

achieve in 2002, it will be the "Thurmond Amendment."

When you ask STROM THURMOND what his secret is for stamina and energy, he may say something about diet, working out, swimming, or loving the work he does for the people of his State.

But his secret is, he thinks young—always.

He probably still considers himself the junior Senator from South Carolina—every time he stands with constituents for a picture in front of the portrait of John C. Calhoun just outside this Chamber.

One year, his campaign camper was the "Strom Trek." Another year it was the "Thurmon-ator."

And he loves to talk with young people.

He always has time to talk to the pages and visit with our staffers, treating them with respect and warmth, making them feel special.

He always remembers to ask about our families, and always imparts some of that joy of life to those around him.

STROM THURMOND has a joy of life, a love of people, and a sense of duty that give him purpose and energy.

In a world that we fear is becoming too coarse, he is gracious—and reminds us of the way back to civility.

He is devoted to God and country.

He is our most senior Senator and the highest-ranking constitutional officer of the Senate. Best of all for us, STROM THURMOND is our friend and teacher.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, June 4, 1997, the Federal debt stood at \$5,358,712,178,993.49. (Five trillion, three hundred fifty-eight billion, seven hundred twelve million, one hundred seventy-eight thousand, nine hundred ninety-three dollars and forty-nine cents)

One year ago, June 4, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,139,964,000,000. (Five trillion, one hundred thirty-nine billion, nine hundred sixty-four million)

Five years ago, June 4, 1992, the Federal debt stood at \$3,942,616,000,000. (Three trillion, nine hundred forty-two billion, six hundred sixteen million)

Ten years ago, June 4, 1987, the Federal debt stood at \$2,302,258,000,000. (Two trillion, three hundred two billion, two hundred fifty-eight million)

Fifteen years ago, June 4, 1982, the Federal debt stood at \$1,078,868,000,000 (One trillion, seventy-eight billion, eight hundred sixty-eight million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,279,844,178,993.49 (Four trillion, two hundred seventy-nine billion, eight hundred forty-four million, one hundred seventy-eight thousand, nine hundred ninety-three dollars and forty-nine cents) during the past 15 years.

U.S. FOREIGN OIL CONSUMPTION FOR WEEK ENDING MAY 30TH

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the American Petroleum Institute reports that for the week ending May 30, the United States imported 8,374,000 barrels of oil each day, 327,000 barrels less than the 8,701,000 imported each day during the same week 1 year ago.

While this is one of the few weeks that Americans imported less oil than the same period 1 year ago, Americans still relied on foreign oil for 56.5 percent of their needs last week, and there are no signs that the upward spiral will abate. Before the Persian Gulf war, the United States obtained approximately 45 percent of its oil supply from foreign countries. During the Arab oil embargo in the 1970's, foreign oil accounted for only 35 percent of America's oil supply.

Anybody else interested in restoring domestic production of oil? By U.S. producers using American workers?

Politicians had better ponder the economic calamity sure to occur in America if and when foreign producers shut off our supply—or double the already enormous cost of imported oil flowing into the United States—now 8,374,000 barrels a day.

JUNK GUN BAN IN CALIFORNIA

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise to mark a historic day in the nationwide movement to get junk guns, or Saturday night specials, off our streets. The California State Assembly and the California Senate passed legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of junk guns in California. The bills require that all guns made or sold in California meet the same quality and safety test currently required of imported firearms.

I applaud and thank each and every member of the California Legislature who voted for the bill for their courage in supporting this important legislation. I especially wish to acknowledge Assemblyman Louis Caldera and Senator Richard Polanco, whose leadership and tenacity contributed immeasurably to the passage of this legislation.

The bills passed by the California Legislature are nearly identical to a bill I introduced in the Senate last spring, the American Handgun Standards Act, which I have reintroduced this year. For the largest State in the Union to pass this legislation is extraordinary.

I trust that this important victory is just what we need here in Congress to move forward with junk gun legislation on the Federal level. Each year, nearly 40,000 Americans die from gunshots and more than 200,000 are injured. Gunshots are now the leading cause of death among children in California.

I have spoken on this floor many times before about the junk gun double standard that has flooded our streets with cheap, unsafe, easily concealable handguns. In 1968, Congress required

that all handguns imported to the United States meet a tough quality and safety test. This import restriction virtually cut off the flow of foreign junk guns. However Congress failed to require domestically produced handguns to meet the same test. This double standard led to the creation of a domestic junk gun industry that has flooded our streets with these unsafe, ultracheap handguns.

Study after study has shown that these junk guns are the criminal's weapon of choice.

California has taken the lead in a nationwide movement to get these guns off our streets. Thirty-two cities and counties have enacted local ordinances banning junk gun sales within their jurisdictions. Now that the California Legislature has taken this courageous step, I urge Governor Wilson to sign this historic legislation.

Today, Californians who want an end to gun violence had a major victory, and the U.S. Senate should take notice. I hope that soon we will be able to pass the American Handgun Standards Act, which will make our children, our families, and our communities safer.

There is no reason why American-made handguns should not have the same quality and safety standards as imported handguns. This dichotomy is killing our people.

NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, over the last few days, I have been reading in newspapers and hearing on radio and television about the Quadrennial Defense Review [QDR] and the so called National Defense Panel [NDP]. The QDR is supposed to be a comprehensive assessment of current military strategy and force structure, as well as outlining a vision for the future. However, experts have called this QDR "A Cold War Relic" and when it comes to the Army, I agree with them.

I truly believe the citizens of Kentucky and the American people deserve the best national defense strategy the Nation can afford. Yet the Active Army wants to cling to their 10 divisions, while simultaneously calling for a new Base Closure Commission. This is especially ironic when you consider that during the 1995 Base Closure Commission, the Active Duty Army leadership insisted the Army could not afford to close any more bases. This was just 2 years ago. The Base Closure Commission said not to have another Commission until the year 2001.

Mr. President, I would urge my colleagues to read page 3-2 of the 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission's report to the President, which says " * * * The Defense Department will be implementing the closures and realignments of the 1995 and prior Commissions through the end of this decade. The requirement in the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act that all Closures be completed within 6 years means that the closures

from the 1995 round will not be completed until 2001. For that reason, the Commission recommends that the Congress authorize another Base Closure Commission for the year 2001 similar to the 1991, 1993, and 1995 Commissions." I understand this is still the view of our former colleague Alan J. Dixon, the Chairman of the 1995 Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

The Active Army argues that they are going to cut the Active Force by 15,000 men and women. But my colleagues shouldn't be fooled. When you look closely, you will see that the 15,000 troops the Army wants to cut are nothing more than ghosts. What you have are 15,000 positions in the Active Army that have been left empty the last few years.

So the question remains: where does the Army plan to put these ten divisions—with no real reductions—if they close bases? How do they meet their budget target, while simultaneously protecting their general officer slots and keeping their 10 active divisions? Their answer? Cut the Army National Guard by approximately 38,000 people. That is a 10 percent reduction of the entire Army National Guard Force Structure.

This is the very same Army National Guard, Mr. President, that currently provides more than 55 percent of the ground combat forces, 45 percent of the combat support forces and 25 percent of the Army's combat support units, while only using 2 percent of the Department of Defense budget.

Why, my colleagues might ask, would the Active Duty Army leadership do such a thing? Well let's look. First, the Army leadership argues that the Guard divisions have no war fighting missions. This is true. But the Guard divisions have no war fighting missions because the Active Duty Army leadership has failed to give them a war fighting mission. And the reason they don't give them a war fighting mission is because then they would have to explain why they still wanted to keep 10 active duty divisions.

Also the Active Army does not consider members of the Army National Guard as soldiers. Instead they treat the men and women of the Army National Guard with contempt. These Active Duty types seem to forget that the men and women of the Army National Guard have undergone the same training as the active duty forces. Fifty percent of the entire Army National Guard are men and women coming off active duty with the Army.

The generals in the Active Army should look at their own figures regarding retention of their active duty members. The annual attrition of the Active Army is 36 percent, the attrition in the Army Reserve is 34 percent, while the attrition in the Army Guard is only 18 percent.

Perhaps what is most frustrating to me is the fact that the Active Army refused to consult with the Army Guard during the QDR. When asked about this

oversight by the press, the Army spokesperson responded that "there is an Army Reserve colonel and a Guard colonel here in our offices. They get to weigh in on the issues." You don't need an extensive knowledge of military affairs to realize that a colonel doesn't pull much weight against a group of active duty Army generals protecting their turf.

Mr. President, there should be no reason for the poor working relationship between the Active Army and the Army National Guard. I look at the strong working relationship between the Active Air Force and Air National Guard and wonder why can't the Army have this kind of relationship. I look at the great relationship the Active Duty Marine Corps has with its reserve units and wonder why not the Army and the Guard?

Mr. President, Company A, 4th Tank Battalion, 4th Marine Division [REIN] which was deployed to Saudi Arabia in December 1990 is stationed at Fort Knox. This company of outstanding reservists was selected to lead the attack by the 6th Marine Regiment into the battle for Kuwait. This outstanding Marine Corps Reserve unit fought along side their active duty comrades and did a great job.

They were able to work side by side with their active duty counterparts because the Marine Corps Reserves play a vital role in the Marine Corps military strategy and because the Marine Corps integrates both reserve training and education with their active counterparts.

There are a number of plans I have been told about which could save more than \$2.5 billion a year for the Army. They envision elimination of two Active Divisions. Two divisions could come out of Europe, and the Army could fly brigades from the United States to Europe on a rotational basis to serve a 3-month tour. The Army could take the equipment from these divisions and modernize Guard Divisions and give the Guard Divisions the war fighting missions of the two eliminated active divisions.

Remember, Mr. President we have a Marine Corps that we can send anywhere in the world. We can do the same with the Army. Look at the 101st, the 82d, the 10th Mountain, and the 3d Infantry Division. These are tough Active Duty Forces that the 15 enhanced National Guard Brigades and the 8 National Guard Divisions can support.

Given these tight fiscal times, I hope all my colleagues remember that an Army Guardsman can be kept combat ready for an annual cost of \$17,000, while an active duty soldier costs more than \$80,000. The Army Guard, just like its Active Duty counterpart, is trained for combat.

Up to this point, I have tolerated the Active Army's all-too-obvious bias. Yet the QDR represents the final straw. Some of my colleagues want to wait for the National Defense Panel to do their review and report to Congress. I was a

cosponsor of the amendment that called for this panel. When Senator BOND and I agreed to cosponsor the amendment creating the Defense Panel, we did so only after we had received assurances that someone with a Guard background would be on the panel.

Mr. President, the National Defense Panel has been turned into a joke. It is nothing more than a warmed-over version of the failed Roles and Mission Commission—a Commission that spent more money in 2 years than the Base Closure Commissions spent in 5 years.

No one other than the outgoing Deputy Secretary of Defense has been interested in anything the Roles and Mission Commission reported and it should come as no surprise that this Commission also did not have a Guard representative. So what we have is a National Defense Panel appointed by the outgoing Deputy Secretary of Defense consisting of individuals from our cold war days who have no background in working day-to-day with the National Guard.

Even my friend Senator McCain, an author of the amendment that created the National Defense Panel, expressed his disappointment with the lack of imagination in appointing the members of this Panel.

I think it's high time we put a stop to this childish bickering between the Army and the National Guard. The Active Duty Army needs to get its act together and accept the National Guard as an equal partner so they all can be the best Army they can be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following articles, one from the National Guard magazine by Maj. Gen. Richard C. Alexander, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks, also that two articles from the Armed Forces Journal, May 1997, issue by former Congressman G.V. "Sonny" Montgomery and a second article by John G. Roos. I hope all my colleagues will read these articles.

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

[From the Armed Forces Journal, May 1997]

AN APPLES-TO-APPLES COMPARISON

(By MG Richard C. Alexander, President, NGAUS)

The Pentagon announced this month that a Virginia Army National Guard rifle company has been notified to begin training for possible deployment to Europe in support of Operation Joint Guard, the Bosnia peace-keeping mission formerly known as Joint Endeavor.

Thousands of Guard members have deployed for this mission over the past several months, many of whom already have returned to home station. So, you may ask, what's the big deal? The big deal is that should the unit actually deploy, Virginia's C Company, 3d Battalion, 116th Infantry, would be the first National Guard infantry unit to be mobilized by the Department of Defense since the Vietnam War. It's fitting that this unit, which once fell under the command of Gen. Thomas "Stonewall" Jackson, might break the ice. I'm proud of C Company, just as I am of all our units.

At the same time, this newsworthy event adds poignancy to an ongoing debate about the Department of the Army's failure to include its National Guard combat troops in national military strategy. To this day, none of the Guard's eight combat divisions is in the nation's warfighting plans. The question is not only why it has taken so long for the Army to call up a Guard infantry unit, but also why Guard divisions are completely excluded from the war fight? Haven't our combat troops undergone the same training as our active-duty brethren? Isn't the Guard's training and readiness ultimately the responsibility of the active Army?

In fact, under the provisions of Title 11, the Army National Guard Combat Readiness Reform Act of 1992, the Army is supposed to provide 5,000 active-component advisors whose primary responsibility is to ensure National Guard and Reserve training standards are achieved. To date, the Army has not met this congressional mandate.

In this issue of National Guard Magazine, you will find strong evidence, despite what some Army leaders say, that Army Guard combat units can mobilize in time for war.

Let me point out a comparison that exposes the weakness in the active Army's straw man concerning the ability of Guard units to successfully mobilize for war. During the Gulf War mobilization, the 4th Tank Battalion, a United States Marine Corps Reserve unit in the 4th Marine Division, successfully transitioned from the M-60 to the M1-A1 Main Battle Tank in just 45 days. The battalion trained, shot and qualified, then deployed to the Gulf where it fought alongside its active Marine Corps counterparts. Indeed, one of its companies knocked out 35 of 36 Iraqi tanks in less than five minutes. This is just one example of the success the Marine Corps has had with putting all its units into the fight—by doctrine and by training.

The Army must be just as accountable for the relationship it has with Army Guard combat units.

In our Gulf War experience, the Tennessee Army Guard's 212th Engineer Company was the first American unit into Iraq after the ground war began, breaching the way for allied tanks. The 20th Special Forces Group, composed of National Guard units from Alabama, Florida, Maryland, Mississippi and Kentucky, completed their 90-day certification program in half the time. And, of course, our National Guard artillery units are legendary for their performance in the Gulf War, with such standouts as Oklahoma's 1st Battalion, 158th Field Artillery, (Multiple Launch Rocket System), which fired record numbers of missiles on target.

Those who pay close attention to national defense know the Guard and Reserve units are dependent upon how they are treated by their respective services. Army Guard members are ready, willing and motivated to take on real-world missions, if only given the chance. We've proven this in places like the Sinai, and we're proving it countrywide everyday.

The active Army leadership needs to be held accountable for the Army Guard's overall performance. The Army must foster a better working relationship among all of its officers and enlisted personnel, active, Guard and Reserve. Army leaders should not only be squelching myths about the Guard's combat units, but taking the lead in promoting our successes on and off the battlefield.

My hat is off to the Marine Corps leadership for fully integrating its reserve fighting units into its total combat force. The Marine Corps reserve forces play a vital role in the national military strategy. The Corps continues to integrate both reserve component training and professional military education with that of the active component.

Needless to say, news about the 4th Tank Battalion's feats during the Gulf War sparked a healthy competition within the Corps' ranks. Last October, five years after the war, the best tank crews from four Marine tank battalions—two active duty and two reserve—were pitted against each other in a showdown at Fort Knox's ultra-modern Yano Tank Range. Not surprisingly, the 4th Tank Battalion's crew came out on top.

To emphasize its policy of equal treatment between its components, the Corps dropped the term "reserve" in reference to its "part-time" soldiers. They train their soldiers for combat, and they send their soldiers to combat. They don't wallow in hypothetical arguments.

It's time the active Army leadership followed suit.

ENSURING THE STRENGTH OF OUR FUTURE—THE QDR AND THE FUTURE OF THE GUARD AND RESERVE

(By Hon. G.V. "Sonny" Montgomery)

Someone recently asked me, "Who's going to look out for the National Guard and Reserve now that you've retired from Congress?" I thought about the question, in light of the soon-to-be-released Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) and the reality of today's changing defense environment, and the answer was simple: The nation, led by my colleagues in Congress, will safeguard the Guard and Reserve because the Guard and Reserve so effectively help protect our nation.

A public treasure, the National Guard is actually older than the United States, first convening in the 13 original colonies. Now, more than 220 years later, its two-fold mission remains the same: to protect the state and to be a part of the federal militia. From thwarting drug smugglers on our southern and western borders to fighting on the front lines in the Gulf War, today's guardsmen and reservists play a vital role in protecting America's interests and citizens.

A roadmap for the future of our defense requirements, the QDR must assess threats to our nation and our military's capability to meet them. This QDR intends to evaluate the changing nature of conflict in the world today and whether it is feasible for our services to fight and win two regional Gulf War-sized conflicts nearly simultaneously.

My colleagues in Congress, however, will continue to base decisions to allocate funds less on the threat of regional conflicts and more on meeting anticipated global contingencies around the world. A keen eye will also be kept on such potential flash points as China, North Korea, Iran, Iraq, and possibly even Russia.

I have heard some concerns voiced that QDR's bottom-up review isn't appropriate given that many members of Congress who will evaluate the report lack military backgrounds. In my view, the process is still effective. Worldly in experience and highly educated, men and women in Congress, regardless of having served in wartime, possess the most important quality—the power to listen—to the QDR commission, to military experts, and most importantly, to the people they serve—their constituents, the American people.

When I was elected to Congress in 1967, more than 50 percent of the national budget went to the military. Now, less than 20 percent of our nation's budget funds the military. With the threat of further reductions of up to 40,000 active military personnel, the fate of our nation's security—and of the Guard and Reserve—is in question.

MORE CUTS AHEAD

The Guard and Reserve have shared the pain of the overall cutbacks, facing reduc-

tions in end strengths each year since 1980. With total active military personnel expected to shrink by 21 percent from FY96 to FY98, selected Reserves are expected to be reduced by 10 percent, and civilians (FTEs) will shrink by 27 percent.

These numbers seem staggering; we simply cannot set in motion the bleeding of the nation's National Guard and Reserve's fighting strength.

A few things to consider: The Guard and Reserve are perhaps one of the best values for the American taxpayer today. In times of conflict, the Guard and Reserve participate equally in the fighting force, side by side with their active-duty counterparts. But personnel costs for Guard and Reserve are only half as much as for the full-time military. And let's remember that these citizen-soldiers are an important link between the public and the professional military.

Some have questioned whether the Guard and Reserve, in their present forms, are still pertinent in today's changing environment. But their existence has become more appropriate than ever before, given the expanded domestic role they fulfill. For example, just in the past few years alone, the Guard and Reserve have been called to perform a wide range of missions here at home, from reacting to the Los Angeles riots, to supporting community rebuilding efforts in the current aftermath of the Midwest flooding, to protecting our borders in the drug interdiction program. These domestic activities should not, however, take the place of combat missions and combat support.

The Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve, for example, with the highest number of full-time technicians, have done an excellent job of training and planning for missions, sometimes a year or more in advance. While other components have so far been prepared to move out despite shorter planning cycles, they are moving to adopt the Air Force's successful advance planning structure. Through proper training, Guard and Reserve units are ready to deploy in a reasonable time.

As with anything, the role of the Guard and Reserve is only as good as we make it. In the last 15 years, I worked with my colleagues in Congress toward the billion-dollar package of add-ons to fortify the Guard and Reserve. But today my colleagues in Congress must be more vigilant than ever before in protecting this extremely valuable national resource.

STEM THE DRAWDOWN

I urge Congress to restore defense budget spending levels to maintain our strength and capability to fight any conflict or mission we encounter. We must also stem the massive drawdown in the Total Force. We've gone about as far as we can or should go.

As a way of strengthening and preserving the Guard and Reserve, I offer the following recommendations:

The Department of Defense and all service branches must continue to accept the role of their National Guard and Reserve counterparts as part of the Total Force. This includes assigning them more combat and combat support missions.

DoD must offer equitable benefits and enticements to gain and retain the best men and women for our Guard and Reserve. This includes expanding health care and dental benefits, offering combat pay for overseas missions, and confirming legislation to provide health care coverage for victims of Gulf War Syndrome rather than waiting indefinitely for the results of lengthy medical research.

The active force must continue to play an important role in improving training for the Guard and Reserve.

Just as for active personnel, we must continue to provide the same state-of-the-art, properly maintained equipment and tools, and the proper personnel to sustain them. Further, we must make Operations and Maintenance funds readily available to keep that equipment in top fighting shape.

Whatever the outcome of the QDR process, the Total Force—Active, Guard, and Reserve—will continue to provide for the defense of this great nation and for the freedom of our people.

Enter Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs Deborah Lee. At her direction, early last year the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA) was told to conduct a comprehensive inquiry to determine how long it would take to get the most complex type of division in the National Guard force structure ready to deploy for combat. The Texas National Guard's 49th Armored Division was selected as the test unit, and the actual readiness conditions prevailing in the 49th were used in establishing the study's baseline.

Drawing on the expertise of officers from HQDA and the Army's Training and Doctrine Command, Forces Command, and other appropriate organizations, a seven-month study began last July. Using relatively conservative planning assumptions for such things as the availability of training areas and the amount of training support that could be expected from active-duty army elements, the IDA-led inquiry determined that the 49th Division could achieve a validated readiness status in 94 days and could get to either a port of debarkation or an airhead in 132 days.

Not surprisingly, when these conclusions made their way to the Army staff early this year, they created more than a bit of heartburn. As things now stand, active-duty Army officials believe that the study results are probably flawed because—get this—the Active Army probably wouldn't be able to deliver the types of training and other support that the Active Army is supposed to provide to the National Guard during the mobilization process. They're not sure though, since there is no standard procedure for validating the readiness status of a National Guard division; in fact, there's no Army field manual that lays out the process by which a division is supposed to mobilize and prepare for deployment.

It's ironic that while most elements of America's military force structure would like nothing better than to find a place to hide during QDR deliberations, the Army National Guard is crying out for attention. But some National Guard officials clearly feel that years of benign neglect have put their divisions in a perilous position for QDR-prompted cuts. With the IDA-led study results in hand, these officials vow, they aren't about to disappear quietly.

UNEQUAL PARTNERS—NATIONAL GUARD'S COMBAT DIVISIONS REMAIN HIDDEN BENEATH MANTLE OF BENIGN NEGLECT

(By John G. Roos)

Today's "Total Army" includes eight National Guard combat divisions. This substantial slice of America's combat power is in addition to the National Guard's 15 "Enhanced Readiness Brigades" that presumably would be used to augment active-duty forces in the event of an all-out national emergency. But those eight divisions haven't attracted much attention during the nearly completed Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), since they're not even included in America's war plans.

Ever since the contentious issue of Georgia's 48th Infantry (Mechanized) Brigade's purported inability to achieve ready-for-deployment status during Desert Storm, Army

planners have shed away from relying on National Guard combat units to augment active-duty Army forces during the early stages of a conflict. In spite of the special attention the Army continues to devote to its Enhanced Brigades in order to keep them at relatively acceptable levels of combat readiness, they still remain far from the tip of the spear in the Service's deployment plans. But at least those Enhanced Brigades do come into play at some point during Army warfighting planning sessions. The same can't be said of the eight National Guard divisions.

In the wake of the "come-as-you-are" planning assumptions that flowed from the Bottom-Up Review's short-notice, two-MRC strategy, those eight divisions were deemed so unlikely to be ready to deploy in time to make a difference in the conflicts the Army would most likely face that they were quietly flushed from Army war plans. The plug was pulled more than five years ago, when former Army Chief of Staff General Gordon Sullivan told the House Armed Services Committee that it would take 365 days to prepare a National Guard division for deployment to a combat arena. After the howls of protests from National Guard leaders subsided, the Army revised its estimate downward to 270 days. But that three month chop by the Army headquarters staff did little to assuage the Guard's leadership: Even a nine-month mobilization, training, and deployment cycle, they argued, was blatantly pessimistic and would continue to exclude National Guard divisions from the Army's warfighting planning process.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I join with my friend and cochair of the National Guard Caucus when I call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial found in today's issue of the Washington Times by Mr. Philip Gold, entitled "The Army vs. The National Guard" which I ask unanimous consent to be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BOND. This editorial outlines succinctly the issues facing the National Guard in the debate surrounding its force structure and its very future. I have said before and reiterate now in the strongest of terms, that rather than bill payer, the Guard's role should be vibrant, viable, and adequately funded by the Department of Defense.

National Guard units from every State are, today, involved in operations domestically in their State roles, and globally in their national role. Recently, units from my home State have been involved in missions in accordance with United States directives in Bosnia, Hungary, the Persian Gulf, and continue to serve our interests there. Units from States which have experienced natural disasters have traditionally been the "Cavalry to the rescue." Even the U.S. Air Force was a recipient of the National Guard's professional response when an A-10 aircraft which had crashed in a remote area was initially discovered by a National Guard Team involved in the search.

With the fiscal constraints being imposed on our military force while simultaneously increasing their roles and missions, we need the Guard now,

more than ever. We need it to be trained, we need it to be well equipped, and we need it funded.

Mr. President I call upon all Senators to join with me and Senator FORD along with the other members of the National Guard Caucus in a pledge to insure the robust nature of the National Guard, a service from which we ask so much.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Times, June 5, 1997]

THE ARMY VS. THE NATIONAL GUARD

(By Philip Gold)

The fracas was inevitable. Several weeks ago, the National Guard's senior leadership concluded that they hadn't been given a fair chance to make their case before the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). They also concluded that the Army was systematically lying to them about the extent of the Guard reductions they wanted. So they requested a meeting with Defense Secretary William Cohen and were told to "go through their chain of command."

So they did . . . through their other chain of command. They went to the governors, who started writing the president, cc: the Pentagon. That got Mr. Cohen's attention and Mr. Cohen's attention—to adapt a venerable adage—started flowing downhill. As of this writing, the secretary was ordered an Army/National Guard "off-site" at the Pentagon (great place for an "off-site") to work it out the first week in June. Also as of this writing, the Guard has received seven contradictory letters from Mr. Cohen, army secretary Togo West and senior army generals on structuring the meeting. About the only thing that hasn't been suggested is a United Nations peacekeeping force in the room.

Maybe not such a bad idea, given the acrimony on both sides.

Whatever the "off-site" producers, it won't last long. The Army and the National Guard have been at it for centuries. The Guard has survived through a combination of domestic political savvy and foreign threats that seemed to require a large reserve. But does this venerable (some would say archaic) institution have any relevance to today's world and tomorrow's missions?

The answer is that the Guard has a greater relevance today than during the Cold War—exactly the kind of relevance the Founding Fathers envisioned when they elected to place the preponderance of the nation's military strength in the state militias.

Three facts vindicate the Guard. First, the U.S. simply cannot afford to maintain a large standing army. The force that did Desert Storm is long-gone. Nor can the United States afford to maintain large portions of the present force at high readiness. Reserves are far cheaper, especially in a world where mass armies are vanishing, and where those that remain grow ever more obsolete and vulnerable to other forms of American power.

Second, the Guard and service reserves provide a de facto "people's veto" on major foreign involvements. If a president lacks the popular support to mobilize, he lacks the popular support to go to war—and has better not do it.

Third, the Guard is a classic "dual use" system, available for foreign and domestic tasks. The Guard's experience in domestic emergencies offers a capability of major military significance. For example, the Guard, not the standing Army, should be given the nuclear/biological/chemical weapons disaster relief mission. The standing Army doesn't need this capability in peacetime, so it should be in the part time forces.

Given the likelihood of future terrorist actions on American soil, the Guard, with thousands of sites around the country and local expertise, offers a far superior means of deploying this capability for domestic emergencies.

Further—and this is not easy to say—the standing Army, is an institution in profound disarray, trashed by scandal and, in many ways, looking for work that will generate hard cash and renewed respect. Almost inevitably, that points toward more domestic missions, especially counter-terrorism in its various aspects. One need not conjure up lurid thoughts of military coups or images of an alienated, embittered officer corps to understand that this is a bad idea. The less the standing military is involved in domestic affairs, the better. Not because they're evil people, but because their professional methods and loyalties may do more harm than good. The Founders knew it; the Army's domestic intelligence activities during Vietnam proved it. To the extent that military force may have to be used in this country in the decades ahead, it ought to be the Guard, with its complex set of responsibilities to and relationships with country, state, and community.

But the political and cultural justifications for the Guard don't address one practical question: Can they be ready to do the job? Obviously, the answer depends on what the job is and what you mean by ready. Still, one thing is clear. There is no inherent reason the Guard cannot perform adequately across the range of its missions. The Marine Corps and the Air Force have demonstrated what can be accomplished when reserves are treated as assets, not rivals. New tools and methods, from tank and cockpit simulators to computerized command post exercises, offer training possibilities unimaginable even 10 years ago. High-priority units can be filled with people willing to accept high levels of contractual obligation, including extended active duty and early call-up. In short, the Guard's proficiency is limited only by resources and creativity—and by a standing Army that, for reasons of its own, prefers not to acknowledge it.

Again, that standing Army isn't evil. It's simply fighting for its institutional life and soul. The current off-site, and the next one, and the one after that, will no doubt reflect the desperation of the struggle. But the Army should not be permitted to sacrifice the Guard to protect its own turf bowls. The current military situation, and the wisdom of centuries, should preclude it.

TRIBUTE TO LORD MICHAEL JOPLING

Mr. STEVENS. I come to the Senate floor today to tell the Senate that a very special and dear friend to many of us who serve in the Senate, the Right Honorable Michael Jopling, has now been honored in his country with a life peerage and will join the House of Lords.

Those of us who know Michael Jopling have known him as a Member of Parliament who has served more than three decades in Britain as a Member of Parliament. He served as a Minister of Agricultural, Fisheries, and Food in the British Government for two 4-year periods between 1979 and 1987. Those of us here in the Senate who know him, know him because of his active participation in the North Atlantic Assembly sessions and par-

ticularly in the British-American Interparliamentary Conference meetings which many of us have participated in from time to time.

He continues to serve, Mr. President, as the Secretary for the Interparliamentary Exchange. Senator BYRD and I will lead a Senate delegation in August to meet with our British counterparts, and for the 10th year in a row it will be Lord Jopling, now, who will meet us. He brings great energy and enthusiasm to the meetings we have held and, really, his participation has been unparalleled.

As a matter of fact, I am sad to report to the Senate that with his youthful exuberance he got the better of himself recently when he suffered an accident in a Go-Kart race. He broke some ribs and had some damage to his lungs, but he is on the mend now. I understand that he will have full recovery.

I further bring greetings to the Senate from our friend Senator Heflin. Senator Heflin has written to me about his real joy to see our friend, Michael Jopling, so honored. I am reminded of a speech that Sir Winston Churchill made in the House of Commons on August 20, 1940. He said:

The British Empire and the United States will have to be somewhat mixed together in some of their affairs for mutual and general advantage. For my own part, looking out upon the future, I do not view the process with any misgivings.

It is, in fact, the British-American interparliamentary process that has given great effect to those words, and Lord Jopling has been a leader of that effort. He has made a lasting contribution to the great relationship between our two countries. He and his wife Gail have always been gracious hosts, and they really are wonderful goodwill ambassadors for Britain.

I come to offer my congratulations to Lord Jopling. I think others who know him will want to congratulate him, also. We particularly thank him for years of dedication to his country and to the cause of world peace and understanding. He is a great personal friend. I am delighted to see a friend honored.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLINGS. As they say in England, hear, hear. We are delighted to hear of the elevation of our friend Michael to Lord Jopling. It shows, amongst other things in England, that you do not only have to be young, you can be old and still succeed.

I wish him well, too, in his recovery, and I appreciate the Senator from Alaska pointing out this wonderful happening.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for those remarks, and I know I reflect the sentiments of my great friend Howell Heflin in reporting to the Senate this great news.

Mr. DODD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DODD. I do not know Michael Jopling as well as our good friends from Alaska and South Carolina, but I have met him on numerous occasions, having attended a couple of the sessions of the North Atlantic Assembly with Judge Heflin, our former colleague.

I remember when I left the other body, Mr. President, and came to the U.S. Senate, our former colleague and delightful raconteur, Morris Udall, pulled me aside and said, "I want you to know I do not approve of your moving to the U.S. Senate. All I can say is by this move you have improved the intelligence of both bodies," and one might suggest I suppose here with our good friend Michael Jopling, being elevated to the status of Lord, that he is certainly going to improve the intelligence of that body.

He is a wonderful person, a great individual, and I wish him well.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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. 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.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR OF 1997—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 hours of debate on the subject of the conference report on H.R. 1469.

The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may use. I state to the Senate that I don't intend to use the whole hour, unless it is necessary to respond to some comments that may come up. It is my hope that we can finish debate on this bill and then turn to the budget resolution.

The conference report on the defense and emergency disaster supplemental bill will soon be before us. It is not before us yet. In the interest of time, we hope that we can get this matter resolved so that we may vote upon the bill as soon as it is received from the House.

Mr. President, the conferees completed their work yesterday afternoon and the conference report was filed in the House last night. The final bill keeps faith with the version that passed the Senate last month. It provides needed relief for the victims of disasters in 35 States. The bill also provides \$1.8 billion for military operations in Bosnia, Southwest Asia, and foreign deployments. Those amounts replace funds already spent by the administration. Without this funding for the Defense Department, we face a severe reduction in training, readiness,