

Mr. LOTT. I believe they probably could be offered to that bill. I do not particularly relish the idea, but I think they probably could be.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield? He made reference to a couple of matters which ought to be addressed briefly.

First, with regard to nuclear waste, I know of nobody on this side of the aisle who wishes to filibuster the bill, and I will be happy to clarify that with the majority leader. I think there is an interest, however, in amending the bill. We would love to have the bill come to the Senate floor under normal Senate order, regular order, and if the bill were brought up under regular order, we would be in support of moving the bill and voting in favor of the motion to proceed. I will be happy to work with the majority leader to schedule that, if we could accommodate Senators who wish to offer amendments.

With regard to the FAA debate, this was one of the more difficult agreements. I appreciate the ability of many of our colleagues to allow us the opportunity to have this debate on Monday. But I must say that, once again, this is a unanimous consent request to limit debate and limit amendments. We are agreeing to this only because we believe the FAA bill is a matter of great national security and of import not only for safety and health of aviation but because we believe we have already taken too long to reauthorize this legislation.

So because of the expiration of the authorizing legislation, because of the safety and health matters, we share the view that this legislation ought to come up and be debated and that we ought to limit ourselves to relevant amendments.

But again I say that we have not had a bill before the Senate under regular Senate order since last May. We have gone through June, July, August, and now September—4 months—and we are simply saying: Let's bring bills to the floor under regular order. Let's have a good debate, and let's have amendments offered. I am hopeful that we can work through the rest of the agenda with that in mind.

So we are not going to object to this bill being brought up, again, under abnormal Senate order and rule. But I think there is a growing concern that too many bills are coming to the floor without the opportunity for a full debate.

So whether it is nuclear waste or whether it is an array of other bills that could come to the floor, we are ready to debate them. We are ready to have a good amount of time dedicated to whatever piece of legislation ought to be considered. But we want the right to offer amendments. We will forego that right under FAA, but there are not many bills that fit into that category, if any, for the rest of the year.

I thank the majority leader for yielding.

Mr. SCHUMER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I want to take this moment to thank both the majority leader and the minority leader, the Senator from Arizona, and the Senator from South Carolina, for their patience because we did have a problem that affected my area that has been worked out.

I ask the majority leader one little question. I want to confirm that the language we have talked about seems to meet the agreement of all sides. I want to get the attention of the majority leader. I was thanking him and the minority leader and others, and I just want to clarify the language we have talked about seems to meet the agreement of all the major players in solving that problem.

Mr. LOTT. I have not had an opportunity to talk personally, directly, to the Senator from Arizona, but I am informed by his senior aide that he is committed to living with the language that the Senator from New York is familiar with, and that also the Senator from South Carolina, the ranking Democrat, has indicated he will comply with that. And based on the assurance I received, then I would work to make sure that understanding was lived up to. Whether you agree with the final result or not, I will make sure that what your understanding is on the part I have been involved in would be honored.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Senator and thank again the Members of the body for their indulgence on this issue.

Mr. BRYAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. Earlier, the majority leader made inquiry about the position on the nuclear waste bill. I want to put the majority leader on notice the Senators from Nevada are not prepared to surrender any of the procedural rights on this issue. This, as you know, is an issue—

Mr. LOTT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRYAN. I am happy to.

Mr. LOTT. You mean you are not ready to go to final passage on this bill at this point?

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator from Mississippi, with his characteristic insight, has hit the nail right on the head.

Mr. LOTT. Let me assure the Chair and my colleagues that we know the very passionate feelings of the Senator from Nevada. We know he is going to make them heard, and in every way he can. And he will be entitled to all the rules of the Senate in that effort. We understand that and appreciate it.

Mr. BRYAN. I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—Continued

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID, give me his attention? We have a sense-of-the-Senate resolution to be offered by Senator INHOFE; and then we have 10 minutes for an amendment to be offered and then withdrawn. We need consent to set aside your amendment. Or perhaps you are ready to withdraw that amendment?

AMENDMENT NO. 1807, WITHDRAWN

Mr. REID. I say to the manager of the bill, I have not received assurance yet that I will have a hearing. To expedite matters, I will agree to withdraw my amendment. But I want everyone to understand there is an amendment pending, a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, on the same issue. Rule XVI does not apply, of course, against my sense of the Senate. But in order to expedite matters, I withdraw my amendment. I will bring up, whenever we get back to this bill, my sense-of-the-Senate resolution on the exact same material.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

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

Mr. SPECTER. Then in our sequence, we have an amendment by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 1816

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding payments under the prospective payment system for hospital outpatient department services under the medicare program)

Mr. INHOFE. I have an amendment at the desk and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] proposes an amendment numbered 1816.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent 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, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING PAYMENTS UNDER THE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR HOSPITAL OUTPATIENT DEPARTMENT SERVICES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The Balanced Budget Act of 1997, in order to achieve the objective of balancing the Federal budget, provided for the single largest change in the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act

(42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) since the inception of such program in 1965.

(2) Reliable, independent estimates now project that the changes to the medicare program provided for in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 will result in the reduction of payments to health care providers that greatly exceeds the level of estimated reductions when such Act was enacted.

(3) Congressional oversight has begun to reveal that these greater-than-anticipated reductions in payments are harming the ability of health care providers to maintain and deliver high-quality health care services to beneficiaries under the medicare program and to other individuals.

(4) One of the key factors that has caused these greater-than-anticipated reductions in payments is the inappropriate regulatory action taken by the Secretary in implementing the provisions of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

(5) The Secretary of Health and Human Services, contrary to the direction of 77 Members of the Senate and 253 Members of the House of Representatives (stated in letters to the Secretary dated June 18, 1999, and September 14, 1999, respectively), has persisted in interpreting the provisions of the prospective payment system for hospital outpatient department services under section 1833(t) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(t)) in a manner that would impose an unintended 5.7 percent across the board reduction in payments under such system.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Health and Human Services should—

(1) carry out congressional intent and cease its inappropriate interpretation of the provisions of the prospective payment system for hospital outpatient department services under section 1833(t) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(t)); and

(2) eliminate the unintended 5.7 percent across the board reduction in payments under such system.

AMENDMENT NO. 1816, AS MODIFIED

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment in accordance with the modification at the desk.

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

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING PAYMENTS UNDER THE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR HOSPITAL OUTPATIENT DEPARTMENT SERVICES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The Balanced Budget Act of 1997, in order to achieve the objective of balancing the Federal budget, provided for the single largest change in the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) since the inception of such program in 1965.

(2) Reliable, independent estimates now project that the changes to the medicare program provided for in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 will result in the reduction of payments to health care providers that greatly exceeds the level of estimated reductions when such Act was enacted.

(3) Congressional oversight has begun to reveal that these greater-than-anticipated reductions in payments are harming the ability of health care providers to maintain and deliver high-quality health care services to beneficiaries under the medicare program and to other individuals.

(4) One of the key factors that has caused these greater-than-anticipated reductions in payments is the inappropriate regulatory action taken by the Secretary in implementing the provisions of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

(5) The Secretary of Health and Human Services, contrary to the direction of 77 Members of the Senate and 253 Members of the House of Representatives (stated in letters to the Secretary dated June 18, 1999, and September 14, 1999, respectively), has persisted in interpreting the provisions of the prospective payment system for hospital outpatient department services under section 1833(t) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(t)) in a manner that would impose an unintended 5.7 percent across the board reduction in payments under such system.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Health and Human Services should—

(1) carry out congressional intent and cease its inappropriate interpretation of the provisions of the prospective payment system for hospital outpatient department services under section 1833(t) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(t)).

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, when the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 was passed, there was a misinterpretation by the Health Care Financing Administration of this bill—while it should have been revenue neutral—to have regular reductions in the amount of reimbursement that goes to hospitals, specifically a 5.7-percent reduction to reimbursement that would take place in July of the year 2000. This was not the intent of the Members of the Senate.

I have a letter that has 77 signatures on it, including those of each Senator who is in the Chamber right now, stating that was not the intent. This is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution saying that was not the intent so we would not be having that 5.7-percent reduction in July of the year 2000.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Oklahoma for the sense-of-the-Senate resolution. I think it is meritorious. It has been cleared by the ranking member on the Democratic side.

Mr. REID. We have not had a chance to clear this with our leader. I apologize to the manager of the bill. We have not cleared this with the leader, so I can't agree to it.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania would yield?

Mr. SPECTER. I do.

Mr. INHOFE. I suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania, both Senator DASCHLE and Senator REID have signed the letter asking for this same thing we have in the sense of the Senate.

Mr. REID. It is pretty persuasive.

Mr. SPECTER. Do you want to check?

Mr. REID. I withdraw our objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The amendment (No. 1816), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. REID. If I could have the floor for a second.

I say to my friend from Oklahoma, that was one of the most persuasive arguments I have heard on the Senate floor.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the final order of business this evening on the pending bill is an amendment to be offered by the Senator from Kansas, Mr. BROWNBACK, for purposes of 10 minutes of discussion, and then it will be withdrawn. So I leave the floor in the hands of Senator BROWNBACK for that 10-minute presentation and withdrawal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 1833

(Purpose: To establish a task force of the Senate to address the societal crisis facing America)

Mr. BROWNBACK. I call up an amendment at the desk numbered 1833 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] proposes an amendment numbered 1833.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following:

TITLE ____ TASK FORCE ON THE STATE OF AMERICAN SOCIETY

SEC ____ 01. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TASK FORCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a task force of the Senate to be known as the Task Force on the State of American Society (hereafter in this title referred to as the "task force").

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the task force is—

(1) to study the societal condition of America, particularly in regard to children, youth, and families;

(2) to make such findings as are warranted and appropriate, including the impact that trends and developments have on the broader society, particularly in regards to child well-being; and

(3) to study the causes and consequences of youth violence.

(c) TASK FORCE PROCEDURE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraphs 1, 2, 7(a) (2), and 10(a) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and section 202 (i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, shall apply to the task force, except for the provisions relating to the taking of depositions and the subpoena power.

(2) EQUAL FUNDING.—The majority and the minority staff of the task force shall receive equal funding.

(3) QUORUMS.—The task force is authorized to fix the number of its members (but not less than one-third of its entire membership) who shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of such business as may be considered by the task force. A majority of the task force will be required to issue a report to the relevant committees, with a minority of the task force afforded an opportunity to record its views in the report.

SEC. ____ 02. MEMBERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION OF THE TASK FORCE.

(a) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The task force shall consist of 8 members of the Senate—

(A) 4 of whom shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate from the majority party of the Senate upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader of the Senate; and

(B) 4 of whom shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate from the minority party of the Senate upon the recommendation of the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(2) VACANCIES.—Vacancies in the membership of the task force shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the task force and shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments to it are made.

(b) CHAIRMAN.—The chairman of the task force shall be selected by the Majority Leader of the Senate and the vice chairman of the task force shall be selected by the Minority Leader of the Senate. The vice chairman shall discharge such responsibilities as the task force or the chairman may assign.

SEC. 03. AUTHORITY OF TASK FORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of this title, the task force is authorized, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel;

(3) to hold hearings;

(4) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate;

(5) to procure the services of individual consultations or organizations thereof, in accordance with the provisions of section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; and

(6) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) OTHER COMMITTEE STAFF.—At the joint request of the chairman and vice-chairman of the task force, the chairman and the ranking member of any other Senate committee or subcommittee may jointly permit the task force to use, on a nonreimbursable basis, the facilities or services of any members of the staff of such other Senate committee or subcommittee whenever the task force or its chairman, following consultation with the vice chairman, considers that such action is necessary or appropriate to enable the task force to make the investigation and study provided for in this title.

SEC. 04. REPORT AND TERMINATION.

The task force shall report its findings, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable, to the relevant committees and the Senate prior to July 7, 2000.

SEC. 05. FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—From the date this title is agreed to through July 7, 2000, the expenses of the task force incurred under this title—

(1) shall be paid out of the miscellaneous items account of the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) shall not exceed \$500,000, of which amount not to exceed \$150,000 shall be available for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof, as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i)); and

(3) shall include sums in addition to expenses described under paragraph (2), as may be necessary for agency contributions related to compensation of employees of the task force.

(b) PAYMENT OF EXPENSES.—Payment of expenses of the task force shall be disbursed

upon vouchers approved by the chairman, except that vouchers shall not be required for disbursements of salaries (and related agency contributions) paid at an annual rate.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Pennsylvania accommodating our desires tonight. The reason we offer this amendment is to discuss it briefly and then withdraw it as being subject to a point of order on this particular bill.

I rise to explain the amendment.

What this amendment regards is the establishment of a 1-year, actually less than 1-year, Senate task force to study the state of American society. There has been a lot of discussion going on about this. I want to spend a little bit of time discussing what this is and what it isn't because I think both are important.

We are proposing this task force, Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator MOYNIHAN, and myself, the Presiding Officer, a number of others, because we believe there is a deep and pressing need to examine in a manner that is bipartisan, intellectual, rigorous, dispassionate, and publicly accessible, the cultural and social health of our society.

It is a simple and undeniable fact that our families and children, schools, and communities have been subjected to seismic shifts over the last 30 years. These changes have had consequences—consequences which deeply impact the public, including the formation of public policy, which deserve a public forum in which to study and address them.

First, if we take a quick look at what is happening across America, in the last 2 years, we have seen one school shooting after another: Conyers, GA; Littleton, CO; Richmond, VA; Paducah, KY; Springfield, OR; Edinboro, PA; Pearl, MS; and Jonesboro, AR. Unfortunately, the list goes tragically on. We just wonder where next.

There are other warning signs. The number and percentages of the children who live in broken homes continues to increase, regrettably. Reports of domestic abuse and child abuse are at shocking levels.

One of our colleagues and cosponsors of this bill, Senator MOYNIHAN, once coined a memorable phrase. He talked about our society in terms of "defining deviancy down." What he meant—and, Senator MOYNIHAN, correct me, if I am incorrect—is that when behavior that was once considered deviant or outrageous becomes more ordinary and commonplace, societies tend to redefine deviancy.

This is such a classic and clear example. For example, in 1929, four gangsters killed seven unarmed bootleggers. The slaughter was considered so horrific that the event was dubbed the "St. Valentine's Day Massacre." Remember that one? It was 1929; seven unarmed bootleggers were slaughtered. It was so horrifying it got its own name, shows, everything, and made news around the world. It so shocked

and horrified the Nation that it has become a well-known historical event. It is even in most encyclopedias—seven people, 1929.

In sharp contrast, let's look to just 2 weeks ago, when a gunman strode into a church in Fort Worth, TX, puffing a cigarette, and slaughtered six defenseless people, including several children, before turning the gun on himself—just as many people, one less, killed in that Fort Worth church as in the St. Valentine's Day Massacre. Yet that story, so far from making it into an encyclopedia, didn't even get a headline in the Washington Post. Why? Why is it that we no longer consider outrageous what is truly outrageous? Perhaps it has become too commonplace. It has become common on our streets and airwaves. It is both the reality in which many live, and it makes up the entertainment into which many escape.

Over the past 30 years, there are many ways we have made progress as a country and as a people. Our economy has grown tremendously. Technological advances have been unprecedented. New doors of opportunity have been opened to people previously denied access. The opportunities available to women and minorities have increased, and they need to increase even further. But in the midst of unprecedented prosperity, there is a widespread belief that we live in a mean society where families are breaking down, children are more prone to crime, violence, alienation, drug use and suicide, and our civic fabric is fraying. In fact, not only does the United States lead the world in material wealth, it also leads the industrialized world in rates of murder, violent juvenile crime, abortion, divorce, cocaine consumption, pornography production, and consumption of pornography. These facts have not been lost on the American people—far from it. Poll after poll shows they recognize it.

I draw the attention of the body to some of the polls that have recently come out. Here is one: What poses the greatest threat to the United States? You can look through here: recession at 30-plus percent; decline of moral values, much higher; military, don't know. That was October 30 of last year.

Here is one from May 3 of this year: Where does the country face the most serious problems today? Moral values area, 56 percent; next closest, environment at 12 percent. Fifty-six percent of the public considering that. That was by a different research group than did the last one.

Here is one done by the Princeton Survey Research Group, July 22 of this year: What priority should be given to dealing with the moral breakdown of the United States? Fifty-five percent say top priority should be given.

My only point in showing these polls is that this is something the American public considers important, indeed, vital for us to be considering. We need to address it in this body. This is not to say that all societal changes have been negative. Far from it.

As I noted earlier, there are many causes for hope, even celebration. But there are causes for concern taking place as well. Even where our challenges remain stark, I am personally optimistic. I believe for every problem in America, there is a solution already in place, usually by an individual or family or community with the heart to make it happen.

I hope this task force will encourage the replication of those solutions, but first and foremost, my hope is that by working together we can begin to better understand where we are as a society and where we are headed.

Senator MOYNIHAN, again, made a point that I think is true: You can't change a problem until you can figure out how to measure it. You need to be able to measure to know when you are making progress on what is happening. That is the stage at which we find ourselves. We know something is happening in our society, but we don't know yet how to accurately measure it. We are still struggling with asking the right questions.

My hope and intention is that this task force would begin the important and necessary work of measuring these issues and asking the right questions.

I want to talk about some of the specifics of the task force, what it is and what it isn't.

There have been a lot of rumors spreading around about this. First, this task force will conduct the important business of investigating and analyzing and examining the state of our culture the causes and consequences of our societal difficulties, and possible solutions. It will hold hearings on such topics as civic participation, the state of the family structure, the impact of popular culture on young people, the causes of youth violence, and innovative and effective initiatives that have reduced various social problems that we have.

It will look at these issues in a holistic and a broad manner and—let me emphasize this—a bipartisan manner. It will not hold legislative jurisdiction. It will not report out or mark up legislation. It will not intrude on people's personal lives or seek to impose a set of values on anyone. It aims to achieve a better description of what is going on in our society, not a prescription of morals. It seeks to inform and investigate, rather than to legislate.

I know there were concerns among some of my colleagues about provisions regarding subpoena power. Let me assure all of them, those have been taken out. This endeavor will be a task force of concerned Members working together to get a better sense of the condition of our society. The task force is bipartisan in purpose, process, and structure, as bipartisan as possible. It is composed of eight members: four Republicans, four Democrats. You can't get much more bipartisan than that.

Together, I hope we can take a good look at what is going on in our society, at the state of the cultural environ-

ment in which we currently reside. While these are not legislative issues, they are important public issues with profound consequences, both in terms of public policy and in our daily lives.

This is an important task. I look forward to the counsel and support of my colleagues in getting to this important work. We have tried to bend over backwards to work in a bipartisan way to get this moving forward. We are still working to get this pulled together. I hope my colleagues will continue to talk with us about this, about how we can do this and how we can work together to address this very important problem.

AMENDMENT NO. 1833, WITHDRAWN

Mr. President, as I stated at the outset, as the Senator from Pennsylvania noted, I realize this will be subjected to a point of order. I wanted to bring it up and discuss it.

With this discussion, I withdraw my amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 1833) was withdrawn.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes.

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

MAJOR GENERAL BRUCE SCOTT, CHIEF OF ARMY LEGISLATIVE LIAISON

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Maj. Gen. Bruce Scott, who will soon depart his position as Chief of Army Legislative Liaison to assume command of the United States Army Security Assistance Command in Alexandria, VA.

I imagine that the impression most people have of someone who is a general is that of an officer who is in charge of troops, such as a person leading an Infantry division. Few realize that there are more generals who are administrators than troop leaders, and probably even fewer realize one of the most critical jobs any general in the United States Army could hold as far as preparing that service to protect the people, borders, and interests of the nation is the position which General Scott has held for the past two years. Though he might not have been wear-

ing BDU's or eating MRE's for the past twenty-four months, General Scott has had the extremely important responsibility of serving as the head of liaison efforts between the Congress and the Army. In that role, he has led the efforts to make sure that our soldiers have the resources they require to accomplish their mission and dominate any battlefield, anytime, anywhere.

General Scott is well qualified to represent the Army to the Legislative Branch. Every position he has held since beginning his Army career in 1968 as a Cadet at the United States Military Academy at West Point has given him a unique insight into what it is like to be a soldier at every level of the service. Thanks to his assignments to Infantry and Armored divisions, he understands what is involved in serving in a combat arms unit; as a result of his service as a Commanding General and Division Engineer, he understands what general officers require to do their jobs; a veteran of the White House Fellows program, he was exposed at an early stage to the relationship between the legislative and executive branches of government, as well as to the notion of civilian control of the military; and as a former Deputy Director of Strategy, Plans and Policy, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and plans, he has an appreciation of the strategic, or "bigger", picture. All in all, General Scott came to this job with the credentials and experience that was required of him.

During his command as the Chief of Army Legislative Liaison, General Scott put his rich background to work for him and the Army, working hard to represent the interests of the service to the Senate and House of Representatives, as well as working to make sure that the Army was responsive to our requests and interests. Over the past two years, General Scott helped to shepherd through the Congress major initiatives on Army modernization and digitization. He has been a forceful and effective advocate for the Army's "Force XXI" and its "Force After Next"; and, during my tenure as Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, we worked together to build even stronger ties between the Army and the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I have always believed that hard work will be rewarded, and after what I am certain at times was an agonizing, if not occasionally exasperating, experience of working with Congress, General Scott will soon take the reins of the United States Army Security Assistance Command. This is an important assignment, especially in this day and age when building or re-reinforcing coalitions and friendships with other nations is as important to the security of the United States as maintaining a well equipped, well trained fighting force. In his new job, General Scott will in many ways be carrying out the duties of an ambassador, he will certainly be making an important contribution to the diplomatic efforts of