent less than anticipated. Also, modern communications technology makes it unnecessary to have large staffs at the Pentagon to manage dispersed operations.

Mr. President, in 1990 Congress transferred responsibility for the operation, maintenance, and renovation of the Pentagon from the General Services Administration to the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Congress recognized that the serious structural problems of the Pentagon building had to be addressed without further delay, and we took this action to get the long overdue project moving forward. Congress earmarked the \$1.2 billion DoD would have paid to GSA in rent for the next 12 or 13 years as a break even way to pay for the renovations. This \$1.2 billion was not based on projected renovation costs; it was simply a sum that was available and seemed a logical way to fund the renovation. Congress also provided the Department of Defense great flexibility in managing this large and complex project.

Since fiscal year 1994, the Senate Appropriations Committee has required the Secretary of Defense to certify that the total cost of Pentagon renovation will not exceed \$1,218 million. But this \$1.2 billion cap does not include all the renovation costs. In fact, there are four categories of expenses which add substantial amounts to the total. For example, the Pentagon estimates the cost of buying and installing information management and telecommunications equipment is \$750 million. This amount is not part of the \$1.2 billion cap. Neither is the heating and refrigeration plant, the classified waste incinerator, the furniture, or the 780,000 square feet of leased spaces for people who must be moved during the construction. A figure of \$1.2 billion is misleading; the expense of renovating the Pentagon easily exceeds \$2 billion.

Last year the Senate passed my amendment to cut Pentagon Renovation expenses by \$100 million. During conference, however, the conferees agreed to eliminate that requirement and instead directed the Defense Department to review the Pentagon's renovation plans and recommend cost saving options. In fact, this review had been underway since March of 1995. A

March, 1995 Pentagon press release stated:

This review will include re-examination of all lower cost options. At a time when the Secretary has initiated efforts to improve housing for our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines, we need to do all we can to insure that dollars being spent for other infrastructure projects are not being taken away from the very high priority of improving the lifestyles of our men and women in uniform.

I agree with this sentiment, and now I'd like to ensure that we turn these words into actions.

This well publicized review was supposed to produce a report which was due in February of this year. We didn't get that report, but on June 5 the Armed Services Committee staff did receive a one-page memo which states the Defense Department has found a savings of \$37 million and will continue to look for more. A reduction of \$37 million out of a total of \$1.2 billion is not what I consider an aggressive response to our call to reduce costs.

Mr. President, 15 months ago the Pentagon itself publicly announced the intent to reduce the cost of this project. The Defense Department identified a new spending target only after last year's threat of a reduced cap and after I announced at the Readiness Subcommittee markup on April 30 that I would introduce a similar amendment this year if I was not convinced by the Pentagon's long-overdue report. Well, that report is not here. I am not convinced that \$37 million is the best the Pentagon can do in the way of savings. The only way in which we can force additional savings is to keep up the pressure. That is what my amendment does.

Mr. President, Americans have been asked to tighten their belts and they expect no less from their Government. The Pentagon must be expected to do the same.

I yield the floor and urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, this amendment conforms to the Senate-passed authorization that places a ceiling on the Pentagon renovation fund. It has been cleared by both sides.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we do support this to conform with the authorization bill as passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the amendment No. 4489 is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4489) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4566

(Purpose: To increase the funding level available to continue the Maritime Technology program to \$50,000,000 within available RDT&E, Defense-Wide appropriations and provide appropriate offsets)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I call before the Senate amendment No. 4566.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. LOTT, proposes an amendment numbered 4566.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Before the period on page 30, line 13, insert: “: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$50,000,000 shall be available for the Maritime Technology program and \$3,580,000 shall be available for the Focused Research Initiatives program”.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this is to increase the funding level available to the Maritime Technology Program to \$50 million within the available research and development funds of the defensewide appropriations to provide for appropriate offsets, and it is an item that I have introduced on behalf of Senator LOTT, and I ask for its consideration.

Mr. INOUE. This amendment has been cleared and approved by both sides.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection to amendment No. 4566, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4566) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator HUTCHISON, I ask unanimous consent that Michael Montelongo be admitted to the floor during the consideration of this Defense appropriations bill. He is a congressional fellow.

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4490

(Purpose: To set aside \$10,000,000 for the United States-Japan Management Training Program)

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, in behalf of Senators BINGAMAN, DOMENICI, and SANTORUM, I call for the immediate consideration of amendment No. 4490.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], for Mr. BINGAMAN, for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, and Mr. SANTORUM, proposes an amendment numbered 4490.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 30, line 13, insert before the period the following: “: Provided, That, of such

amount, \$10,000,000 is available for the United States-Japan Management Training Program”.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, this amendment would allocate \$10 million within the DOD university research initiatives program element 61103D for the United States-Japan Management Training Program.

This program was begun in fiscal year 1991 at my initiative. It has enjoyed the support of both the Armed Services and the Appropriations Committees since its inception and I have been very grateful for the support of the senior Senators from Alaska and Hawaii. The goal of the program is to train American scientists and engineers and business managers in the Japanese language as part of their graduate educations and then place them in Japanese research institutions for internships or fellowships where they could learn firsthand how the Japanese research and development system—second only to our own at more than \$100 billion per year—functions. They could then later in their careers in American industry and government help tap and build bridges to the Japanese research efforts in their areas of expertise. Essentially, this was an effort on a modest scale to learn from the Japanese success in tapping our research enterprise through such fellowships at our universities.

By all reports—and there have been several thorough reviews of this program—the program, as run by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research [AFOSR], has done an impressive job of achieving its objectives. Nineteen universities from around the country have received grants under the program and there has been significant cost-sharing from non-Federal sources to match funds provided by AFOSR.

Unfortunately, in fiscal year 1996, AFOSR was only able to fund the program at \$2 million from its own resources after several years in which DARPA had provided AFOSR \$10 million per year for the program. Essentially, the program got caught up in the politics of the Technology Reinvestment Project [TRP], even though the Japan program's focus was only peripherally related to the TRP's focus on government-industry technology partnerships.

Earlier this year, the Senate Armed Services Committee in its report provided discretion for the Pentagon to allocate up to \$10 million to the Japan program from either PE61102F, the Air Force's defense research sciences program element, or PE61103D, the Office of Secretary of Defense's university research initiatives program element. The Armed Services Committee also directed AFOSR to ensure that cost-sharing from non-Federal sources should match AFOSR funds to the maximum extent practicable in future grant awards.

The Appropriations Committee in its report on the pending bill also urged the Pentagon to fund this program up

to the \$10 million level in its report language on the university research initiatives program element. I agree with the Appropriations Committee that the university research initiatives line is the more appropriate source for funds for this program, although the Air Force Office of Scientific Research should continue to manage it. I very much appreciate the Appropriations Committee's continuing support for the program. My amendment would take the extra step of insuring the full \$10 million is really available to the program. I believe that taking this step is warranted in light of the great success the program has enjoyed in achieving its goals. I hope that the managers of the bill can support taking this additional step in supporting the Japan program.

I urge the adoption of the amendment and yield the floor.

Mr. INOUE. This amendment earmarks \$10 million for the U.S.-Japan Management Training program. Both authorization and appropriations include supporting report language, and it has been cleared by both sides, Mr. President.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I concur with the statement of the Senator from Hawaii. This is a matter that needs to be adopted to conform with the action taken by the authorizing committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, amendment No. 4490 is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4490) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4462

(Purpose: To provide \$4,000,000 for the procurement of a real-time, automatic cargo tracking and control system)

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, in behalf of Senator FEINSTEIN, I call up amendment No. 4462 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], for Mrs. FEINSTEIN, proposes an amendment numbered 4462.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 29, line 10, strike out “1998.” and insert in lieu thereof “1998: Provided, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, \$4,000,000 shall be available for the procurement of a real-time, automatic cargo tracking and control system.”

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of my amendment to make \$4 million from the Army's Research, Development, Test and Evaluation available to acquire a real-time,

demonstrated, automatic cargo tracking and control system. This cargo tracking and control system is designed to assure that the smooth flow of cargo and to reduce the occurrence of misplaced cargo at Army ports. This demonstrated cargo tracking mechanism makes it possible for the manager of a port, rail yard, or other cargo distribution area to know where each container is and to move those containers without risk of being lost.

The Army has already witnessed massive unreported but costly loss of cargo location in storage following Vietnam and Desert Storm. The Army made previous attempts to purchase this tracking system but was unable to do so due to funding constraints. It is my understanding that the Army Material Command would like to use \$4 million from Army Research, Development, Technology, and Evaluation budget line PE0603804A.

I am pleased that this amendment is acceptable and I thank the managers of the bill.

Mr. INOUE. This amendment appropriates \$4 million to be made available for the procurement of a real-time, automatic cargo tracking and control system. It has been cleared by both sides, Mr. President.

Mr. STEVENS. I do concur in this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, amendment No. 4462 is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4462) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4442

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I call before the Senate amendment No. 4442.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. McCAIN, proposes an amendment numbered 4442.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have called this amendment before the Senate on behalf of Senator BOND and Senator FORD. It is an amendment that will prevent the reduction of the funds that are available under authorized program activities for the National Guard, and it has been cleared on both sides. It does indicate that if additional funds are required for a program, project or activity of a higher priority than any other in future acts, they should be submitted to Congress under section 1997 of the Defense Authorization Act.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4452

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of appropriated funds to inactivate or reduce any unit of special operation forces of the Army National Guard)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senate. The number should have been 4452. I mistakenly called up 4442. I ask the previous amendment be set aside. We do not want to call it up or recall it, just not bring it before the Senate at this time.

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

Mr. STEVENS. And that the amendment we consider now be the amendment for Mr. BOND, Mr. FORD, and Mr. LOTT, which is 4452.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. BOND, for himself, Mr. FORD, and Mr. LOTT, proposes an amendment numbered 4452.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 88, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

SEC. 8099. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended—

- (1) to reduce the number of units of special operations forces of the Army National Guard during fiscal year 1997;
- (2) to reduce the authorized strength of any such unit below the strength authorized for the unit as of September 30, 1996; or
- (3) to apply any administratively imposed limitation on the assigned strength of any such unit at less than the strength authorized for that unit as of September 30, 1996.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, as cochairman of the Senate National Guard Caucus, I join with my colleague, Senator BOND, to thank my good friend Senator STEVENS and his ranking member Senator INOUE for including our amendment prohibiting the use of appropriated funds to inactivate any units of Special Operation Forces of the Army National Guard in the managers amendment.

This issue has just been brought to Senator BOND's and my attention. From all indications, the U.S. Special Operations Command has decided on their own to inactivate two Army National Guard Special Forces battalions by September 1998.

This inactivation represents a loss of 802 individuals—or one-third of the Army National Guard Special Forces structure. This is not only a complete surprise to me and Senator BOND, but also to the Department of Defense.

Upon hearing of this plan, I asked my staff to check with the Pentagon to see if they knew of this proposal and had given their approval. Much to my dismay, I found out this was new to them as well.

The Special Operations Command tells us that these National Guard units are excess. However, a closer examination of the facts indicates that the actual motive behind this proposal is to harvest moneys to be spent on ac-

tive forces. It is my understanding that the Special Operations Command did not even bother coordinating these proposed reductions with the leadership of the National Guard Bureau, the Army National Guard, or the active duty Army.

I believe this is the first step by the Special Operations Command for the total elimination of Special Forces in the National Guard.

The National Guard Special Forces units—the 19th and 20th Groups—are made up from the following States: Alabama, Utah, Mississippi, Florida, West Virginia, Colorado, Massachusetts, Maryland, Illinois, Virginia, Washington, Ohio, Rhode Island, California, and Kentucky.

These Special Forces groups are at the highest personnel readiness levels in history. Just recently, they proved their mission readiness during Operation Uphold Democracy when they made up over one-half of the U.S. Special Forces presence in Haiti.

Mr. President, the Special Operations Command's proposal to reduce these National Guard units does not appear to be based on any thorough analysis of force structure required or cost comparison savings between Active Components and Reserve Components units.

It was because of decisions like this that Senator BOND and I joined Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator McCAIN and others to co-sponsor an amendment to the 1997 Defense authority bill calling for a complete review of our military force structure needs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I received from the adjutant general of the State of Kentucky, Gen. John Groves, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. President, I again thank the chairman and ranking member and their staffs for their assistance in this matter.

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

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY, DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS, OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL,

Frankfort, KY, July 5, 1996.

Hon. WENDELL H. FORD,  
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FORD: I have just become aware of a proposal by the United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) to inactivate two Army National Guard Special Forces Battalions by September 1998. This represents 802 ARNG spaces or one-third of the Army National Guard Special Forces structure.

As you may recall, USSOCOM conducted a comprehensive review of requirements during the 1990-92 timeframe. This review identified that two SF Groups were excess to requirements in light of the end of the Cold War. At that time, a determination was made to inactivate one group each from the Guard and USAR. The 1993 Offsite Agreement resulted in a determination that both USAR groups would inactivate and both Guard groups would remain in the structure.

Upon inactivation of the two USAR groups, the Adjutants General, with the full support



of the National Guard Bureau, committed to ensuring that the readiness levels of these two groups were appropriately maintained. This was accomplished by absorbing highly qualified SF soldiers from the inactivating USAR units and intensively managing and resourcing the other shortfalls. Today, the 19th and 20th Groups are at the highest personnel readiness levels in history. Further evidence of their mission readiness was proven during Operation Uphold Democracy, when one-half of the U.S. Special Forces presence in Haiti was from the National Guard.

This proposal by USSOCOM to reduce these SF units does not appear to be based on any thorough analysis of force structure required or cost comparison savings between Active Component and Reserve Component units. It seems to be an attempt by USSOCOM to capture dollars at the expense of the Reserve Component without regard to any hard facts. These reductions will most likely jeopardize the ninety-five SF positions in Kentucky. However, the most critical aspect of these reductions is the loss of highly skilled/trained soldiers/units at a considerable savings in OPTEMPO and PERSTEMPO costs at a time when the probability of extensive participation in military operations other than war, such as in Haiti, is at an all-time high. The skills and equipment these soldiers possess to accomplish state and federal missions at minimum costs cannot be overstated.

Your assistance in stopping any further reduction in Special Forces Units would be very much appreciated. I am available to discuss this matter or answer any questions you may have either personally or by telephone at your convenience.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. GROVES, JR.  
Brigadier General, KYNG,  
Adjutant General.

P.S. In order to lose no time, I directed that background materials be sent to you by Fax on 3 July. This letter is my position relative to those materials.

Mr. STEVENS. Again, this is the same item discussed before. It is what I would call a preventive amendment and really instructs that the funds cannot be obligated to reduce the number of units of Special Forces in the Army National Guard for the year 1997, and we believe that it is consistent with existing law. It just indicates that those funds shall be expended for the purpose authorized only.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I am pleased to advise the Senate that this amendment has been cleared and approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, amendment No. 4452 is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4452) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4572

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of the Army to establish subcontracting goals for certain procurement using funds appropriated by the bill)

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, on behalf of Mr. SHELBY and Mr. HEFLIN, I call up amendment No. 4572 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], for Mr. SHELBY, for himself and Mr. HEFLIN, proposes an amendment numbered 4572.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 88, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

SEC. 8099. (a) The Secretary of the Army shall ensure that solicitations for contracts for unrestricted procurement to be entered into using funds appropriated for the Army by this Act include, where appropriate, specific goals for subcontracts with small businesses, small disadvantaged businesses, and women-owned small businesses.

(b) The Secretary shall ensure that any subcontract entered into pursuant to a solicitation referred to in subsection (a) that meets a specific goal referred to in that subsection is credited toward the overall goal of the Army for subcontracts with the businesses referred to in that subsection.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I rise today to propose an amendment designed to aid small business in this time of consolidation and reduced Federal spending. Over the last few years, as the Army has reduced its contracting personnel strength, I have seen larger and larger small business set-aside contracts. This process is known as bundling. Unfortunately, when the bundled contract values approach \$50 million annually, the number of firms eligible to compete is greatly reduced. The pressure on small businesses is further increased by the Army's failure to place firm small business subcontracting targets in its unrestricted requests for proposals.

My amendment would, therefore, require the Army to place firm small business, small disadvantaged business, and women-owned small business subcontracting targets in appropriate unrestricted RFP's. These subcontracts would then count toward the Army's small business set-aside goal. This amendment would not, however, increase the percentage of work being set aside for small business.

As this amendment is beneficial to small business and will not affect the Army's procurement workload, I hope my colleagues will fully support it.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, this amendment has been cleared. It relates to small business activities and contracts, and provides disadvantaged businesses and women-owned small businesses a slight advantage.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we have examined the amendment. There is no objection to this amendment from this side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, amendment No. 4572 is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4572) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4564

(Purpose: To require a report from the Secretary of the Air Force and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask the clerk to lay before the Senate my amendment No. 4564.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] proposes an amendment numbered 4564.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following general provision:

SEC. . (a) The Secretary of the Air Force and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall submit a joint report describing in detail the benefits, allowances, services, and any other forms of assistance which may or shall be provided to any civilian employee of the Federal government or to any private citizen, or to the family of such an individual, who is injured or killed while traveling on an aircraft owned, leased, chartered, or operated by the Government of the United States.

(b) The report required by subsection (a) above shall be submitted to the Congressional defense committees and to the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight of the House of Representatives not later than December 15, 1996.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this is a general provision which requires the Secretary of the Air Force and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to submit a joint report describing in detail the benefits, allowances, services, and other forms of assistance which may or shall be provided to any civilian employee of the Federal Government or to any private citizen, or to the family of such an individual, who is injured or killed while traveling in an aircraft owned, leased, chartered, or operated by the Government of the United States.

This report is to be submitted to the congressional defense committees, the Governmental Affairs Committee of the Senate, and the Committee on Governmental Reform Oversight of the House, no later than December 15, 1996.

This report is needed because we have had some recent accidents—the terrible accident involving Commerce Secretary Brown and other accidents—of military aircraft on which civilians who were not employees of the Federal Government were killed, as a result of the accident.

I am seeking a study to determine the fairness of the situation with regard to people who may be asked, invited, by the Government to perform

what amounts to semiofficial tasks, and they are involved in missions that are undertaken on behalf of the United States, and they are killed as a result of an aircraft accident.

There has been some indications that some of these people do not have the coverage of benefits and other assistance that employees of the Government have, and that their survivors do not have the assistance of the laws that are in effect for survivors of those who were official employees. I wish to present to the Senate and the Congress next year legislation to see if we can correct this situation.

There was a similar concept in World War II that I recall. We called them the dollar-a-year persons. They were placed on the payroll and received \$1 in order that they might be considered government employees so their survivors, in the event of disaster, were given the same consideration as the survivors of those who were government employees.

I do not ask the Senate, the Congress, at this time, to try to correct this, because I think there is sort of a patchwork quilt out there of benefits for survivors. I want to be able to consider this matter in the next session, as I indicated.

The difficulty is that, in almost all instances, these aircraft are military aircraft, but some of them, now, are leased and some of them are actually leased for the United States but operated under other departments than the Department of Defense. So this has to be a comprehensive report for us to see what is, really, the situation under this patchwork quilt that I mentioned, and see if we can find some way to be fair and treat these survivors honorably, without regard to which agency of the Federal Government was in charge of the aircraft and without regard to whether or not they were, in fact, employees of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I am pleased to advise the Senate that this measure has been cleared and approved by both managers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, amendment No. 4564 is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4564) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4550

(Purpose: To require a report on meeting Department of Defense procurements of propellant raw materials)

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 4550 be called up for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], for Mr. LAUTENBERG, proposes an amendment numbered 4550.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 88, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

SEC. 8099. (a) Not later than March 1, 1997, the Deputy Secretary of Defense shall submit to the defense Committees a report on Department of Defense procurement of propellant raw materials.

(b) The report shall include the following:

(1) The projected future requirements of the Department of Defense for propellant raw materials, such as nitrocellulose.

(2) The capacity, ability, and production cost rates of the national technology and industrial base, including Government-owned, contractor-operated facilities, contractor owned and operated facilities, and Government-owned, Government-operated facilities, for meeting such requirements.

(3) The national security benefits of preserving in the national technology and industrial base contractor owned and operated facilities for producing propellant raw materials, including nitrocellulose.

(4) The extent to which the cost rates for production of nitrocellulose in Government-owned, contractor-operated facilities is lower because of the relationship of those facilities with the Department of Defense that such rates would be without that relationship.

(5) The advantages and disadvantages of permitting commercial facilities to compete for award of Department of Defense contracts for procurement of propellant raw materials, such as nitrocellulose.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I appreciate the cooperation of the managers of this bill in approving this amendment. The amendment is straightforward. It asks the Deputy Secretary of Defense to provide a report, not later than March 1, 1997, to the Defense committees on examining the advantages and disadvantages of allowing commercial facilities to compete for future contracts of propellant raw material requirements, such as nitrocellulose.

The report shall include an assessment of first, the projected future procurement requirements for propellant raw material, such as nitrocellulose; second, the capacity, ability, and production cost rates of the national technology and industrial base to satisfy DOD requirements; third, the national security advantage of preserving contractor owned, contractor operated facilities as part of the industrial base; and finally, the extent to which government owned, contractor operated rates for nitrocellulose are reduced as a result of their relationship with the DOD.

Nitrocellulose is the basic chemical in the propellant mixture that provides the propulsion power for a projectile or cartridge, such as for the 120 millimeter target practice cartridge used on the M1A2 tank for gunnery training.

Because of the shrinking Defense procurement budget, the Department of the Army had directed the production

of propellant to its Government owned, contractor operated facility located at the Radford Army Ammunition Plant in Virginia in order to keep its industrial base operating. However, this decision has precluded a commercial facility in my home State from competing for certain grades of nitrocellulose. This commercial facility wants to compete for future contracts beginning in fiscal year 1999.

Mr. President, this study is intended to make information available to help the Congress and the administration make an informed decision on this issue in the future. Therefore, Mr. President, I am pleased that my colleagues support this amendment.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, this amendment calls for a report on DOD procurement of propellant raw materials such as nitrocellulose.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we have examined this. There have been some technical changes made at our request. We do not object to the amendment offered on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, amendment No. 4550 is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4550) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4534

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of the Air Force to carry out a cost-benefit analysis of consolidating the ground station infrastructure supporting polar orbiting satellites)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I call before the Senate amendment No. 4534, offered by my colleague from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. MURKOWSKI, proposes an amendment numbered 4534.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 88, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

SEC. 8099. Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to Congress a cost-benefit analysis of consolidating the ground station infrastructure of the Air Force that supports polar orbiting satellites.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this is a very straightforward amendment that deals with requiring a report from the Air Force on the cost-benefit analysis of consolidating the ground station infrastructure of the Air Force that supports polar orbiting satellites. At present, there are several. We seek



to discover whether it would be cost effective to consolidate those.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, this amendment has been cleared and approved by both managers.

Mr. STEVENS. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, amendment No. 4534 is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4534) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we have just completed a series of amendments that would have taken about—well, about 12 hours under cloture. So I am grateful to the Senate for an opportunity to proceed with our bill.

I would now like to announce to the Senate we would like Members who have amendments that they wish to present that have not been cleared to come to the floor. We will be pleased to consider any amendment and see if we can handle it as expeditiously as we have these that we have presented to the Senate. I might add, many of those amendments were modified substantially before we agreed to them.

So we look forward to that opportunity with regard to the rest of these amendments that have been filed before cloture. The leaders, I am informed, will look at this situation somewhere around 1 o'clock to determine whether we should proceed with our cloture vote.

At present, I think we could announce to the Senate, from the way we look at the amendments that have been submitted to us for review and were submitted to the Senate under the cloture procedure, if we work cooperatively we should be able to finish this bill by 7 or 8 o'clock tonight. We can do that by limiting the amount of time a Member might seek for the debate of an amendment or by assuring Members we will be more than pleased to attempt to work with them to alter the form of the amendments so we could agree to an amendment and take it to conference.

I am sure my friend from Hawaii joins me in urging Members now to come to the floor to present controversial amendments.

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

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

COMMENDING DR. LEROY T. WALKER

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this has been cleared on both sides. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of a Senate resolution that I submitted earlier today, Senate Resolution 279.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 279) to commend Dr. LeRoy T. Walker for his service as President of the U.S. Olympic Committee and his lifelong dedication to the improvement of amateur athletic opportunities in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. STEVENS. I have submitted this Senate resolution to commend and thank Dr. LeRoy T. Walker, the current president of the U.S. Olympic Committee, for his contribution to amateur sports in the United States.

Dr. Walker has been the USOC president since 1992, and has been involved with the USOC since 1977. He is the first African-American to be the USOC President in the 100-year history of the U.S. Olympic Committee.

Dr. Walker started working for the U.S. Olympic Committee the year before the Congress enacted the Amateur Sports Act of 1978. That was a bill I introduced in the Senate, Mr. President.

That act marked the beginning of the modern Olympics in the United States.

Dr. Walker has been the leader in carrying out Congress' vision for the modern Olympic movement through the Amateur Sports Act.

He has brought the U.S. Olympic Committee from an era where its budget was in the tens of millions to its most recent budget in the hundreds of millions.

Athletes in the late 1970's were a different kind of amateur than today's Olympians who are able to earn millions of dollars in endorsements, and whose fame is far greater due to the substantial television coverage that we now enjoy.

The Olympics have gone from being held once every 4 years to once every 2 years, with the staggered Summer and Winter Olympics schedule.

Dr. Walker has guided the Olympic movement in the United States and in the world through these significant changes and growth.

The resolution that I have submitted mentions many of Dr. Walker's accomplishments with the U.S. Olympics and with other amateur sports organizations over the years.

Let me speak briefly on some of the remarkable things Senators may not know about my friend, Dr. Walker.

Dr. Walker was the youngest of 13 children raised in Harlem during the Great Depression. He was the first person in his family to earn a college degree in 1940.

Not only did he earn the degree, but he graduated magna cum laude from Benedict College in just 3½ years. During that time, he earned 12 varsity letters in football, basketball, and track and field during that same time.

Dr. Walker was selected as an All-American quarterback in 1938, but kept the fact that he even played football a secret from his mother until his commencement because she was worried he would get hurt.

He earned a masters degree from Columbia in 1941. Columbia did not allow African Americans to earn doctoral degrees at that time, so Dr. Walker went to New York University to earn his Ph.D.

He was only the second African American to earn a Ph.D. at New York University.

Before Dr. Walker became involved with the U.S. Olympic Committee, he had one of the most remarkable coaching careers in the history of sports in the United States.

In all, he has coached football, basketball, and track teams that produced over 80 All-Americans, 40 national champions and 10 Olympians.

He coached or consulted the Olympic track teams of Israel in 1960, Ethiopia in 1960, Trinidad-Tobago in 1964, Jamaica in 1968, Kenya in 1972, and served as the head men's coach of the U.S. Olympic track and field team in Montreal in 1976.

Any one of Dr. Walker's achievements—whether his own athletic successes, his coaching accomplishments and his academic endeavors—not to mention his service with the U.S. Olympic Committee—would be a great achievement for most of us.

Dr. Walker has made those achievements look routine.

We commend him today for his leadership in preparing the United States for the 1996 Olympics and for preparing the U.S. Olympic Committee for the challenges of the 21st Century.

Dr. Walker is the 23d president of the U.S. Olympic Committee, and truly is one of the founding fathers of amateur sports in the United States.

His tenure as U.S. Olympic Committee President, and his long and distinguished career in amateur sports, will be capped off with the 1996 Summer Olympics in Atlanta, GA, which begin shortly.

It will be my pleasure to go to Atlanta on Wednesday to deliver to Dr. Walker the resolution I am presenting to the Senate today.

I hope the Senate will join me in support of this resolution commending and thanking Dr. Walker for all that he has done for amateur sports in the United States.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution S. Res. 279.

The resolution (S. Res. 279) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.