

However, I am not terribly sympathetic for a Federal agency which misbehaved and manipulated the public trust. They have placed burdens and expenses on Americans through false risks and unnecessary anxiety. This type of regulatory zeal must be stopped.

Plain and simple; this legislation will identify the underlying scientific assumptions used in the risk assessments so that all concerned parties can evaluate the judgments and conclusions. This process allows for full and open public debate which will neither threaten our democracy nor the health and safety of the American public who we all serve.

Opponents want to dismiss any risk assessment legislation as a form of technospeak to justify the destruction of the environment and health rules. But this "sky-is-falling" complaint strategy is spurious and disingenuous. This legislation will not remove one environmental or safety rule. It will, however, require the assumptions, methodologies and extrapolations to be part of the public record. Only if science supports different conclusions can the foundation for the rules be challenged.

I urge my colleagues to look at S. 333, the basic legislation which was introduced by Senators MURKOWSKI and JOHNSTON last month and this amendment. Both focus on removing risk misinformation and restoring public confidence in our rulemaking process. I believe it deserves your support.

It is time to get past partisan bickering and exaggerations.

It is time to end the false debate on the value of risk assessment and cost benefit analysis.

It is time to focus our health and safety policies with sound risk assessment methodologies.

It is time for Congress to act.

I thank my colleagues for their consideration.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce publicly that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will hold a hearing on Thursday, March 9, 1995, at 10 a.m. in SR-418, Russell Senate Office Building.

The committee has two purposes for holding this hearing. First, we will receive testimony on the nomination of Mr. Dennis M. Duffy to be the Department of Veterans Affairs' Assistant Secretary for Policy and Planning. Mr. Duffy currently serves as VA's Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional Liaison.

Second, the committee will hear testimony from officials of three Federal entities—the Department of Veterans Affairs; the Department of Labor, Veterans Employment and Training Service; and the Court of Veterans Appeals—on those entities' proposed budgets for fiscal year 1996. We also in-

tend to receive testimony from representatives of veterans' service organizations concerning the fiscal year 1996 budget for veterans programs.

The committee would be pleased to receive written statements from members of the public concerning these matters. Such statements may be submitted to the Committee's offices. Members of the public may also contact Mr. William F. Tuerk, the committee's general counsel, if they have questions or need information concerning the subject matter of this hearing.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet immediately after the vote on the balanced budget amendment on Thursday, March 2, 1995, to consider the following nominations:

Sheila Cheston to be the general counsel of the Air Force;

Josue Robles, Jr. to be a Commissioner on the BRAC;

Herschelle Challenor to be a member of the National Security Education Board; and

Vincent Ryan to be a member of the board of directors on the Panama Canal Commission.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 2, 1995, at 3:30 p.m. to hold a hearing regarding United States Policy toward Iran and Iraq.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

F-22 ELECTRONIC COMBAT EFFECTIVENESS TESTING

• Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, what is it about F-22 electronic combat effectiveness testing that terrifies Air Force?

The fiscal year 1995 Senate Defense Appropriations Report 103-321 included the following language:

The Committee is concerned that the F-22 test and evaluation master plan [TEMP] may not include sufficient electronic combat effectiveness testing before the onset of production. The Committee believes that it is important for the F-22 to demonstrate its capabilities in an offensive air superiority mission against a full array of likely threats. Those threats should include a modern integration air defense system, at a minimum on a simulated basis to the extent practicable, affordable, and cost effective.

Therefore, the Committee directs that no more than 65 percent of the funds provided for the F-22 program for fiscal year 1995 may be obligated until the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (acquisition) submits to the congressional defense committees a report

outlining the cost and schedule impacts on the F-22 program, and the technical and operational advantages and disadvantages, of revising the TEMP to include significantly more thorough electronic combat effectiveness testing before initiation of: (1) pre-production vehicle procurement; (2) commitment to low-rate initial operational test and evaluation.

This report shall include, as a baseline, thorough electronic combat testing at the real-time electromagnetic digitally controlled analyzer and processor [REDCAP] and the Air Force electronic warfare evaluation simulator [AFEWES], and an installed system test facility with a capable wide-spectrum radio frequency generator that is interfaced for real-time control from remote facilities and a high capability dome, visual system cockpit simulator.

The report also shall identify the funding required between fiscal years 1996-99 to allow the electronic combat test facilities cited in the preceding paragraph to thoroughly undertake effectiveness testing on integrated avionics suites.

This report requirement was retained in Conference, though, as a courtesy of the House colleagues, the fence was dropped.

Well, March 1, 1995 has come and gone, but no report; however, there has been an interesting development. On February 28, 1995, the Air Force base closure and realignment recommendations were made public. The Air Force operates 10 major test and evaluation [T&E] facilities with a combined budget in fiscal year 1995 of \$1.722 billion. Not one was recommended for closure; but two very small T&E facilities with a combined fiscal year 1995 budget of less than \$20 million were recommended for closure: the Real-time Electromagnetic Digitally-Controlled Analyzer and Processor [REDCAP] and the Air Force Electronic Warfare Evaluation Simulator [AFEWES], the very facilities where Congress directed the Air Force to consider conducting F-22 electronic combat effectiveness testing. What is the Air Force afraid of?

The one facility mentioned in the Senate report that was not closed, the installation system test facility, belongs to the Navy. Apparently, the Air Force could not get at it.

The most perplexing thing about the aversion of the Air Force to proper testing of the F-22 is that the B-2 program is about to undertake tests at the REDCAP very similar to those being avoided by the F-22. The B-2 test program has been thorough to the point of exhaustive. Is the B-2 successful because it was thoroughly tested, or was it successful so it is being thoroughly tested? Either way, what lesson can we draw about the F-22?

When our needs are so many, and money so short, Congress can ill-afford to buy a pig in a poke. Congress gave the Air Force the opportunity to prove its claims regarding the F-22. The Air Force responded by trying to eliminate the facilities that could have rendered a judgment on the effectiveness of the F-22. Obviously, the Air Force has something to hide. If they will not test it, we will not buy it. Come budget