

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.