

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator from Montana. My answer is that, "yes", all projects incurring the same impacts from the Federal water releases associated with fish and wildlife mitigation should be treated the same. That provision in the report urges BPA to enter into equitable energy exchange agreements. Moreover, such agreements should not increase costs for BPA.

Mr. BURNS. I thank the Senator from Oregon, my constituents will be very pleased. Let us hope that Bonneville will faithfully follow the committee's urging on this matter.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I think we are in sight of the goal line on this bill. If Members have amendments yet pending or have registered in their respective Cloakrooms an intention to offer an amendment by the terms relevant or whatever else, we would like to have them come now because we are down to the last handful of amendments and then final passage.

I do not anticipate any votes on the remaining amendments. I do not think they are that controversial, but I am just making a judgment. We are inquiring as to the leadership's view about putting the final passage vote over until tomorrow to relieve other Senators who are not involved in the amendment process. As soon as we get that information, I will relay it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5140

(Purpose: To provide funding for the Institute of Railroad Safety)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] proposes an amendment numbered 5140.

At the appropriate place in the bill add the following new section:

SEC. . THE RAILROAD SAFETY INSTITUTE.

Of the money available to the Federal Rail Administration up to \$500,000 shall be made available to establish and operate the Institute for Railroad Safety as authorized by the Swift Rail Development Act of 1994.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, this is something that the Senate approved last year. It is a very important matter with regard to railroad safety. The matter has been cleared on both sides, I believe. I urge its adoption.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I urge its adoption.

The amendment (No. 5140) was agreed to.

Mr. EXON. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. EXON. I thank the Chair and I thank the managers of the bill.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I think we are down now to the last three or four amendments. I hope the Senators who have those amendments—I could enumerate the Senators by name, but I do not think I want to do that at this point—at least will have the courtesy to call the floor and tell us whether they are going to offer their amendments or not. Is that asking too much? Please, please, make it a little easier to complete our business here.

To the Senators who put a place hold on amendments to the respective cloakrooms, at least let us know whether you plan to do it or not. We have contacted some Senators. They say, "Oh, I'm not going to offer that after all," but we have not been informed. I think everybody's mother taught them better manners. So much for my lecture. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

COMMEMORATING THE 80TH BIRTHDAY OF DAVID BRODY

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, just moments ago I left a reception for a friend, David Brody. I am very pleased to just rise briefly and commemorate the 80th birthday of one of the most remarkable men who it has been my privilege to know, Mr. David Brody.

He is perhaps best known to all of us in the Senate as the "101st Senator," which was a characterization appropriately applied to him in 1989 in a Senate resolution which passed unanimously.

That resolution was passed on the occasion of David Brody's so-called "retirement" from the Anti-Defamation League of the B'Nai B'rith. As I have previously noted in other remarks, it was most carefully phrased so as to avoid any mention of the word "retirement."

There is nothing "retiring" about David Brody—nothing. He remains the essence and embodiment of energy, spirit, enthusiasm, and good will which he has always been.

It has been my personal pleasure on occasion to pay tribute to David Brody on the Senate floor, to participate in a retirement ceremony on his behalf several years ago, and most recently on March 11, 1993, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the wedding of Bea and David Brody. I have informed David that he and I have one thing in common for very certain above all oth-

ers, and it is that we both "severely overmarried." The marriage and partnership of Bea and David enriches our lives in so many ways, a monument to their boundless love to each other, and to the innumerable good works of each of them individually.

So on David's 80th birthday, I am certain he will have cause to reflect on his good fortune in spending evermore time and more than the 50 years of life wedded to that fine lady. And all of us will have cause to reflect upon our own good fortune in having David with us for now 80 years.

And our wish for him is that he may have many more years of life to savor. My wife Ann and I wish him Godspeed and all our love. I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO DAVID BRODY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming, just a few minutes ago, addressed the celebration of the 80th birthday of a friend of the U.S. Senate, a friend of most every U.S. Senator, David Brody. There was a celebration of that on the Hill this evening.

It is most appropriate that Senators help David Brody celebrate his 80th birthday because he is so well known, he has been so active on the Hill, and he has been, in the truest sense of the word, a public-spirited person, a person who has been civic-minded about his responsibilities to Government. He has represented a lot of good causes, as he has interacted with Members of the U.S. Senate throughout his career on the Hill.

A few years ago, you could have read a newspaper article that stated it better than any of us could have. It was about how David Brody is respected. In that newspaper article he was referred to as the 101st Senator.

So I wish David Brody a happy birthday. I wish him and his wife well in the future. Happy birthday.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATFIELD. 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 TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The Senate continued with consideration of the bill.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I have the following unanimous consent agreement that has been cleared with the two leaders, Republican Senator TRENT LOTT and Democratic leader TOM DASCHLE.

I ask unanimous consent that, during the Senate's consideration of the transportation appropriations bill, the following amendments be the only first-degree amendments in order, subject to second-degree amendments which must be relevant to the first-degree they propose to amend, with the exception of the antiterrorism amendments, on which there will be 1-hour notification of the two leaders prior to the offering of any amendment regarding terrorism, and they be subject to second-degree amendments which must deal with the subject of terrorism.

The amendments are follows: Two relevant amendments by Senator LOTT; one relevant amendment by Senator MCCAIN; COHEN-SNOWE, truck weight limitations; GRAMM, highways; LOTT, six amendments regarding terrorism; MCCONNELL, bridge amendment for Kentucky; HATFIELD, relevant amendment.

For the information of all Senators, any votes ordered this evening will be stacked in a sequence beginning immediately following passage of S. 1936, with the first vote and all remaining votes in the voting sequence limited to 10 minutes only, and those votes will be ordered on a case-by-case basis. In light of this agreement on behalf of the majority leader, there will be no further votes this evening.

Mr. President, I want to amend what I said. I forgot to read the Democratic list of amendments that will be relevant and in order.

A Baucus amendment on highway obligation; five antiterrorism amendments by Senator BIDEN; a Bradley amendment on rail safety/newborns; BYRD, two relevant amendments; DASCHLE, two relevant amendments; DODD, an FMLA2 amendment; DORGAN, runaway plants and a relevant amendment; LAUTENBERG, two relevant amendments; REID, one relevant amendment; WYDEN, one relevant amendment, and WELLSTONE, one relevant amendment.

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

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I believe we have run the limit of our activity for the evening. As I indicated, by a leadership agreement, there will be no further votes this evening.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

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

MARINE CORPS GENERALS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have just received a letter from the

Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. C.C. Krulak.

General Krulak's letter concerns the Marine Corps' request for 12 additional general officers.

His letter responds to a letter which I sent to the House conferees on the fiscal year 1997 Defense authorization bill.

My letter urged the House conferees to hang tough and block the Senate proposal to give the Marine Corps 12 more generals.

The Senate approved the Marine Corps's request. But the House remains opposed to it.

So the request for 12 additional generals is a bone of contention in the conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the conferees and the Commandant's response to it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 29, 1996.

Hon. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY:
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GRASSLEY: I have been provided a copy of the letter you sent to House Conferees concerning the proposal in the Senate Authorization Bill that would give the Marine Corps twelve additional general officers. While this responds to the issues raised in your letter, it has been my desire to meet with you in person to discuss this issue. I understand our staffs have finally worked out a time to do so, and I look forward to meeting with you on Wednesday.

Those familiar with the Corps know that we pride ourselves in squeezing the most out of every dollar that you entrust to your Marine Corps. The also know that we don't ask for something unless it is truly needed.

The main thrust of your letter is that the number of general officers should be reduced consistent with force structure reductions. Reduction in end strength does not necessarily have a one-to-one correlation with command billet reduction. Permit me to explain. As you have correctly stated, the Marine Corps in 1988 had a total active duty end strength of approximately 198,000, with a general officer population of 70. Today, we have an end strength of 174,000, and a general officer population of 68. That said, please note that the 82nd Congress mandated in Title X that our Corps of Marines be "so organized as to include not less than three combat divisions and three air wings,"—as it was in 1987, it is so organized today. This point is key: While the Marine Corps has reduced its end strength by 24,000 personnel, its three division, three wing structure has remained essentially unchanged. Those familiar with the military know that the requirement for general/flag officers is tied directly to the number of combat divisions and air wings—and that number has not been reduced. Of the 70 Marine general officers in 1987, 11 were assigned to joint/external billets. Today, 16 of the 68 Marine general officers are serving in joint/external billets. Today we have 52 general officers manning essentially the same structure that was manned by 59 general officers in 1988.

Throughout our history, we Marines have prided ourselves in doing more with less. In the past, we have compensated for our general officer shortfall by "frocking" officers selected for the next higher grade to fill that position without the pay. While that practice has its own drawbacks, it did provide us

with the requisite number of general officers to fill critical shortfalls. Last year, the Senate set increasingly strict limits on the number of general officers that the Services may frock. And I understand their rationale—the practice of frocking simply makes deficiencies in Service grade/billet structure. These shortages are indeed better addressed with permanent fixes rather than the stop-gap measures such as frocking. This restriction on frocking, however, has placed the Marine Corps in an untenable position. Losing six of our nine frocking authorizations means that we would now have 46 general officers manning essentially the same structure that was manned by 60 general officers in 1987. This makes it critical that we have additional general officer allotments.

In response to your remark that we are "simply trying to keep up with the Joneses" let me offer this: Other Service ratios of general officer to end strength range from one general/flag officer for 1,945 troops to one general/flag officer for 1,435 troops. Excluding the Marine Corps, the Service-wide nominal ratio of one general per 1,620 troops would give the Marine Corps a minimum of 104 general officers. The twelve additional officers that the SASC has provided would give us a total of only 80—hardly keeping up with the Joneses!

Finally, this is a matter of providing quality, experienced leadership for our Marines. We are the nation's force in readiness, standing by to go into harm's way to protect U.S. interests globally. Providing these brave Americans with an adequate number of commanders and representation in the joint arena is not just prudent—it is the right thing to do.

Senator Grassley, I am convinced that these additional general officer billets serve the best interest of our Services and our national defense. I am also convinced that the solution is not to bring the other Services down to our untenable position, but rather to grant us the minimal increase we need to properly perform those functions Congress has mandated and our nation expects. Our meeting on Wednesday afternoon should be productive—I am looking forward to an honest and open dialogue. Semper Fidelis!

Very respectfully,

C.C. KRULAK,
Commandant of the Marine Corps.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, July 24, 1996.

DEAR HOUSE CONFEE: I am writing to encourage you to hang tough and do everything possible to block the Senate proposal that would give the Marine Corps 12 additional general officers.

The Senate argues that these additional Marine generals are needed to two reasons: (1) to fill vacant warfighting positions; and (2) to meet the requirements of the joint warfighting area mandated by the Goldwater-Nichols Act.

These arguments are nothing but a smoke screen for getting more generals to fill fat headquarters jobs.

In 1990, your Committee took a very straightforward, common sense approach to the question of how many general officers were really needed. Your Committee could see the handwriting on the wall. The military was beginning to downsize in earnest. As the force structure shrinks, your Committee said the number of general and flag officers should be reduced. New general officer active duty strength ceilings were established. The total number authorized had been set at 1,073 since October 1, 1980. The FY 1991 legislation reduced that number to 1,030 in 1991, including 68 for the Marine Corps. However, based on the projected 25% reduction in the force structure between 1991 and