

Mr. MOYNIHAN submitted five amendments intended to be proposed by him to amendment No. 1487 proposed by Mr. DOLE to the bill S. 343, supra; as follows:

## AMENDMENT No. 1714

On page 2, strike lines 15 through 25; on page 3, strike lines 1 through 7 and insert in lieu thereof, the following:

"(a) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies to every rulemaking according to the provisions thereof, except to the extent that there is involved—

"(1) a matter pertaining to an auxiliary or foreign affairs function of the United States;

"(2) a matter relating to the management or personnel practices of an agency;

"(3) an interpretative rule, general statement of policy, guidance, or rule of an agency, organization, procedure, or practice unless such rule, statement, or guidance has general applicability and substantially alters or \* \* \* rights or obligations of persons outside the agency;" strike "or;

"(4) a rule relating to the acquisition, arrangements, or disposal by an agency of real or personal property, or of services; these are promulgated in compliance with otherwise applicable criteria and procedures; or

"(5) an interpretative rule involving the internal revenue laws of the United States other than an interpretative regulation."

## AMENDMENT No. 1715

On page 12, line 9: after "petition", insert "(other than a petition relating to a rule described in section 621(9)(B)(i))".

## AMENDMENT No. 1716

On page 68, line 18: insert "(other than a rule described in section 621(9)(B)(i))" after "rule".

## AMENDMENT No. 1717

On page 9, line 5: insert "Nothing in this section shall be interpreted to limit the application of 26 U.S.C. 7805."

## AMENDMENT No. 1718

On page 13, line 4: insert "(or as otherwise provided)" after "subchapter".

On page 16, line 8: insert "for purposes of this chapter" after "(i)".

PACKWOOD AMENDMENTS NOS.  
1719-1723

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. PACKWOOD submitted five amendments intended to be proposed by him to amendment No. 1487 proposed by Mr. DOLE to the bill S. 343, supra; as follows:

## AMENDMENT No. 1719

[Amendment No. 1719 was not reproducible for the RECORD. It will appear in a subsequent issue.]

## AMENDMENT No. 1720

On page 13, line 4: insert "(or as otherwise provided)" after "subchapter".

On page 16, line 8 insert "for purposes of this chapter" after "(i)".

## AMENDMENT No. 1721

On page 9, line 5, insert "Nothing in this section shall be interpreted to limit the application of 26 U.S.C. 7805."

## AMENDMENT No. 1722

On page 68, line 18, insert "(other than a rule described in section 621(9)(B)(i))" after "rule."

## AMENDMENT No. 1723

On page 12, line 9: after "petition", insert: "(other than a petition relating to a rule described in section 621(9)(B)(i))".

GLENN (AND LEVIN) AMENDMENTS  
No. 1724-1725

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. GLENN (for himself and Mr. LEVIN) submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by them to amendment No. 1487 proposed by Mr. DOLE to the bill S. 343, supra; as follows:

## AMENDMENT No. 1724

On page 57, at the end of paragraph (1), insert:

"The requirements of this subsection shall not apply to a specific rulemaking where the head of an agency has published a determination, with the concurrence of the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, and notified the congress, that the agency is unable to comply fully with the peer review requirements of this subsection and that the rulemaking process followed by that agency provides sufficient opportunity for scientific or technical review of risk assessments required by this subchapter."

## AMENDMENT No. 1725

On page 21, line 25, insert between "of" and "reasonable" the following: "a reasonable number of".

On page 23, line 11, insert between "and of" and "the" the following: "a reasonable number of".

NOTICE OF HEARING  
CANCELLATIONCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL  
RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the hearing on S. 871, the Hanford Land Management Act, previously scheduled before the full Committee on Energy and Natural Resources for Thursday, July 20 at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC, has been canceled. For further information, please call Maureen Koetz at 202-224-0765 or David Garman at 202-224-7933.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO  
MEETCOMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN  
AFFAIRS

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Friday, July 14, 1995, to conduct a hearing on Mexico and the exchange stabilization fund.

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

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

## B-2 BOMBERS

• Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I am disappointed that the Senate Armed Serv-

ices Committee did not include funding for additional B-2 bombers in the National Defense authorization bill that was filed yesterday. In my view, this was a short-sighted decision, one which I hope can be reversed. Today, Mr. President, I want to enter into the RECORD two recent editorials and a letter, all of which, I believe, help Members to understand the importance of continuing the B-2 program.

The first editorial comment was authorized by Paul Wolfowitz, and appeared in the June 12 edition of the Wall Street Journal. Mr. Wolfowitz points out that the DOD-IDA bomber study had assumed enough warning time for over 500 U.S. tactical aircraft and many other assets to arrive before the war started. He notes, and I quote, "Not surprisingly, the contribution of additional B-2's would not be cost-effective in those hypothetical circumstances." Mr. Wolfowitz goes on to posit the importance of the B-2 bomber in less favorable scenarios and circumstances, noting its independence from foreign bases; its value in possible East Asian scenarios, where neither land-based nor carrier air have the needed range; and its ability both to deter and to retaliate while placing few Americans in harm's way. After noting the advantages of stealth, Mr. Wolfowitz goes on to note, and I quote:

With more than 30 wings of traditional fighter aircraft and only one wing of B-2's and two wings of F-117's it could hardly be said that the U.S. is overemphasizing stealthy attack capability.

The second editorial comment is by Charles Krauthammer, and is in today's Washington Post. Mr. Krauthammer notes that, and I quote:

There are three simple, glaringly obvious facts about this new era: (1) America is coming home; (2) America cannot endure casualties; (3) America's next war will be a surprise. \* \* \*

He goes on to note that the B-2 is not a partisan project, that today it is supported by,

Seven Secretaries of Defense representing every administration going back to 1969. They support it because it is the perfect weapon for the post-cold war world.

Mr. Krauthammer goes on to note that the so-called Republican cheap hawks, concerned about high costs, hold the future of the program in their hands. He notes, and I quote,

But the dollar cost of a weapon is too narrow a calculation of its utility. The more important calculation is cost in American lives. The reasons are not sentimental, but practical. Weapons cheap in dollars but costly in lives are, in the current and coming environment, useless. A country that so values the life of every Captain O'Grady is a country that cannot keep blindly relying on nonstealthy aircraft over enemy territory.

My third submission, Mr. President, is a letter to me from recently retired Air Force Gen. Chuck Horner, who was the overall air commander during Operation Desert Storm. He begins by noting that his career was spent in operations and that in his entire career, he had never advocated buying any specific weapons system. Having said that,