

reached a compromise on the defense numbers.

I do not intend to mention names. But I would like to relay a couple points that were made by House leaders in defense of pumping up the defense budget.

The first argument was the pork argument. At the time of the defense meeting of conferees, the relevant House committee had already completed work on this year's defense bill. If the conferees did not pump up the numbers, it would mean going back to Members of Congress and saying we would have to go back on our promise to fund this project or that program.

Now, when a Member of Congress is faced with a choice like that, guess what he or she will do? The choice is, go along with the pumped-up defense numbers, or we'll cancel this project in your district. And that'll mean jobs.

What kind of national security strategy is this, Mr. President?

Everyone knows, the defense budget is justified by a national security strategy. We've all heard of the two-war strategy. The defense budget is built on a strategy of fighting and winning two near-simultaneous wars in different parts of the globe.

Now, I am not so naive to think there's any real tight connection between a national strategy and our defense budget. But at least our defense community usually goes along with the gag. They pay lip service to the connection, even though we all know the defense budget is as much a big pork factory as it is a generator of fighting capabilities. If we did not pay lip service, there would be no justification for budget increases, and hence no credibility.

In this case—in my discussion in that defense meeting—there was not even lip service. It was unadulterated realpolitik. The justification for more defense spending was more pork and more jobs. Period.

The other comment that was made was the recognition that a national security strategy is no longer the basis of our defense budget, since the cold war is over. So what, I asked, is the justification for the present budget, let alone vast new increases. The answer I got was that more defense spending is needed because the United States must police the world. And we are the only ones who can do it.

My question is, how in the world can that justify the spending levels in this agreement? If anything, it undermines it. This defense budget is still based on an obsolete, cold war strategy. We are still buying cold war relics. Before this conference agreement, we were on a path toward a post-cold war budget. But with this influx of money, we are now returning to the cold war budget in a post-cold war era.

If we are now going to be policemen of the world, why are we still buying things that were specifically designed to counter the Soviet threat, not to police the world? We are still buying

Seawolfs and B-2's and F-22's and Comanche helicopters, and the like. If we are supposed to now police the world, why are we buying these? The fact is, this argument does not justify these larger defense numbers.

Another argument is that the defense budget is not going up, we are simply trying to freeze it, and keep it from going down. But this is not a credible argument. And it never has been. The defense budget is based on a national strategy, at least supposedly. If the budget declines, which would be consistent with the disappearance of the Soviet threat, what is the problem? There should not be a problem—unless, that is, we view it as a port factory with jobs attached.

Mr. President, there is no logical basis for the defense numbers in this conference agreement. The arguments are bogus, and they reflect a lack of serious, credible justification.

As I mentioned earlier, I support the conference agreement because I believe it will lead to a legitimate balanced budget in 2002. And I am willing to accept the defense compromise if that's what it takes to get an overall agreement.

But I am taking this opportunity to warn my Republican colleagues not to repeat the mistakes we made in the 1980's with the defense budget. In the 1980's, our goal was not a defense build-up. It was a defense budget build-up. We ended up buying much less with much more than we got and spent under the Carter administration. That's because we substituted more money for better management. We lost credibility as a party because of it.

As the party that now controls Congress for the first time in 40 years, we are right back where we were in 1981. Our defense policy, as reflected in this conference agreement, is to once again build up the defense budget, not defense. It is to, once again, create jobs, not a lean fighting machine.

I have been given assurances by Members of the other body that defense reforms are forthcoming. After concentrating this year on health care reform, the top reform priority of the other body next year will be major defense reform.

By inference, my colleagues are admitting that they will tolerate business-as-usual with the Defense Department—at least for 1 more year. I am here to warn my colleagues that 1 year is all they will get. One year to conclude that better management will win out over more money, as a solution.

Because if there is not a change next year to doing business-as-usual in defense, then I will expend everything in my arsenal to bring sanity to our defense policy. Just like I did from 1983 to 1985, when I ended the irrational defense budget buildup under President Reagan. It was my amendment on this very floor on May 2, 1985, by a vote of 50-49 that ended the insanity back then. And I will do it again.

Even if it takes me 2 full years to do it, like it did back then. And I will win.

Because it is not right to have a double standard—one for defense, and one for the rest of Government. All that will do is hurt the credibility of our party. And I do not want that. Because in my view, our party is the only one that can restore hope and opportunity for the next generation.

---

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein.

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

---

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

---

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

---

#### REPORT OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 58

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

As required by section 19(3) of the Public Telecommunications Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-356), I transmit herewith the report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 28, 1995.

---

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At noon, a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

The message also announced that the house has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to

transfer the catafalque to the Supreme Court for a funeral service.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1565. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend through December 31, 1997, the period during which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs is authorized to provide priority health care to certain veterans exposed to agent orange, ionizing radiation, or environmental hazards.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 9355(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Speaker announces the appointment as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. TANNER.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1565. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend through December 31, 1997, the period during which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs is authorized to provide priority health care to certain veterans exposed to agent orange, ionizing radiation, or environmental hazards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following report of committee was submitted:

By Mr. STEVENS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:  
Special Report entitled "Review of Legislative Activity During the 103D Congress" (Rept. No. 104-100).

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. D'AMATO, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

Deborah Dudley Branson, of Texas, to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation for a term expiring December 31, 1996.

Charles L. Marinaccio, of the District of Columbia, to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation for a term expiring December 31, 1996.

Steve M. Hays, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Institute of Building Sciences for a term expiring September 7, 1997.

Martin Neil Baily, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Tony Scallon, of Minnesota, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank for a term of three years.

Sheila Anne Smith, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank for a term of three years.

Marianne C. Spraggins, of New York, to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation for a term expiring December 31, 1997.

Albert James Dvoskin, of Virginia, to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protec-

tion Corporation for a term expiring December 31, 1998.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed, subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

By Mr. PACKWOOD, from the Committee on Finance:

Ira S. Shapiro, of Maryland, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Senior Counsel and Negotiator in the Office of the United States Trade Representative:

(The above nomination was reported with the recommendation that he be confirmed, subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CHAFEE:

S. 975. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel JAJ0, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. NICKLES:

S. 976. A bill to transfer management of the Tishomingo National Wildlife Refuge in Oklahoma to the State of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 977. A bill to correct certain references in the Bankruptcy Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. DODD):

S. 978. A bill to facilitate contributions to charitable organizations by codifying certain exemptions from the Federal securities laws, to clarify the inapplicability of antitrust laws to charitable gift annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. INOUE, Mr. GLENN, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. DODD, and Mr. SPECTER):

S. 979. A bill to protect women's reproductive health and constitutional right to choice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 980. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Social Security Act to protect and improve the availability, quality and affordability of health care in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. EXON:

S. 981. A bill entitled "Truck Safety and Congressional Partnership Act"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. NICKLES:

S. 976. A bill to transfer management of the Tishomingo National Wildlife Refuge in Oklahoma to the State of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### THE TISHOMINGO NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE ACT

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I take the floor today to introduce a bill which will turn the management responsibilities of the Tishomingo National Wildlife Refuge from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service over to the Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation. This legislation responds to unacceptable policies promulgated by the Fish and Wildlife Service in their management of national wildlife refuges.

During the past several years, the Fish and Wildlife Service has attempted to restrict public access and traditional activities on our wildlife refuge preserves. Long-allowed public uses on refuges such as wildlife viewing, hunting, fishing, hiking, grazing, and boating, have come under close scrutiny and curtailment. These shortsighted restrictions proposed by the administration's political appointees have resulted in unnecessary burdens and pressures on the public who use and benefit from our wildlife refuges.

What the Fish and Wildlife Service fails to realize is that the taxpayers own and finance the refuge lands. Outdoor recreation contributes significantly to local economies and local support for the refuges. Allowing traditional activities, such as fishing and boating at Tishomingo, is integral in maintaining continued public support and funding for the refuge system.

Due to ill-advised changes in Federal management practices during the last 10 years, wildlife populations on the Tishomingo refuge have severely declined. The State of Oklahoma, however, presently provides suitable habitats for wildlife resources across the State and currently manages 650,000 acres of Federal land. State officials have assured me that they will improve habitat conditions for wildlife at the refuge and work to reverse the negative impact of inadequate Federal management.

My legislation will ensure limited Federal funding for the Tishomingo Refuge and will ultimately result in significant savings to the Federal Government. The Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation can manage the refuge more efficiently and with fewer taxpayer dollars. Specifically, my bill stipulates annual funding be made available to the State in the amount of 50 percent of the refuge's current operating costs.

In conclusion, I believe the State of Oklahoma can manage the Tishomingo National Wildlife Refuge in an efficient and cost-effective manner and do so with fewer employees than the Federal Government. Local management will result in better communication between the managers of the refuge and