

indicated, there is similar housing available at other installations. I would urge the chairman to lend his support to this inquiry.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senators for bringing this matter to my attention, and I also appreciate Senator McCain's interest. I support this inquiry and would add that it is the committee's desire to receive a report from GAO within 30 days specifically to allow us to resolve this matter to our satisfaction prior to conference and final passage of the fiscal year 1997 DOD authorization bill.

Mr. INHOFE. May I ask of the Armed Services Committee chairman and the Readiness Subcommittee chairman, respectively, if they will agree to consider modifying or eliminating this project during the joint conference on the fiscal year 1997 Department of Defense authorization bill, if the GAO's conclusions indicate that doing so would be in the best interest of the American taxpayer?

Mr. THURMOND. I assure the Senator from Oklahoma that I will support such actions if warranted by the conclusions of General Accounting Office report.

Mr. MCCAIN. I concur with Senator THURMOND. I will look carefully at the results of the GAO study before agreeing to fund this project.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, the subject of Senator INHOFE's GAO request will be the unaccompanied noncommissioned officers barracks. This project was planned, programmed, and funded to house NCO's who will come to Fort Leonard Wood as a result of the BRAC decision to move the chemical warfare training school and military police school to Fort Leonard Wood from Fort McClellan which is scheduled to close.

Current barracks space at FLW is designed for basic training students living four to a room with gang latrines—not for senior NCO's.

Any connection between the new barracks and the totally separate issue of basic training housing is irrelevant since the BRAC was aware of the need for the new barracks when it made its decision.

Even if there were space to renovate current barracks rather than build new barracks, the Corps of Engineers has already studied that option and deemed the extensive renovations required would not be cost effective.

The result of this report for all its good intentions will be to subvert the decision of the BRAC Commission and will set an unacceptable precedent.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMMAND'S PERSONAL PROPERTY REENGINEERING PROGRAM

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I applaud the efforts of the Senate Armed Services Committee to reform the Military Traffic Management Command's personal property reengineering program. I am concerned that MTMC's plan does not adequately address the concerns of the small moving companies, which comprise most of the industry. The Senate Armed Services Com-

mittee initiative establishes a working group of military and industry representatives to develop an alternative pilot program and requires the Government Accounting Office to review this revised plan.

Mr. BOND. I also share Senator STEVENS' concerns about the Department of Defense proposal to reengineer the personal property program and its associated impact on the small business community. While I support the Department's goals of improving the quality of personal property shipment and storage services to members of the military and their families, it should not be done at the expense of the small businesses which make up most of the moving industry.

Mr. THURMOND. Thank you very much for your comments regarding this initiative. We included this provision because of concerns about how this reengineering proposal would cause a major restructuring of the moving industry. As you know, the majority of movers in the communities near our military bases are small businesses. My primary goal is to improve the quality of service that service members and their families receive when they move.

Mr. STEVENS. I support reforming the current system to improve the quality of service and achieve cost reductions. However, I believe that the moving industry needs to participate in these discussions in a meaningful way. I believe that the fiscal year 1997 Defense authorization language will facilitate that process.

Mr. BOND. I agree that reforming the current system can lead to improvement of service to our military members and their families and a reduction in costs to the Government. I am sure that the reforms to the Military Traffic Management Command's personnel property reengineering program as instituted by the Senate Armed Services Committee will ensure that our military enjoys flexible, rapid, and efficient service as can only be found in a competitive environment.

#### VANCE AFB MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, Vance Air Force Base continues to be the preeminent pilot training base within the Department of the Air Force. Unfortunately, the Department of the Air Force has historically underfunded this installation in its military construction request. I have brought to your attention three projects which will assist Vance in meeting its infrastructure needs in the future. These projects include a base engineering complex, a consolidated logistics complex, and a project to add to and alter the Physical Fitness Training Center. It is my belief that planning and design funds for these projects, if identified, will allow the Department of the Air Force and Air Education and Training Command to consider these projects for inclusion in the fiscal year 1998 budget request.

I might point out to the distinguished chairman that these projects have wide support elsewhere in Congress. The Senate Committee on Appropriations' fiscal year 1997 military construction appropriations bill directs that not less than \$1,695,000 be made available for design of these projects from the "Military Construction, Air Force" account. Moreover, the House National Security Committee's fiscal year 1997 Defense authorization bill "directs the Secretary of the Air Force [to] conduct planning and design activities for the following projects: \$288,000 for a physical fitness training center at Vance Air Force Base, OK; and \$512,000 for a consolidated logistics complex at Vance Air Force Base, OK." Finally, the House Appropriations Military Construction Subcommittee's markup of the fiscal year 1997 appropriations bill directs the Air Force "to report to the committee on the need for these projects and its plans for construction by September 16, 1996."

Can the Chairman assure me that he will work with me to ask the Air Force to consider identifying funds for reprogramming in the coming months for planning and design purposes for these projects, which are so crucial to the future of Vance Air Force Base?

Mr. THURMOND. I can assure my colleague that I will work with him to urge the Air Force to consider identifying sufficient funds through reprogramming to meet the planning and design requirements for the three projects you have identified at Vance Air Force Base. I would also urge the Department of the Air Force to reexamine these projects for inclusion in the 1997-2001 FYDP and subsequently the fiscal year 1998 budget request. I am fully aware of the unique nature of Vance Air Force Base operations and applaud their continued efforts in achieving taxpayer savings through efficient training of our Nation's future aviators.

#### QUADRENNIAL DEFENSE REVIEW

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, along with Senator Ford as cochairman of the National Guard Caucus, I rise to address my concerns over the amendment to provide for a quadrennial defense review and the independent assessment of alternative force structures for the Armed Forces.

While I applaud and appreciate the specific inclusion of the Reserve and National Guard components in the review. I would be remiss if I did not raise my concerns over the qualifications of the independent members of the National Defense Panel. I believe that for the panel to be truly independent it must be diverse and must include collectively, members knowledgeable in all components of the Nation's Armed Forces.

I am concerned because of historical precedent set by the makeup of prior panels when composed of Secretariat designees. It is my understanding that when the Commission on Roles and Missions initially conducted its work,

there was no one with specific background expertise in National Guard issues.

Mr. THURMOND. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, if I may, I remember that incident very clearly and as the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee will remember, in the endgame of that Commission's work, the Secretary did finally appoint a member with National Guard expertise but it was well after the bulk of the work had been completed.

Mr. NUNN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FORD. The Senate from Missouri and I want the Secretary of Defense be aware of the National Guard Caucus' grave concerns and urge you to ensure that this independent review team be truly balanced.

Mr. NUNN. I assure the Senator that I am aware of his concerns and will keep them in mind as we deliberate with the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask the Chairman, to be resolute in his insistence that at least one member of the panel have a recognized understanding of National Guard functions when consulting with the Secretary of Defense on the composition of the panel and I and Senator FORD would be more than willing to lend any assistance the Chairman and the ranking member might require during those consultations.

Mr. THURMOND. I want to thank the senior Senator from Missouri for raising his concerns on this matter. The Senator has always been a stalwart supporter of Guard interests and the points he raises with the senior Senator from Kentucky are compelling. I assure the Senators that I will insist that the concerns of the National Guard will be adequately represented in the review panel.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY LIABILITY FOR  
NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am pleased that earlier today the Senate approved my amendment to S. 1745, the Department of Defense authorization bill, dealing with the Department of Energy's liability for damages to natural resources with respect to Federal Superfund sites. I want to thank Chairman THURMOND and Ranking Member NUNN and their respective staffs for working with me to ensure the passage of this amendment.

My amendment requires the Department of Energy to conduct a study of the Department's natural resource damages liability at its Superfund sites and report back to the appropriate committees of Congress 90 days after enactment of this bill. This is an issue of great importance and one that has been surrounded by uncertainty. Since the beginning of the 104th Congress, the Environment and Public Works Committee, under the leadership of Subcommittee Chairman SMITH and Committee Chairman CHAFEE, has been working tirelessly to bring much-needed reform to the Superfund Program.

During the course of hearings held on this topic, significant questions were raised regarding the Department of Energy's liability for natural resource damages at its Superfund sites. During testimony at a hearing in 1995, a Department official speculated that the Department's liability could be in the hundreds of billions of dollars. It has been reported that he termed the Department's liability for natural resource damages the sleeping giant of Superfund. However, during a follow-up hearing in April of this year the Department changed its tune. When asked about earlier statements, the same Department official who had a year earlier called natural resource damages a serious problem produced a study by the Council on Environmental Quality that claimed these damages are a "minor problem." While the timing of the release of the study was obviously circumspect, it became increasingly clear that the contents of the study were equally so.

The CEQ study estimated the Department of Energy's NRD liability at between \$200 and \$500 million. In the meantime, GAO has also been conducting its own study of Department liability and their preliminary results put the estimate at between two and \$15 billion. Mr. President, you can see why this issue has raised so many questions. We have a Department of Energy official estimating liability in the hundreds of billions of dollars, then his superiors in the White House overruling him and painting the problem as minor, and finally a GAO study which will come down somewhere in the middle.

I find this all rather troubling, Mr. President, and frankly it seems like this situation has created more questions than when we began. There are several aspects of CEQ's study that I find remarkable to say the least. I understand CEQ is currently modifying their first study and will shortly issue a corrected study, but fundamental questions about their assumptions remain. It is my intention, as chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee on Oversight, to hold a hearing later this summer to address some of these questions. But what I find most troubling of all, Mr. President, is that the Department of Energy has not undertaken their own study of this issue. The Department of Energy is the single biggest responsible party at Superfund sites in the Nation. That means the taxpayers of this country are on the hook for the biggest piece of liability at Superfund sites. Yet the Department has not done one study to determine what their liability might be in the second phase of superfund liability—the lurking, sleeping giant that is only now awakening—natural resource damages liability. My amendment corrects that incredible oversight in the hope that we can have an accurate estimate, done by those with the most knowledge about the nature of this complicated situation. In

addition, my amendment ensures we will have a realistic view of that liability by forcing the folks conducting the study to use the same program parameters that the private sector has been dealing with. This is the only fair way to calculate the Department's liability.

Again, I want to thank the Chairman and Ranking Member, and I want to thank my colleagues in the Senate for passing this important amendment.

Mr. NUNN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, if I can just report from this side of the aisle to our colleagues, we had a very productive day today because we stayed on the defense bill. We, basically, handled amendments on the defense bill all day except for one amendment, which was worked out and was unanimously agreed to on a rollcall vote on a very important matter.

If we can do that tomorrow, we have a good chance of finishing this bill tomorrow night. If we do not finish it tomorrow night, we can finish it on Friday. If we get back on amendments not related or relevant to the defense bill, then we will be—I understand the majority leader has to speak to this—we will be on this bill for a long time, and it will be up to the majority when we complete this bill.

We have 35 amendments we have worked out. We have accepted 27 already. We have 7 or 8 more we will be able to work out tonight. The minority leader on this side has done a lot of work, working with us, and Senator DORGAN and Senator FORD have led the effort to get our list of amendments on the Democratic side down as low as we can. We are working on that now.

Many of these amendments, I think, can be worked out. We have two or three more major hurdles that we have to get over to give us a clear sailing to finishing this bill, but those matters are being worked on, and I think they have a good chance, a reasonable chance, of being worked out sometime tomorrow so we can conclude this bill.

That is the report from our side of the aisle. I know the chairman of the committee will have some thoughts on his side of the aisle.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I commend the Members of the Senate and thank them for the progress that we have made today.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. May we have order? There are at least 12 conversations taking place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears the request of the Senator from West Virginia. The Senate is not in order. The Senate will be in order before we proceed.

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Again, I thank the Members of the Senate for the progress we have made today. If we can just avoid amendments that are not related to defense, we can finish this bill by tomorrow night. If we work hard, stay on the job, be here and take up the amendments—I am anxious for us to get

through this bill tomorrow night if possible. The majority leader wants this bill finished by tomorrow night. So I ask for the cooperation of all the Senators. Let us work together and get through this bill and not have to be here over the weekend.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I certainly share the concern and the attitude of the chairman and the ranking member. They are working hard to deal with these amendments. I hope work is being done very seriously now to identify a finite list of amendments.

I want to say, again, so everybody will know, the intent here is that we are going to finish the DOD authorization bill this week. That could mean not only Thursday night, it could mean Friday, it could mean Friday night and, if necessary, it could mean Saturday.

I want to be very much sympathetic to Members' desires to be with their families at night and certainly during the recess, but in order for the leader to be able to do that, I have to have the cooperation of Members on both sides of the aisle.

This is very important legislation, the Department of Defense authorization bill. So I am asking Members, help work with the leadership to get this bill done. We need to get it done so we can move on to the DOD appropriations bill and the military construction appropriations bill, so we can get our work done.

It can be done tomorrow night, but if it takes going over to Friday, we have no option but to do that. I know the chairman and ranking member will do that. Expect us to be here Friday and voting in order to complete it.

We are going to keep moving ahead. We always want to try to be reasonable. Tonight, the intent will be to have Senator NUNN lay down his amendment and have debate tonight, and the vote would occur in the morning at 9:30.

So there will be no more recorded votes tonight, but we are going to keep pushing ahead on this bill until we can get an agreed-to list of amendments, until we can get them resolved.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor, so we can proceed with the amendment.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. We are not in a quorum call, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

#### MARINE GENERALS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am not going to offer an amendment, but I do want to discuss, while there are still leaders of the committee, both Republican and Democrat, on the floor, a very important issue, as far as I am concerned. It may be very easy to ex-

plain to my colleagues. I know even many people who are not on the committee may know the issue. But I want to raise the issue with the committee of why this legislation provides for 12 additional Marine generals when the Marines are very much in a downsized mode.

This deals with what is called section 405. Section 405 would increase the number of general officers on active duty in the Marine Corps. If enacted, it would increase the number of generals in the Marine Corps from 68 to 80. That is 12 more Marine generals.

I think it is legitimate to ask why does the Marine Corps need an extra 12 generals when it is downsizing? In 1987, Marine end strength was at 199,000. At that time the Marine Corps had 70 generals; 199,000 marines, 70 generals.

As the Marine Corps began downsizing, the number of generals dropped slightly by 2 in 1991 to 68. But Marine end strength continued a gradual decline until last year it leveled off at 174,000. We used to have 70 generals, 199,000 marines. Today, we have 68 generals, 174,000 marines, a reduction of 25,000 since the late 1980's.

Despite this drop in end strength, the number of generals stayed right at 68 until right now. If this bill becomes law, section 405, the number heads north again. Why? I really do not understand. I hope somebody can explain it. Why do 25,000 fewer marines need 12 more generals giving them orders?

I suppose somebody could say that a possible explanation would be what is on page 279 of the committee report. I will quote:

This increase is intended to permit the Marine Corps to have greater representation at the general officer level on the Department of the Navy/Secretariat staff and in the joint arena. As a general rule, the Committee is reluctant to act on independent service requests of this nature \* \* \*

So this explanation is given in the committee report. I repeat, in the way of emphasizing, the additional 12 would "permit the Marine Corps to have greater representation at the general officer level on the Department of the Navy/Secretariat staff and in the joint arena."

I suppose the second possible explanation might be that the committee would say that technology has changed and the nature of warfare has changed and more generals are needed to run the battles. I suppose they could also say the Goldwater-Nichols Act is the culprit and requires it. Those are possible explanations. One of them, obviously, is somewhat of an explanation being in the committee report.

But let me suggest this, that when you figure that war is conducted on the battlefield—and that is where the lives are going to be put in danger—it seems to me, the extent to which we need 12 more generals ought to be related to the number of people that are going to be fighting and potentially shedding their blood.

In regard to the Goldwater-Nichols Act, it did place special emphasis upon

joint operations, joint staff, and joint duty. I suppose that is how this works its way into the committee report. But it seems to me that that should not constitute a license to expand joint headquarters staff when force structure is shrinking, shrinking by 25,000 marines. In fact, joint headquarters should replace duplicative service headquarters. If the Marines need more generals in joint billets, then they should reduce the number assigned to Marine headquarters.

The report language makes it clear that the extra generals are not needed for combat jobs. Instead, they are needed for bureaucratic in-fighting in the Pentagon budget wars. Those are my words. I suppose the people that write the reports are going to take exception to that explanation on my part. But when you talk about more people needed at the Navy/Secretariat level, to make the points of view for the Marines, that is the way I read it.

I suppose it also sounds like the Marines want to be topheavy with rank, just like the other services, like the Navy, for example. The Navy is approaching the point where it has one admiral for every ship. I suppose, to be more accurate, I should say 1.67 ships per admiral.

The Navy got the job done with 20 ships per admiral in World War II. If we apply the World War II ratio to today's fleets, the Navy should have no more than 20 admirals to get the job done. But the Navy has 218 admirals.

The proponents of section 405 might also suggest that technology creates a need for more generals. That is possible. But the reverse is also possible. Technology could reduce the need for so many generals and admirals.

I would like to have you take C CUBED-I, for example. This is the command, control, communications and intelligence. This bill contains billions of dollars for C CUBED-I. C CUBED-I gives the top generals and admirals the capability to run the battles from the Pentagon. It gives them the ability to communicate directly down to the smallest unit, the smallest unit operating anywhere in the world.

I do not expect you to take the judgment of the Senator from Iowa on that. But it seems to me, if you read Colin Powell's book, "My American Journey," you can see how he did it. If he did it just a few short years ago, we ought to be able to do it.

So C CUBED-I technology could reduce the need for having so many admirals at sea with the fleet. It could reduce the need for having so many generals forward deployed with the fleet Marine force.

So, Mr. President, I do not understand or see the need for the increase in the number of generals provided for in section 405. The number of generals should be decreased as the Marine Corps gets smaller, as I said, down from 199,000 to 174,000 today. Yet we are going to increase the number of marines, potentially, from 68 to 80.

Now, again, you may not want to believe Colin Powell in his book, "My American Journey," you may not want to listen to the Senator from Iowa, but maybe you would like to listen to a marine general, John Sheehan, commander in chief of the U.S. Atlantic Command. I quoted him very extensively on some debate last week. I quoted him when I was trying to make my case to freeze defense infrastructure costs. General Sheehan, Marine Corps general, argues that, "Headquarters should not be growing as the force shrinks." Could I repeat that. We have a Marine Corps general saying that "headquarters should not be growing as the force shrinks."

The force is shrinking, from 199,000 to 174,000. That is a fact of life already. The number of marine generals is suggested to increase from 68 to 80. The possible explanation in the committee report—need more generals at the Navy Secretary level, so the marines have more of a voice at the higher echelons of decisionmaking. General Sheehan, a marine general, same branch of the military, as we are increasing the number of marines, commander of Atlantic forces, General Sheehan hits the nail right on the head when he says, "The growth in headquarters staff jobs is threatening the military's war-fighting capability." He says that after he said, "Headquarters should not be growing as the force shrinks."

Surely marines in the U.S. Senate—and I have not served in the military; I want to make that very clear. I am no military hero, as Senator MCCAIN and a lot of other people in this body, but I can read. I do not know why any marine in this Senate would question General Sheehan when he says, "Headquarters should not be growing as the force shrinks."

"The growth of headquarters staff jobs is threatening the military's war-fighting capability."

General Sheehan has identified the root cause of the problem. He helps me understand why the Department of Defense cannot cut infrastructure costs, as I tried to do a week ago on my amendment. The growth in headquarters staff is being driven by one powerful force—excess generals and admirals searching for a mission. Each senior officer needs a place to call home and to hoist a flag. Every senior officer needs a command, a headquarters, a base, a staff, or a large department of some kind, somewhere, someplace. Each general, then, created by section 405, will need some new real estate that is going to cost our tightly written defense budget very much. It is going to weaken our defense and not provide the national security that it ought to provide.

All of this makes me think, Mr. President, that this new section 405, increasing the number of generals from 68 to 80, may not be such a hot idea, particularly when Marine General John Sheehan says, "Headquarters should

not be growing as the force shrinks." And when it does, he says, "The growth of headquarters staff jobs is threatening the military's war-fighting capability."

I hope my colleagues on this floor who, out of their heart and probably even out of their intellect, firmly believe and so state on the floor of this body that we do not have enough money for defense—and I may disagree with them on that point, but I know my colleagues who say that sincerely believe it—if they do believe it, and we have a defense dollar that is so terribly squeezed, why we are adding this number of personnel at the highest ranks of the marines at the same time the marine force is shrinking.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I will have the opportunity to study in some detail the comments of my distinguished colleague. I am not prepared at this time to respond to the detailed statement that he made, but I think it is very worthy of having a response. I will make certain tomorrow that I will address the issues.

I know first and foremost that comes to mind, having served in the Navy Secretariat and dealt with the flag, promotions, and the need for flag officers, and listening to the Senator harken back to the days of World War II when, indeed, an admiral did command a good number of units, what has changed is the joint service arena, requiring so many flag officers to participate in joint service assignments. That has made up, in large measure, for the expansion of the numbers of our flag and general officers, particularly in the Navy and the Marine Corps.

However, tomorrow, Senator—your statement is highly deserving of a reply—I will present my own views on it.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, if I could have a moment to respond to the Senator from Virginia.

Thank you very much for giving it the thought that I know the Senator will give it and the explanation the Senator will give. I would particularly like to have the Senator comment, as the Senator thinks about it, on what Marine Corps General Sheehan has said and written about. I have quoted him, but he has also published, as well, in one of the defense publications on a longer basis than what I quoted. I think he ought to have considerable credibility in this area, because he is making the same criticisms.

Second, I am not sure I can be here, and I do not have to be here, but if the Senator will notify me when the Senator will be on the floor to respond, I would appreciate that.

Mr. WARNER. I will acknowledge both of those requests, and, indeed, I share the distinguished Senator's high regard for General Sheehan.

AMENDMENT NO. 4349

(Purpose: To take measures to protect the security of the United States from proliferation and use of weapons of mass destruction)

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment temporarily be laid aside, and I send to the desk an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. SPECTER, proposes an amendment numbered 4349.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the agreement reached yesterday be further modified to reflect that there be no small business tax amendments offered by the two leaders in order and all remaining provisions in the agreement still in place.

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

#### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 1996

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, so that Members will know what the timeframe is going to be tonight and in the morning, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 8 a.m., Thursday, June 27; further, that immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, that no resolutions come over under the rule, that the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed to have expired and the time for the two leaders reserved for their use later in the day.

I further ask unanimous consent that there be a period of morning business until the hour of 9:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each, with the following Senators in control of the designated time: Senator MURRAY, 10 minutes; Senator DEWINE, for 10 minutes; Senator LEAHY, from 8:30 until 8:45; Senator DORGAN, from 8:45 to 9 o'clock; Senator THOMAS, from 9 o'clock to 9:30.

Further, at 9:30, the Senate proceed to resume consideration of the DOD authorization bill, and there be 10 minutes remaining for debate on the Nunn-Lugar-Domenici amendment to be equally divided in the usual form, and a vote to occur following the conclusion or yielding back of time on the Nunn-Lugar-Domenici amendment, with no second-degree amendments in order to that amendment.

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