

On page 3, line 6, increase the amount by 3,991,000,000.
 On page 3, line 7, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000.
 On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by 2,006,000,000.
 On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by 2,820,000,000.
 On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by 3,991,000,000.
 On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000.
 On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by 2,533,000,000.
 On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by 3,481,000,000.
 On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by 4,993,000,000.
 On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by 7,305,000,000.
 On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by 2,006,000,000.
 On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by 2,820,000,000.
 On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by 3,991,000,000.
 On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000.
 On page 21, line 25, increase the amount by 1,013,000,000.
 On page 22, line 1, increase the amount by 643,000,000.
 On page 22, line 8, increase the amount by 1,951,000,000.
 On page 22, line 9, increase the amount by 1,335,000,000.
 On page 22, line 16, increase the amount by 3,453,000,000.
 On page 22, line 17, increase the amount by 2,458,000,000.
 On page 22, line 24, increase the amount by 5,755,000,000.
 On page 22, line 25, increase the amount by 4,224,000,000.
 On page 23, line 15, increase the amount by 20,000,000.
 On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by 13,000,000.
 On page 23, line 22, increase the amount by 30,000,000.
 On page 23, line 23, increase the amount by 23,000,000.
 On page 24, line 5, increase the amount by 40,000,000.
 On page 24, line 6, increase the amount by 33,000,000.
 On page 24, line 12, increase the amount by 50,000,000.
 On page 24, line 13, increase the amount by 43,000,000.
 On page 26, line 14, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.
 On page 26, line 15, increase the amount by 1,350,000,000.
 On page 26, line 22, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.
 On page 26, line 23, increase the amount by 1,463,000,000.
 On page 27, line 5, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.
 On page 27, line 6, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.
 On page 27, line 13, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.
 On page 27, line 14, increase the amount by 1,500,000,000.
 On page 41, line 7, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000.
 On page 41, line 8, increase the amount by 15,752,000,000.
 On page 43, line 21, increase the amount by 2,533,000,000.
 On page 43, line 22, increase the amount by 2,006,000,000.
 On page 43, line 24, increase the amount by 3,481,000,000.
 On page 43, line 25, increase the amount by 2,820,000,000.

On page 44, line 2, increase the amount by 4,993,000,000.

On page 44, line 3, increase the amount by 3,991,000,000.

On page 44, line 5, increase the amount by 7,305,000,000.

On page 44, line 6, increase the amount by 5,766,000,000.

At the appropriate place insert the following:

It is the sense of the Senate that funding should be increased for vital programs serving the youngest children. Head Start should be funded at a level necessary to serve all eligible children. Funding for the Child Care Development Block Grant should be doubled to support the working poor and new resources should be dedicated to addressing issues of quality and supply in areas such as infant care and care during non-traditional work hours. The Healthy Start should be expanded to improve maternal and infant health. These initiatives should be funded through by changes in the tax code such as the elimination of the runaway plant deduction, the billionaire's loophole, the exclusion of income from Foreign Sales Corporations and other changes as necessary.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, May 20, 1997 in open session, to receive testimony on the quadrennial defense review and the impact of its recommendations on national security as we enter the 21st century.

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

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet for a Full Committee Hearing on "Health Plan Quality" during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 20, 1997, at 10 a.m.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 20, 1997, at 10 a.m. to hold an open hearing on intelligence matters.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Immigration, of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 20, 1997, at 9:30 a.m. to hold a hearing on "A Private Relief Initiative for Christopher Meili."

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NATO ENLARGEMENT AND U.S. SECURITY

• Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the topic of North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] enlargement and U.S. security. Now that there is agreement on the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security Between NATO and the Russian Federation, a significant obstacle to NATO enlargement has been removed. I have said before and say again that NATO enlargement is good for the United States, good for our NATO allies, good for the candidate states, and good for Russia.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is scheduled to announce at its July 8 and 9 summit meeting in Madrid, Spain, which candidate states will be invited to engage in negotiations leading to accession of these states to the Washington Treaty by 1999. Each of the states that have expressed interest in consideration for accession are participating states in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe [OSCE].

As Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I have led the Commission through a series of hearings on NATO enlargement which we will complete with a final hearing next Tuesday. We have invited official representatives of states to present their own positions to the Commission at these hearings to help meet the Commission's responsibility to the Congress and the American people to oversee implementation of the Helsinki Accords and subsequent Helsinki process documents, with a particular emphasis on human rights and humanitarian affairs. Congress and NATO have both recognized the significance of candidate states' compliance with OSCE principles in various official documents.

The Commission's approach to this series of hearings is focused on how well these candidate states have implemented OSCE agreements and complied with OSCE principles. Commissioners ask questions relating to other areas of candidate states' policies and conduct that have been identified as critical to acceptance into NATO, but we are not competing with the committees having legislative jurisdiction in these areas, who will examine those issues more thoroughly and with greater expertise.

Let me make it very clear that I am a supporter of NATO enlargement. I think that, in principle, every candidate state should be included in NATO when they meet the standards for accession. I do not believe that NATO enlargement should end with the Madrid announcement of the states invited to participate in accession negotiations.

I believe that it is very important that the United States, and our NATO allies, make very clear to those states

not invited to join in the first round that the door is not closed, that the process has not ended, and that we and our allies encourage them to press ahead to meet the standards so that they can join when they are ready.

We must, with our allies, establish a clearly defined process for achieving membership. If we don't, we run the risk of cutting the legs out from under the reform movements just now taking control of some of the Eastern European countries that have failed to reform their political, military, and economic systems fast enough to meet NATO member country standards. These reform governments must be given a clear, strong signal that when they meet the standards, they will be allowed to join.

We must not create in Eastern Europe a gray zone between NATO and Russia where the old spheres of influence and balance of power politics could give rise to lasting political instability, poverty, and isolation. While I have not yet seen the text of the new Founding Act, according to news reports it does not create a group of second class NATO members whose security guarantees are diluted and undermined. NATO enlargement does not threaten Russia's security.

An Eastern Europe without NATO could become a black hole of unrest, poverty, ethnic conflict, and extremism of the worst kinds. This would likely attract overt and covert Russian intervention in the affairs of the states in this area, pulling Russia into rebuilding its military machine and deploying it westward, and triggering United States and allied reaction. Neither the United States nor Russia want that to happen.

An eastern Europe without NATO would threaten Russia's security by preventing Russia from changing its thinking about NATO and about European political and economic relations, preventing constructive changes in Russian policy, and delaying or blocking Russia's full integration into the community of nations.

NATO enlargement is good for Russia. Russian agreement to the Founding Act signals that the Russian foreign policy elite recognizes that fact. Now, Russian energies can focus on driving political and economic reform to a successful conclusion instead of battling NATO enlargement. Russia should be pleased that one of its strategic flanks will be secured by a strong, friendly defensive alliance.

Russia should take note that the political, economic, military, and foreign policy changes NATO is insisting upon in successful candidate states will build stable, democratic, free market countries that will not themselves engage in aggression against Russia and that will not allow themselves to become participants in some other state's aggressive designs. Russia should want states with these characteristics on its borders.

The Russian foreign policy elites should climb up in the Kremlin's tow-

ers and look hard at the situations on Russia's other borders. Agreement with the Final Act signals some understanding that it is not in Russia's best long term interests to keep eastern Europe unstable and economically backward. After Russia's experiences in Afghanistan and Chechnya, does Russia really think that any threat, much less the main threat, to its independence and territorial integrity comes from NATO?

Russia's leaders have a question to which they need an answer—when Russia gets into trouble, who can Russia call upon for help? Recent reports of closer relations between Russia and China should not lead to the conclusion that Russia has a friend or an ally in China.

The only nations Russia can count on for help are the nations with the capacity to help. The only nations with that capacity are the developed nations of the West, the most powerful of whom are NATO members, and Japan.

For that help to be available, Russia now needs to press ahead with the same agenda of reforms that the NATO candidate states are implementing. It would be far easier to convince the western republics that Russia deserves help when it needs it if Russia is a democratic, rule-of-law state with a free market economy.

Reportedly under the new Founding Act, Russia does not have a veto over NATO enlargement and no state's candidacy is foreclosed. Russia needs leaders who can discard cold war thinking and stop seeing NATO enlargement as a victory for the West and a defeat for Russia. Boris Yeltsin is such a leader.

NATO enlargement is good for the United States, good for NATO's current member states, good for the candidate states, and, finally, good for Russia.

Wednesday's agreement on the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security Between NATO and the Russian Federation between NATO Secretary General Solana and Russian Foreign Minister Primakov proves that Russia's current leaders are not as opposed in fact as they sounded in rhetoric to NATO enlargement. The agreement reportedly was put before the North Atlantic Council, NATO's highest body, earlier today, and was approved.

Among other things, it draws Russia into closer collaboration with NATO on matters of mutual concern. The new NATO-Russia Council will give Russia insight into NATO processes and input into NATO consideration of issues without allowing Russia to block measures the alliance agrees must be taken for our mutual security.

Perhaps the best part of this enlargement process is not the military security guarantees that go with it to successful candidate states, but the leverage that the enlargement process exerts for basic change in each candidate state that will result in better, safer, and more prosperous lives for each of their citizens. The impact of that le-

verage has been on view during the course of the Commission's hearing process, as ambassadors of candidate states discuss their progress in meeting the standards for membership.

Even better, there may be the beginning of a halo effect on the surrounding countries. As they see their neighbors moving into closer integration with the West, they are becoming concerned about their own futures. They can see NATO membership being followed by European Union membership for these successful neighbors. They can see them pulling ahead in the competition for foreign investment, trade, and market access, growing in prosperity and stability behind NATO's shield. And they understand that there is no alternate path that they can follow that will get them to the same place any time soon.

Thus, even those states that are not now candidates for NATO membership are influenced in the direction of political and economic reform by the process of NATO enlargement. This will have a very positive and long-lasting impact on Europe's political stability, prosperity, and freedom, and decrease the chances that the security guarantees we solemnly extend to new NATO members will ever have to be invoked in crisis or in conflict. This, in the end, is a tremendous benefit for the security of the United States.

I believe that we must be resolute in pursuing our aim of expanding NATO to encompass all candidate states that meet the standards for membership. We must make it clear that the enlargement is a continuing process that will not end with the first group announced at Madrid, and that NATO membership remains open to states as they improve conditions for their people. In the end, this effort will move European security, prosperity, freedom, and human rights ahead more rapidly than any other course of action.

In closing, I want to briefly say something to those Americans who can trace their roots to those countries now being considered for NATO membership. Thanks in part to the hopes and beliefs that you would not let die even when times were very bad, and to your hard work in the American political system, these countries are free and independent again, something the realists of 10 years ago would have said couldn't happen, and would never happen. Keeping the faith, making sure that the United States never recognized the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, making sure that we supported Solidarity, sustaining support for Charter 77, keeping the life lines open to the many struggling Helsinki groups, making your voices heard here in Washington, those were key events that helped pave the way to where we are today. Thank you for your efforts and know that the futures of these countries could have been much worse but for your active support for their sovereign independence, and for freedom and human rights for their citizens.●

TRIBUTE TO JAMES R. MELLOR

• Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to James R. (Jim) Mellor, who retires next week from his position as chief executive officer and chairman of the board of General Dynamics Corp., a position he has held for 3 years. Jim has been with General Dynamics for a total of 16 years. Prior to becoming CEO and chairman, he was the president and chief operating officer and before that, the executive vice president—Marine, Business Systems and Corporate Planning. Jim Mellor is completing an illustrious 42 year career in the defense industry having worked at Litton Industries and Hughes Aircraft Corp. before joining General Dynamics.

During his time with General Dynamics Jim took part in the delivery of 18 Trident ballistic missile submarines, the upgrade of the Army's M1 tank to the state-of-the-art M1A2, and the development and transition into production of the Tomahawk cruise missile. The Trident submarine played a major role in bringing about the end of the cold war, and we are all familiar with the important contributions made by the M1 tank and the Tomahawk cruise missile in our overwhelming success in Desert Storm.

Jim is a graduate of the University of Michigan, earning both bachelor of science and master of science degrees from that institution. He served in the U.S. Army from 1952 to 1955. While at Hughes & Litton he received three patents relating to large screen display and digital computing technology. He has also authored more than 30 articles in national and international publications covering a wide range of management and technical subjects.

In addition to these accomplishments, Jim has been active in many charitable and community causes. He is a member of the University of Southern California Business School Board of Councilors, a member of the National Advisory Committee of the University of Michigan, and a trustee of Ford's Theater. Under his leadership for the past 7 years, General Dynamics has sponsored the annual Memorial Day Concert held right here on the Capitol Grounds. Jim has also been an active sponsor of and participant in the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation's annual walk on the Mall. Jim and his wife, Suzanne, will be moving to California to be near their three children and nine grandchildren, but will maintain a residence in the Washington area and will remain active in business and governmental issues.

Please join me in paying tribute to this distinguished engineer, business leader, civic sponsor, and family man. •

TRIBUTE MARKING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. ARMY SPACE AND MISSILE DEFENSE

• Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to

recognize the celebration of the 40th anniversary of U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense.

During this week, May 19–22, 1997, a number of special events will be taking place in Huntsville, AL, to celebrate this important anniversary. I wish to express my congratulations to the Army community in Huntsville for their splendid record of achievement in space and missile defense, and to ask my colleagues to join me saluting them for what this has meant to our Nation's security.

The U.S. Army led the nation into space and ballistic missile defense [BMD] in 1957 with the authorization to proceed with the launch of an artificial satellite and the start of development of the Nike Zeus BMD system. The Army Ballistic Missile Agency successfully launched the free world's first artificial satellite in 1958, only 89 days after receiving the go-ahead, restoring America's leadership in space exploration following the Soviet Sputnik launch 3 months earlier.

The Huntsville BMD team performed the first demonstration of a successful intercept of an ICBM class ballistic missile in 1962, deployed the first and only BMD system in the United States, conducted the first nonnuclear intercept of an ICBM in 1984, and carried out the first and the largest number of intercepts of tactical ballistic missiles, including the spectacular performance of the Patriot system against Scud rockets during Desert Storm.

The U.S. Army role in space has continued to provide significant contributions to battlefield communications, precise detection, tracking of threatening missiles, and a host of space-based capabilities tailored for the warfighter on the ground.

The Huntsville team has made significant contributions to BMD technology, including development of nuclear and nonnuclear interceptors and kill vehicles; advanced BMD radar and optical sensors; the first BMD computer, associated software and a long progression of innovations in BMD computational capabilities; and lastly, a wide range of BMD phenomenology, components and techniques.

In view of their long record of outstanding achievements, the future of military space and BMD lies to a large extent in the hands of the men and women who work in the Army organizations in Huntsville, together with their industry team mates.

Mr. President, I salute Huntsville and the hard-working men and women of that great community. Most importantly, I wish to extend a warm and hearty congratulations to the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense team for a job well done, and best wishes for its continued success now and during the next 40 years. •

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD P. SCOTT, VA ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CONGRESSIONAL AFFAIRS

• Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, it is with a mixture of happiness and sadness that I pay tribute to Edward P. Scott, VA's Assistant Secretary for Congressional Affairs, as he retires from Federal service—happiness for Ed and his family as they embark on a new phase of their lives, and sadness for those of us who will miss Ed's wise counsel and assistance as we carry on our work on veterans issues.

Mr. President, Ed has had a long and distinguished career, including 16 years here in the Senate where he served on the Veterans' Affairs Committee as general counsel, minority general counsel, and in the 102d Congress, as chief counsel and staff director. I first became familiar with Ed's work when I joined the Veterans' Affairs Committee in 1985 when I first came to the Senate; I have recognized and relied on his great professionalism and integrity ever since. I particularly appreciated his assistance in 1993 when he worked tirelessly to ensure that my transition to the chairmanship of the committee went as smoothly as possible.

For the past 4 years, Ed has served ably in the often challenging job of Assistant Secretary for Congressional Affairs at the Department of Veterans Affairs. He is enormously knowledgeable about veterans' programs and laws, and both the committee and the Department have relied heavily on his expertise and keen insight. He has worked hard to keep his various constituencies—most particularly, Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Jesse Brown and the authorizing and appropriating committees of both the House and Senate—informed and working together. On any number of occasions, Ed has kept the train on the tracks when it was threatening to tumble off.

During these 4 years, Ed has played an important role in working with Congress to ensure passage of significant legislation to improve benefits and services for the service men and women who have sacrificed so much for our great country. He was particularly instrumental in working with the Congress last year to enact health care eligibility reform legislation, Public Law 104-262. Ed has also been in the middle of efforts to make sure that the Congress understood what the administration was doing in response to the concerns of veterans of the Persian Gulf.

Ed's high standards—in doing the job and doing it right, in being a person of unassailable integrity, and in working with all parties concerned to find solutions that all could embrace—have inspired all who have worked with him.

Mr. President, Ed's earlier career was equally distinguished. He graduated cum laude from the University of Pennsylvania Law School where he was an editor of the law review. Following a clerkship with a justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, he entered active duty in the Air Force and served